

NOTES

Taking the *lulav* is merely moving – טְלִטּוֹל בְּעֵלְמָא הוּא: The primary prohibition cannot be due to the fact that the *lulav* is set aside, as then it should be prohibited on the Festival day just as it is on Shabbat. Therefore, the prohibition must be one that exists on Shabbat but not on the Festival: The prohibition against carrying from one domain to another (*Arukh LaNer*).

Perek IV  
Daf 43 Amud a

NOTES

And carry it four cubits – וַיַּעֲבִירוּ אַרְבַּע אַמּוֹת: The early authorities, beginning with Rashi, ask: Why is Rabba concerned specifically lest one carry four cubits in the public domain and not lest one carry from one domain to another? Many answers were suggested: Since in most places there is no full-fledged public domain, when one leaves his house he is not carrying directly into the public domain. However, by the time he reaches the vicinity of the home of the Torah scholar with whom he intends to consult, he will have carried in a public domain (*Rid*). Others explain that everyone is well aware of the prohibition against carrying an object from one domain to another on Shabbat, but people are less aware of the prohibition against carrying four cubits within the public domain. Therefore, the concern that one will inadvertently do so is greater (*Kappot Temarim*). The *Me'iri* explains that Rabba chose the case of carrying in the public domain because it is more succinct (see Rashi and *Tosafot*).

And that is the reason for *shofar* – הֵיִינוּ טַעְמָא דְשׁוֹפָר: The commentaries addressed the matter of *shofar* at length because, unlike the *lulav*, the *shofar* was sounded on Shabbat in the Temple and everywhere that there was a court. They explained that due to the significance of that mitzva, which evokes the memory of the Jewish people before God, they did not eliminate its observance entirely on Shabbat. Alternatively, since by Torah law the mitzva of *shofar* applies for only one day each year, and when the Temple stood there were years when Rosh HaShana was in fact one day, if it were not sounded at all the concern was that it would be forgotten (*Tosafot*). Another explanation is that since the mitzva of *shofar* is performed by one person on behalf of the entire community, one need not be concerned lest he come to carry the *shofar* in a prohibited manner (*Ritva*, citing Rabbi Aaron HaLevi).

We do not know – אֲנָן לֹא יָדְעִינָּהּ: Although today the correct dates of the Festivals are common knowledge, the Sages already established that there may be no deviation from the custom of our ancestors, lest foreign oppressors issue decrees and the calendar of the Festivals be forgotten (*Ran*; see *Tosafot*).

גמ' אמאי? טְלִטּוֹל בְּעֵלְמָא הוּא, וְלִידְחֵי שַׁבָּת! אָמַר רַבָּה: גּוֹרָה שְׂמָא יִטְלְנוּ בְּיָדוֹ וְיִלְךְ אֶעֱלֶה בְּקֵי לְלִמּוּד.

**GEMARA** Apropos the prohibition against taking a *lulav* on Shabbat, the Gemara asks: Why is this prohibited? After all, taking the *lulav* is merely moving<sup>n</sup> the object and is prohibited due to the rabbinic prohibition of set-aside. Since the mitzva to take the *lulav* is a mitzva by Torah law, let it override this relatively minor Shabbat prohibition. Rabba said: This prohibition is a decree lest one take the *lulav* in his hand and go to an expert to learn how to wave the *lulav* or how to recite its blessing,

וַיַּעֲבִירוּ אַרְבַּע אַמּוֹת בְּרִשּׁוֹת הָרַבִּים. וְהֵיִנוּ טַעְמָא דְשׁוֹפָר, וְהֵיִנוּ טַעְמָא דְמַגִּילָה.

אי הָכִי, יוֹם רִאשׁוֹן נִמְי! רִאשׁוֹן, הָא תִּקְיֵנוּ לִיה רַבְּנָן בְּבֵיתוֹ. הֲתִינַח אַחַר תִּקְנָהּ, קוּדָם תִּקְנָהּ מֵאֵי אִיבָא לְמִימְרָ?

אָלָּא: רִאשׁוֹן דְּאִיתִיבָה מִן הַתּוֹרָה בְּגִבּוּלֵין – לֹא גּוֹרוּ בְּהוּ רַבְּנָן, הֲנֵךְ דְּלִיתְנָהּ מִן הַתּוֹרָה בְּגִבּוּלֵין – גּוֹרוּ בְּהוּ רַבְּנָן.

אי הָכִי, הֵיִדְנָא נִמְי! אֲנָן לֹא יָדְעִינָּהּ בְּקִיבוּעָא דְיִרְחָא. אִינְהוּ דִּידְעִי בְּקִיבוּעָא דְיִרְחָא – לִידְחוּ!

and in doing so carry it four cubits<sup>n</sup> in the public domain, thereby violating a severe Torah prohibition. And that is the reason for the prohibition against sounding the *shofar*<sup>n</sup> on Shabbat, and that is the reason for the prohibition against reading the Scroll of Esther when Purim coincides with Shabbat.

