

אָמַר: לְיִדְהוֹ נִמְי לֹא דָחַי וְאֵלָא קִשְׁיָא  
הֵינָא תְרַתֵּי; דְתִנָּא חֲדָא: כָּל הָעָם מוֹלִיכִין  
אֶת לְוֵלְבִיָּהוֹן לְהַר הַבַּיִת, וְתִנָּא אֵינְדָּךְ:  
לְבֵית הַכְּנֻסֶת. וּמִתְרַצִּין: כָּאן – בְּזִמְנָא  
שְׁבִית הַמִּקְדָּשׁ קַיָּים, כָּאן – בְּזִמְנָא שְׁאִין  
בֵּית הַמִּקְדָּשׁ קַיָּים.

לֹא, אֵינְדִי וְאֵינְדִי – בְּזִמְנָא שְׁבִית הַמִּקְדָּשׁ  
קַיָּים, וְלֹא קִשְׁיָא: כָּאן – בְּמִקְדָּשׁ, כָּאן –  
בְּגִבּוֹלֵין.

אָמַר לִיה אַבְי לְרַבָּא: מַאי שְׁנָא לְוֵלְבִיָּהוֹן  
דְּעִבְדִּין לִיה שְׁבַע יָמִים זְכוֹר לְמִקְדָּשׁ, וּמַאי  
שְׁנָא עֲרֵבָה דְלֹא עִבְדִּין לֵיה שְׁבַע יָמִים זְכוֹר  
לְמִקְדָּשׁ? אָמַר לִיה: הוּאִיל וְאֵדָם יוֹצֵא  
יְדֵי חוֹבְתוֹ בְּעֵרְבָה שְׁבַלְלֵב. אָמַר לִיה:  
הֵהוּא מְשׁוּם לְוֵלְבִיָּהוֹן הוּא דְקָא עִבְדִּין לִיה.  
וְכִי תִמָּא דְקָא מְגַבֵּה לִיה וְהִדְר מְגַבֵּה  
לִיה – וְהָא מְעַשִׂים בְּכָל יוֹם דְלֹא קָא  
עִבְדִּין הֵכָּהּ!

אָמַר רַב זְבִיד מְשַׁמֵּיה דְרַבָּא: לְוֵלְבִיָּהוֹן  
דְּאִוְרִייתָא – עִבְדִּין שְׁבַע יָמִים זְכוֹר לְמִקְדָּשׁ.  
עֲרֵבָה דְרַבָּנָא – לֹא עִבְדִּין לֵיה שְׁבַע יָמִים  
זְכוֹר לְמִקְדָּשׁ.

לְמַאי? אֵילִמָּא אַבָּא שְׁאוּל – הָאֵמַר:  
”עֲרֵבֵי נְחֹל” כְּתוּב, שְׁתֵּים – אַחַת לְוֵלְבִיָּהוֹן  
וְאַחַת לְמִקְדָּשׁ. אֵי לְרַבָּנָא – הֲלִכְתָּא  
גְּמִירִי לָהּ. דְּאָמַר רַבִּי אֲסִי אָמַר רַבִּי  
יִוֶּחָנָן מְשׁוּם רַבִּי נְחוּנְיָא אִישׁ בְּקַעַת  
בֵּית חוֹרְתָן: עֶשְׂרֵי נְטִיעוֹת, עֲרֵבָה, וְנִסְוֶן  
הַמֵּים – הֲלִכְהָ לְמִשְׁהָ מְסִינֵי.

אֵלָא אָמַר רַב זְבִיד מְשַׁמֵּיה דְרַבָּא: לְוֵלְבִיָּהוֹן  
דְּאִית לִיה עִיקָר מִן הַתּוֹרָה – בְּגִבּוֹלֵין  
עִבְדִּין לִיה שְׁבַע יָמִים זְכוֹר לְמִקְדָּשׁ, עֲרֵבָה  
דְּלִית לָהּ עִיקָר מִן הַתּוֹרָה – בְּגִבּוֹלֵין לֹא  
עִבְדִּין שְׁבַע יָמִים זְכוֹר לְמִקְדָּשׁ.