The Gemara asks: If so, on the first day of *Sukkot* that coincides with Shabbat too one should not take the *lulav* due to this concern. The Gemara answers: With regard to the first day, the Sages instituted that one should take the four species in his house. Since the Sages already prohibited one from taking the *lulav* out of the house, he will remember that it is prohibited and will not come to take it elsewhere to learn to wave it or to recite the blessing. The Gemara asks: This works out well after the ordinance that one takes the *lulav* in his house was instituted. However, prior to introducing the ordinance, what is there to say in explaining why it is permitted to take the *lulav* on the first day?

Rather, the Gemara rejects the previous explanation and explains the distinction differently. On the first day, when the mitzva of taking the *lulav* even in the outlying areas and not just in the Temple is in effect by Torah law, the Sages did not issue a decree to prohibit taking the *lulav* on the first day and permitted the mitzva to be performed even in the outlying areas. However, with regard to these other days of *Sukkot*, when the mitzva of taking the *lulav* is not in effect by Torah law in the outlying areas and the *lulav* is taken there only to commemorate the practice in the Temple, the Sages issued a decree to prohibit taking the *lulav* on the other days.

The Gemara asks: If it is so that the mitzva on the first day is a mitzva by Torah law even in the outlying areas, today too one should take the *lulav* on the first day of *Sukkot* that coincides with Shabbat. The Gemara answers: We do not know<sup>n</sup> when precisely the establishment of the month<sup>8</sup> was determined by the court. Therefore, it is possible that the day observed as the first day of *Sukkot* is not *Sukkot* at all. Certainly, one does not violate the rabbinic decree to fulfill a mitzva that is not definitely a mitzva by Torah law. The Gemara asks: If so, with regard to the people of Eretz Yisrael, who sanctify the month based on eyewitness testimony and who know when precisely the establishment of the month was determined by the court, let them override Shabbat for the mitzva of *lulav* on the first day of *Sukkot* even today.

BACKGROUND

The establishment of the month – קִיבוּעָא דְיִרְחָא: For an extended period in antiquity the Hebrew calendar was established by the court based on the testimony of people who witnessed the appearance of the new moon. During that period, the addition of an extra day to a month was determined by that testimony. If the moon was sighted on the night following the

twenty-ninth day of the month, the next day was declared the first day of the following month. If, however, the moon was not sighted that night, or if witnesses to the new moon did not appear in Jerusalem to testify the following day, a day was added to the previous month, creating a month of 30 days. The delay in communicating this decision to Babylonia led to differences

in observance between the communities in Eretz Yisrael and those in the Diaspora.

Since the fourth century the Jewish calendar has operated on a fixed astronomical system in which, with few exceptions, months of 29 days alternate with those of 30 days. Nevertheless, the second Festival day in the Diaspora is still observed.

**Lulav on the first day – לולב ביום הראשון** – Since the mitzva of *lulav* on the first day of the Festival is a mitzva by Torah law everywhere, when the Temple is standing the *lulav* is taken even when the first day coincides with Shabbat (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Lulav* 7:14).

**Lulav today – לולב בזמן הזה** – Today, after the destruction of the Temple, the *lulav* is not taken on Shabbat even in Eretz Yisrael and even though the actual dates of the Festivals are common knowledge. This is meant to avoid distinguishing between different Jewish communities, so as not to cause a split among the Jewish people. The prohibition is based on the decree of Rabba (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Lulav* 7:17).

**The mitzva of *lulav* during the day – מצות לולב ביום** – The mitzva of *lulav* is performed specifically during the day, and it may be performed at any point throughout the day (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 652:1).

**The mitzva of *sukka* during the day and the night – סוכה** – The mitzva of *sukka* is performed throughout the festival of *Sukkot*, both at night and during the day (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 639:1).

NOTES

**ראשון אפילו בגבולין – First, even in the outlying areas** – Rashi explains that the Gemara derives that this applies even in the outlying areas from the fact that the verse does not specify that it applies in the Temple. Others, however, understand that the word *first* is apparently superfluous, and it is from that word that the Gemara derives that the mitzva applies even in the outlying areas (*Sefat Emet*).

BACKGROUND

**Verbal analogy – גזירה שוה** – This is a fundamental rabbinic principle of biblical interpretation, appearing in all standard lists of exegetical principles. If the same word or phrase appears in two places in the Torah, and a certain *halakha* is explicitly stated in one of these places, the Rabbis may infer on the basis of verbal analogy that the same *halakha* must apply in the other case as well. Consequently, the inferences drawn on the basis of verbal analogy rely on verbal identity, rather than on conceptual similarity as in the inductive analogy. Usually inferences can be drawn through verbal analogy only if the same word or phrase appears in both of the verses being compared, although a verbal analogy may occasionally be drawn even if the words being compared are not identical, provided that their meanings are similar. In its simplest form, the verbal analogy is a type of linguistic interpretation by means of which the meaning of an obscure word or phrase is inferred on the basis of another occurrence of the same word or phrase in a clearer context. However, it is often used not only to determine the meaning of obscure words and phrases, but to transfer entire *halakhot* from one context to another. Most significantly: One cannot infer a verbal analogy on his own, i.e., only a verbal analogy based on ancient tradition is valid.

אין הכי נמי: (דתני) חדא: ביום טוב הראשון של חג שחל להיות בשבת כל העם מוליכין את לולביהן להר הבית, (ותניא) אידך: לבית הכנסת. שמע מינה: כאן – בזמן שבית המקדש קיים, כאן – בזמן שאין בית המקדש קיים, שמע מינה.

The Gemara answers: Yes, it is indeed so, and that is their practice, as it was taught in one mishna: **On the first day of the Festival that occurs on Shabbat, all the people bring their *lulavim* to the Temple Mount on Friday. And we learned in another mishna: They bring their *lulavim* to the synagogue. Learn from the change in formulation that here, where the mishna says that they bring their *lulavim* to the Temple Mount, it is referring to when the Temple is in existence, and there, where the mishna says that they bring their *lulavim* to the synagogue, it is referring to when the Temple is not in existence.** The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from it that this is so.

דאיתיה מן התורה בגבולין מנא לן? דתניא: "ולקחתם" – שתהא לקיחה ביד כל אחד ואחד.

§ The Gemara asks: **From where do we derive that by Torah law the mitzva of *lulav* on the first day<sup>4</sup> is in effect even in the outlying areas?** The Gemara answers: **As it was taught in a *baraita*:** "And you shall take for yourselves on the first day the fruit of a beautiful tree, branches of a date palm, and boughs of a dense-leaved tree, and willows of the brook, and you shall rejoice before the Lord your God seven days" (Leviticus 23:40). The Sages parse the phrases and terms in the verse. In the phrase "And you shall take," the plural form of you is used, indicating that there should be taking in the hand of each and every one, and no one can fulfill the obligation on another's behalf.

"לכם" – משלכם, להוציא את השאול ואת הגזול. "ביום" – ואפילו בשבת. "ראשון" – אפילו בגבולין. "הראשון" – מלמד שאינו דוחה אלא יום טוב הראשון בלבד.

They continue to expound the verse. **Yourselves** indicates from your own, to exclude a borrowed or stolen *lulav*. **On the day** comes to emphasize that there is a mitzva by Torah law to take the *lulav* on each day of the Festival, even on Shabbat. The word *first*, used with no qualification as to where the *lulav* is to be taken, indicates that this obligation is in effect everywhere on the first day, even in the outlying areas.<sup>5</sup> **The first**, with the definite article for emphasis, is restrictive and teaches that the mitzva of taking the *lulav* overrides Shabbat only on the first day of the Festival.<sup>6</sup>

אמר מר: "ביום" ואפילו בשבת. מכדי טלטול בעלמא הוא, איצטריך קרא למישרי טלטול? אמר רבא: לא נצרכא אלא למכשירי לולב, ואליבא דהאי תנא. דתניא: לולב וכל מכשיריו דחין את השבת, דברי רבי אליעזר.

The Gemara analyzes the *baraita*. **The Master said: On the day**, indicates even on Shabbat. The Gemara asks: **Now, since taking the four species entails merely moving the object and is prohibited due to the rabbinic prohibition of set-aside, is a verse needed to permit moving the *lulav*?** Obviously, the Torah does not address prohibitions that are not by Torah law. **Rava said:** Indeed, the verse is necessary only for actions that are facilitators of the performance of the mitzva of *lulav*, i.e., to permit actions necessary to prepare a *lulav* for the mitzva, such as severing it from the tree, which may be performed on Shabbat. **And that is in accordance with the opinion of this *tanna* who permits doing so on Shabbat, as it was taught in a *baraita*:** *Lulav* and all the actions that are its facilitators override Shabbat; this is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer.

מאי טעמא דרבי אליעזר – אמר קרא "ביום" – ואפילו בשבת. ורבנן: האי "ביום" מאי עבדי ליה? מיבעי ליה: "ביום" ולא בלילה. ורבי אליעזר, ביום ולא בלילה מנא ליה? נפקא ליה מסיפא דקרא: "ושמחתם לפני ה' אלהיכם שבעת ימים" – ימים ולא לילות. ורבנן: אי מהתם – הוה אמנא: לילף ימים ימים מסוכה, מה לילן ימים ואפילו לילות – אף כאן נמי ימים ואפילו לילות.

The Gemara explains: **What is the rationale for the statement of Rabbi Eliezer?** It is as the verse states: **On the day**, indicating that the obligation exists every day of the Festival, and even on Shabbat.

The Gemara asks: **And the Rabbis, what do they do with the verse: On the day?** The Gemara answers: **They require it to teach that the mitzva of taking the *lulav* is specifically during the day<sup>7</sup> and not at night.**

The Gemara asks: **And from where does Rabbi Eliezer derive that the *lulav* is taken during the day and not at night?** The Gemara answers: **He derives it from the end of the verse:** "And you shall rejoice before the Lord your God seven days" (Leviticus 23:40), indicating that the obligation to take the *lulav* is during the days and not during the nights.

The Gemara asks: **And the Rabbis, why don't they derive it from that verse?** The Gemara answers: **If it was derived from there, I would have said: Derive days** written with regard to *lulav* from days written with regard to *sukka* by means of a verbal analogy,<sup>8</sup> just as there, with regard to *sukka*, it means days and even nights,<sup>9</sup> here too, with regard to *lulav*, it means days and even nights.

Or go this way – או כַּלְךָ לְדַרְךָ זוּ: Some raise the following question: Why doesn't the Gemara respond by citing the principle that analogies produce only strictures and not leniencies? They explain that the verbal analogy between days and days is not a full-fledged verbal analogy in the sense that the *halakha* is derived from it. Rather, it merely reveals an already existing *halakha*. Therefore, the Gemara elaborates precisely how it arrived at that conclusion.

וְסוּכָה גוֹפֵה מִנְלֵן? דְּתַנּוּ רַבְנָן: "בְּסוּכוֹת תִּשְׁבוּ שִׁבְעַת יָמִים" – יָמִים וְאַפִּילוּ לַיְלוֹת. אֵתָּה אוֹמֵר יָמִים וְאַפִּילוּ לַיְלוֹת, אוֹ אֵינּוּ אֶלָּא יָמִים וְלֹא לַיְלוֹת? וְדִין הוּא: נֹאמֵר כָּאן "יָמִים" וְנֹאמֵר בְּלוּלָב "יָמִים", מִה לְהֵלֵן יָמִים וְלֹא לַיְלוֹת – אֶף כָּאן יָמִים וְלֹא לַיְלוֹת.

או כַּלְךָ לְדַרְךָ זוּ: נֹאמֵר כָּאן "יָמִים" וְנֹאמֵר בְּמִלּוּאִים "יָמִים", מִה לְהֵלֵן יָמִים וְאַפִּילוּ לַיְלוֹת – אֶף כָּאן יָמִים וְאַפִּילוּ לַיְלוֹת.

נִרְאָה לָמִי דוֹמָה: דְּמִן דְּבַר שְׂמִצּוֹתוֹ כֹּל הַיּוֹם מְדַבֵּר שְׂמִצּוֹתוֹ כֹּל הַיּוֹם, וְאֵל יוֹכִיחַ דְּבַר שְׂמִצּוֹתוֹ שְׂעָה אַחַת. או כַּלְךָ לְדַרְךָ זוּ: דְּמִן דְּבַר שְׂמִצּוֹתוֹ לְדוֹרוֹת מְדַבֵּר שְׂמִצּוֹתוֹ לְדוֹרוֹת, וְאֵל יוֹכִיחוּ מִלּוּאִים שְׂאִין נוֹהֲגִין לְדוֹרוֹת.

תְּלוּמֵד לִוְמַר:

The Gemara asks: **And with regard to *sukka* itself, from where do we derive that the mitzva is observed at night as well? As the Sages taught in a *baraita* that it is written: "You shall reside in *sukkot* for seven days" (Leviticus 23:42), from which they derived: Days and even nights.** The *tanna* continues the discussion: **Do you say days and even nights; or perhaps the meaning is only days and not nights? And it may be inferred logically that the latter is correct. It is stated here, with regard to *sukka*: "Days." And it is stated with regard to *lulav*: "Days." Just as there, with regard to *lulav*, the meaning is days and not nights, so too here, with regard to *sukka*, the meaning is days and not nights.** That is one possibility.

Or, perhaps, go this way<sup>n</sup> and say the opposite. **It is stated here, with regard to *sukka*: Days, and it is stated with regard to the inauguration of the Tabernacle: "And at the door of the Tent of Meeting you shall reside day and night seven days" (Leviticus 8:35). Just as there, with regard to the inauguration of the Tabernacle, the meaning is days and even nights, so too here, with regard to *sukka*, the meaning is days and even nights.** A source exists for either possibility.

The *baraita* continues: **Let us see to which of the paradigms the mitzva of *sukka* is comparable. Perhaps one derives a matter whose mitzva is in effect the entire day, *sukka*, from another matter whose mitzva is in effect the entire day, the inauguration of the Tabernacle, and do not let a matter whose mitzva is in effect for a brief moment, *lulav*, prove otherwise. Or perhaps go this way and say the opposite: One derives a matter whose mitzva is in effect throughout the generations, *sukka*, from another matter whose mitzva is in effect throughout the generations, *lulav*, and do not let the inauguration that is not in practice throughout the generations, as it was in effect only at the establishment of the Tabernacle, prove otherwise.**

Since it is impossible to determine the more appropriate source based on logical inference, derive the matter as **the verse states**:

## Perek IV

Daf 43 Amud b

"תִּשְׁבוּ" "תִּשְׁבוּ" לְגוֹרָה שׁוּה. נֹאמֵר כָּאן "תִּשְׁבוּ" וְנֹאמֵר בְּמִלּוּאִים "תִּשְׁבוּ", מִה לְהֵלֵן יָמִים וְאַפִּילוּ לַיְלוֹת – אֶף כָּאן יָמִים וְאַפִּילוּ לַיְלוֹת.

"עֲרֵבָה שְׁבַעָה בַּיּוֹם" עֲרֵבָה בְּשִׁבְעֵי מַאי טַעְמָא דְּחֵיאָ שְׁבַת? אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: כְּדֵי לְפָרְסָמָה שְׁהִיא מִן הַתּוֹרָה. אִי הָבִי, לִוְלָב נִמְי לִידְחֵי כְּדֵי לְפָרְסָמוֹ שְׁהוּא מִן הַתּוֹרָה!

"You shall reside," "you shall reside," by means of a verbal analogy. **It is stated here, with regard to *sukka*: "You shall reside in *sukkot* seven days" (Leviticus 23:42), and it is stated with regard to the inauguration of the Tabernacle: "And at the door of the Tent of Meeting you shall reside day and night seven days" (Leviticus 8:35). Just as there, with regard to the inauguration, the meaning is days and even nights, so too here, with regard to *sukka*, the meaning is days and even nights.**

§ The mishna continues: The altar is encircled with the **willow branch for seven days. How so?** If the seventh day of performing the mitzva of the willow branch occurs on Shabbat, since on that day the mitzva of the willow branch is a mitzva by Torah law, it overrides Shabbat and the mitzva of the willow branch is then performed seven days. The Gemara asks: **With regard to the mitzva of the willow branch on the seventh day, what is the reason that it overrides Shabbat? Rabbi Yoḥanan said: It is in order to publicize that it is a mitzva that applies by Torah law, since it is not written explicitly in the Torah. The Gemara raises an objection: If so, *lulav* too should override Shabbat in the Temple on the other days of *Sukkot* as well and not only on the first day in order to publicize that it is a mitzva by Torah law all seven days, since that too is not written explicitly in the Torah.**

Agents of the court bring it – שְׁלוּחֵי בֵּית דִּין מֵיְהוּדָה – לֵךְ: The Ritva writes that this is the source for the custom that developed even in the Diaspora that the heads of the synagogue are responsible for bringing willow branches for the congregation, with which they fulfill the mitzva of the willow branch.

People would come to raise doubts about *lulav* – אֲתֵי לְפָקְפוּקֵי בְּלוּלָב: The Rambam, in his Commentary on the Mishna, explains that they are likely to raise doubts about the rabbinic decree prohibiting taking the *lulav* on Shabbat, and consequently come to take it even on Shabbat.

Does not coincide – לֹא אֵיִקְלַע: Although the New Moon was then sanctified based on eyewitness testimony, at times the court would reject the witnesses or extend their interrogation to synchronize the calendar with their calculations. Based on those calculations, the court knew that the moon could not have been seen before its designated time. That is the understanding in the Jerusalem Talmud as well.

Perhaps it is performed by standing the branches upright – דִּילְמָא בּוֹקִיפָה: Some explain that they would stand the willow branches upright at the sides of the altar prior to the beginning of Shabbat, and therefore it involved no desecration of Shabbat (Ritva).

## HALAKHA

Does not coincide – לֹא אֵיִקְלַע: When Hillel HaNasi and his court established the fixed calendar, they ensured that Rosh HaShana never coincided with Sunday, in order that the seventh day of *Sukkot* would not coincide with Shabbat (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 428:1).

לוּלָב גּוֹרָה מִשּׁוּם דְּרַבָּה. אִי הָכִי עֲרַבָה נִמְי נִגְזוֹר! עֲרַבָה שְׁלוּחֵי בֵּית דִּין מֵיְהוּדָה לָהּ, לוּלָב לְכָל מְסוֹר.

The Gemara answers: One is prohibited from taking the *lulav* on Shabbat by rabbinic decree due to the concern expressed by Rabba (42b) lest he take the *lulav* in his hand and go to an expert to learn how to wave the *lulav* and thereby carry it in the public domain. The Gemara objects: **If so, with regard to the willow branch as well let us issue a decree due to the same concern.** The Gemara answers: The two cases are different. With regard to the **willow branch, agents of the court bring it<sup>N</sup>** to the priests who perform the mitzva in the Temple, and they carefully prepare the willow branch prior to the onset of Shabbat and will not come to carry it in a prohibited manner on Shabbat. However, performance of the mitzva of *lulav* is incumbent upon every individual. Therefore, there is concern lest one unwittingly perform the prohibited labor of carrying on Shabbat.

אִי הָכִי, כָּל יוֹמָא נִמְי לִידְחֵי! אֲתֵי לְפָקְפוּקֵי בְּלוּלָב. וְלִידְחֵי בְּיוֹם טוֹב רִאשׁוֹן! לֹא מוֹכְחָא מִלְתָּא. אֲמַרִי: לוּלָב הוּא דְקָא דְחֵי.

The Gemara objects: **If so, i.e.,** because the willow branch is supplied by agents of the court there is no concern that Shabbat will be desecrated, **let the mitzva of the willow branch override Shabbat on every day of the Festival as well.** The Gemara answers: In that case people would come to raise doubts about the significance of the mitzva of *lulav*,<sup>N</sup> as, unlike the mitzva of the willow branch, it would override Shabbat on only one day of the Festival and not on all seven. The Gemara asks: **And let the mitzva of the willow branch override Shabbat on the first day of the Festival,** just as the mitzva of *lulav* does, and not on the seventh day. The Gemara answers: **The matter of publicizing that the mitzva of willow branch is a mitzva by Torah law would not be apparent, as people would say that it is really the mitzva of *lulav* that overrides Shabbat, and once *lulav* is permitted the willow branch is permitted as well.**

וְלִידְחֵי בְּחַד מֵהַנֶּהְדָּ! בֵּינּוֹן דְּקָא מִפְקֵת לָהּ מִרִאשׁוֹן – אוֹקְמָה אֲשַׁבְּעֵי.

The Gemara asks: **And let the mitzva of the willow branch override Shabbat on one of these other days of *Sukkot*;** why specifically the seventh day? The Gemara answers: **Once you moved it from the first day, establish it on the seventh day,** which is also a unique day of *Sukkot*, and not on one of the other intermediate days of *Sukkot*.

אִי הָכִי, הָאֵיִדְנָא נִמְי לִידְחֵי! אֲנִי לָא יְדַעִינָן בְּקִיבוּעָא דִּירְחָא.

The Gemara asks: **If so, i.e.,** if the mitzva of the willow branch is so significant that it overrides Shabbat, **let it override Shabbat today as well,** even though the Temple is not standing. The Gemara answers: **We do not know when precisely the establishment of the month was determined by the court.** Therefore, it is possible that the day observed as the seventh day of *Sukkot* is not the seventh day at all. Certainly, one does not violate the rabbinic decree to fulfill a mitzva that is not definitely a mitzva by Torah law.

אֵינְהוּ דִּידְעֵי בְּקִיבוּעָא דִּירְחָא. לִידְחֵי! כִּי אֲתָא בַר הֲדֵיָא אֲמַר: לֹא אֵיִקְלַע, כִּי אֲתָא רַבִּי וְכָל נְחוּתֵי אֲמַרִי: אֵיִקְלַע, וְלֹא דְחֵי.

The Gemara asks: **If so, with regard to the people of Eretz Yisrael, who know the establishment of the month, let them override Shabbat for the mitzva of willow branch on the seventh day of *Sukkot* even today.** **When bar Hedyā came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia he said:** That is not a practical question, as the seventh day **does not coincide<sup>NH</sup>** with Shabbat, since the Sages fixed the calendar to avoid that possibility. **When Ravin and all those emissaries who descended to Babylonia, or who originally left Babylonia for Eretz Yisrael and returned, came, they said: It does coincide with Shabbat, but it does not override Shabbat.**

וְאֵלָא קִשְׂיָא! אֲמַר רַב יוֹסֵף: מֵאֵן לִימָא לָן דְּעֲרַבָה בְּנִטְיָלָהּ, דְּלִמָּא בּוֹקִיפָה?

The Gemara asks: **But then it is difficult;** why doesn't the mitzva of the willow branch override Shabbat on the seventh day today? **Rav Yosef said: Who will say to us definitively that the mitzva of the willow branch is performed by taking it? Perhaps it is performed by standing the branches upright<sup>N</sup>** against the altar. Since there is no altar today, the mitzva does not override Shabbat.

אֵיִתִּיבִיהָ אַבְי: לוּלָב וְעֲרַבָה שְׂשֵׁה וְשַׁבְּעָה. מֵאֵי לָאוּ – בְּלוּלָב, מֵה לּוּלָב בְּנִטְיָלָהּ, אֵף עֲרַבָה בְּנִטְיָלָהּ! מִיָּדֵי אִירְיָא! הָא – כְּדֵאִיתִיהּ, וְהָא – כְּדֵאִיתִיהּ.

Abaye raised an objection to Rav Yosef from the mishna, which states: The *lulav* is taken and the altar is encircled with the willow branch either six or seven days. **What, is it not learned from the juxtaposition of these mitzvot in the mishna that the mitzva of the willow branch is like the mitzva of *lulav* in that just as the mitzva of *lulav* is performed by taking it, so too, the mitzva of the willow branch is performed by taking it and not by standing it upright?** He answered him: **Are the cases necessarily comparable?** Perhaps this mitzva of *lulav* is as it is, by means of taking, and this mitzva of the willow branch is as it is, by means of standing it upright.

**People circle the altar – מקיפין את המזבח:** Most commentaries explain that the priests circled the altar, as it is prohibited for an Israelite to enter the area between the Entrance Hall and the altar. However, some of the *ge'onim* explain that they did not actually circle the altar. Rather, the people stood on all sides of the altar where it was permitted for them to stand. When it says that they circle the altar seven times it means that they would disperse and then reassume their position seven times. According to this opinion, Israelites also participated in this ritual, albeit from a distance. However, Rabbi Yitzhak ibn Giot maintains that in order to fulfill this mitzva, the Israelites were permitted to enter that area of the courtyard and circle the altar with the priests.

**Seven times – שבע פעמים:** Some say that this practice was based on the conquest of the city of Jericho, where it too was circled once each day and seven times on the seventh day. Furthermore, an allusion to the practice of circling the altar with a willow branch can be found in the verse: "Order [*isru*] the Festival procession with branches, even unto the horns of the altar" (Psalms 118:27). Although not typically interpreted in that manner, the verb *isru* can be interpreted as circle (see Onkelos on Genesis 49:11). According to that interpretation the verse means: Circle the altar on the Festival with branches, an allusion to the mitzva of willow branch (*ge'onim*).

**And concealed them – וכבשום:** Some explain this verb to mean concealed. The Boethusians sought to conceal the willow branches, until the ignoramuses discovered their location. Others explain that it means pressed or applied pressure, meaning that the Boethusians placed stones on the willow branches, thinking that the Sages would be unable to move the stones due to their set-aside status. The latter authorities write that either way it was a futile effort, as the Boethusians were unaware that under the circumstances it would have been permitted even to lift the stones off the branches directly, and all the more so would it have been permitted to do so in an unusual manner (see *Arukh LaNer* and *Emek Sukkot*).

**Son of Torah [*bar urya*] – בר אורי:** This is a term used infrequently as a title for a Torah scholar. It often appears with the first-person plural suffix as *uryan*, meaning son of our Torah.

Some explain this term, particularly in this instance where it appears without the suffix and where there are variant readings supporting this explanation, as son of a lion [*bar arya*]. Those rare scholars who received this title were in fact sons of prominent leaders of their generation, and it was appropriate to address them in that manner.

#### HALAKHA

**Circling the altar – תקיפת המזבח:** In the Temple the people would circle the altar with the *lulav*. They would also stand willow branches upright at its side and take willow branches with the *lulav* in fulfilling the mitzva of the four species, as per the conclusion of the Gemara (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhos Lulav* 7:22–23).

#### BACKGROUND

**Boethusians – ביתוסין:** The Boethusians, usually mentioned together with the Sadducees, were a deviant sect that diverged from the path of the Sages. It is not clear what the difference between the two sects was, but from various sources it is evident that the Boethusians sought, in deceitful ways, to discredit the opinions of the Sages and cause the people to adopt their opinions.

איתיביה אביי: בכל יום מקיפין את המזבח פעם אחת, ואותו היום שבע פעמים. מאי לאו – בערב! לא. בלולב. והא אמר רב נחמן אמר רבה בר אבוא: בערב! אמר ליה: הוא אמר לך בערב, ואנא אמינא בלולב. אתמר, רבי אלעזר אומר: בלולב, רב שמואל [בר נתן] אמר רבי חנינא: בערב. וכן אמר רב נחמן אמר רבה בר אבוא: בערב.

אמר ליה רבא לרב יצחק בריה דרבה בר בר חנה: בר אורי. תא ואימא לך מלתא מעלייתא דהוה אמר אבוי. הא דתנן כל היום מקיפין את המזבח פעם אחת, ואותו היום מקיפין את המזבח שבע פעמים – הכי אמר אבוי משמיה דרבי אלעזר: בלולב.

איתיביה: לולב דוחה את השבת בתחלתו, וערבה בסופו. פעם אחת חל שביעי של ערבה להיות בשבת, והביאו מרביות של ערבה מערב שבת, והניחום בעורה, והבירו בהן ביתוסין ונטלום וכבשום תחת אבנים.

למחר הבירו בהן עמי הארץ, ושטמום מתחת האבנים, והביאום הכהנים וקפום בצדי המזבח. לפי שאין ביתוסין מודים שחיבוב ערבה דוחה את השבת.

אלמא בנטילה היא! תיובתא.

ואלא נדחו: כיון דאנן לא דחינן – אינהו נמי לא דחו. והא יום טוב הראשון, דלדין לא דחי ולדידהו דחי!

Abaye raised an objection to Rav Yosef from a mishna: On every day the people circle the altar<sup>NH</sup> one time, and on that day, the seventh day of the willow branch, they circle it seven times.<sup>N</sup> What, is the mishna not referring to circling the altar with the willow branch in hand? He answered him: No, it is referring to circling the altar with a *lulav*. Abaye objects: But didn't Rav Nahman say that Rabba bar Avuh said: They would circle the altar with the willow branch? Rav Yosef said to him: He said to you with the willow branch; however, my authority is no less than his, as we are both *amora'im*, and I say that they circle the altar with a *lulav*. It was stated that this was the subject of dispute between other *amora'im* as well. Rabbi Elazar says: They circle the altar with a *lulav*. Rav Shmuel bar Natan said that Rabbi Hanina said: They circle the altar with the willow branch. And likewise, Rav Nahman said that Rabba bar Avuh said: They would circle the altar with the willow branch.

Rava said to Rav Yitzhak, son of Rabba bar bar Hana: Son of Torah [*bar urya*],<sup>N</sup> come and I will tell you an outstanding statement that your father would say. With regard to that which we learned in a mishna: On every day the people circle the altar one time, and on that day, the seventh day of the willow branch, they circle the altar seven times; this is what your father said in the name of Rabbi Elazar: They circle the altar with a *lulav*.

Abaye raised an objection to Rav Yosef from the *Tosefta* (*Sukka* 3:1): The mitzva of *lulav* overrides Shabbat at the start of the Festival, and the willow branch overrides it at the end of the Festival. One time, the seventh day of the willow branch occurred on Shabbat, and they brought branches of the willow tree on Shabbat eve, before Shabbat, and placed them in the Temple courtyard for use on Shabbat. The Boethusians<sup>B</sup> in the Temple, who disagreed with the Sages and held that there is no mitzva of the willow branch on the seventh day of the Festival, noticed them and took them and concealed them<sup>N</sup> under the stones. This was an attempt to prevent fulfillment of the mitzva, as they knew that the Sages would prohibit moving the stones, which are set-aside on Shabbat.

The next day, some of the ignoramuses noticed the branches concealed under the stones. And since the ignoramuses identified with the opinion of the Sages, and at the same time were ignorant of the details of the mitzvot, they extracted them from under the stones. And the priests brought them and stood them upright at the sides of the altar. This happened because the Boethusians do not concede that waving the willow branch overrides Shabbat.

Apparently, based on the conclusion of the incident, the mitzva of the willow branch is fulfilled by taking it, as it is referring to waving the willow branch and not just standing it upright at the sides of the altar. The Gemara notes: Indeed, it is a conclusive refutation of Rav Yosef's opinion.

Given the refutation of Rav Yosef's opinion, the original question is difficult: Rather, let them in Eretz Yisrael override Shabbat for the mitzva of the willow branch on the seventh day of *Sukkot* nowadays as well. The Gemara answers: Since we in the Diaspora do not override Shabbat for this purpose, they in Eretz Yisrael also do not override it. The Gemara objects: But doesn't the first day of the Festival refute that contention, as for us in the Diaspora it does not override Shabbat and we do not take the *lulav*, and for them in Eretz Yisrael it overrides Shabbat and they take the *lulav*?