The Sages say: For them in Eretz Yisrael it also does not override<sup>N</sup> Shabbat. The Gemara asks: But if that is the case, the contradiction between these two sources is difficult, as it was taught in one mishna: All the people bring their *lulavim* to the Temple Mount on Friday, and it was taught in another mishna that they bring their *lulavim* to the synagogue. And we resolved this contradiction as follows: Here, where the mishna says that they bring their *lulavim* to the Temple Mount, it is referring to when the Temple is standing, and there, where the mishna says that they bring their *lulavim* to the synagogue, it is referring to when the Temple is not standing. Based on the above, when the Temple is not in existence the mitzva of *lulav* does not override Shabbat.

The Gemara resolves the contradiction: No, both this mishna and that mishna are referring to Eretz Yisrael when the Temple is in existence; and nevertheless, it is not difficult. Here, where the mishna says that they bring their *lulavim* to the Temple Mount, it is referring to the procedure in the Temple. And there, where the mishna says that they bring their *lulavim* to the synagogue, it is referring to the procedure in the outlying areas in the rest of Eretz Yisrael, where they knew when the new month was established. However, today, neither in the Diaspora nor in Eretz Yisrael does the mitzva of *lulav* override Shabbat.<sup>H</sup>

Abaye said to Rava: What is different about *lulav* such that we perform the mitzva seven days in commemoration of the Temple, and what is different about the willow branch that we do not perform the mitzva seven days in commemoration of the Temple?<sup>H</sup> Rava said to him: Since a person fulfills his obligation with the willow branch in the *lulav*, no additional commemoration is necessary. Abaye said to him: That is not a satisfactory answer, as he is performing that action due to the mitzva of taking the *lulav* and the other species. And if you say that he lifts the willow branch bound with the *lulav* to fulfill the mitzva of the four species and then lifts it again in commemoration of the willow branch in the Temple, aren't actions performed daily proof that we do not do so, as no one lifts the *lulav* twice?

Rav Zevid said in the name of Rava: Since the mitzva of *lulav* is a mitzva by Torah law, we perform it seven days in commemoration of the Temple even today. Since the mitzva of the willow branch is a mitzva by rabbinic law, we do not perform it seven days in commemoration of the Temple.

The Gemara asks: In accordance with whose opinion did Rava say this? If we say that Rava said this in accordance with the opinion of Abba Shaul, didn't he say that it is written: Willows of the river, i.e., in the plural, indicating two willow branches, one for the *lulav* and one for the Temple? In his opinion, the mitzva of the willow branch in the Temple is also a mitzva by Torah law. If Rava said this in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, they learned this as a *halakha* transmitted to Moses from Sinai, as Rabbi Asi said that Rabbi Yohanan said in the name of Rabbi Nehunya of the valley of Beit Hortan: The *halakha* of the ten saplings, the mitzva of the willow branch in the Temple, and the mitzva of the water libation on the altar during the festival of Sukkot are each a *halakha* transmitted to Moses from Sinai.

Rather, Rav Zevid said in the name of Rava: With regard to the mitzva of *lulav*, which has its basis written explicitly in the Torah, in the outlying areas we perform it seven days in commemoration of the Temple. With regard to the mitzva of the willow branch, which does not have its basis written explicitly in the Torah, in the outlying areas we do not perform it seven days in commemoration of the Temple.

NOTES

לְיִדְהוֹ נִמְי לֹא דָחַי – For them it also does not override – The Rambam explains that the Sages instituted ordinances to prevent the Jews from splitting into sects where some segments of the people practice one custom and other segments either do not practice it or practice another custom instead. Although in other matters, e.g., the second day of the Festivals observed in the Diaspora, this is not a concern, as can be explained the way Ritva explained it here: With regard to *lulav*, the Sages instituted that everyone follows his ancestral custom. Therefore, in the Diaspora the practice is not to take the *lulav* on Shabbat, since in ancient times it was never the practice to take the *lulav* on Shabbat due to the uncertainty concerning the correct date of the Festival. Based on the conclusion of the Gemara here, apparently the practice in Temple times in the outlying areas of Eretz Yisrael was not to take the *lulav* on Shabbat so as not to deviate from the custom of the rest of Jewry. Therefore, even today, the *lulav* is not taken in Eretz Yisrael on Shabbat, in keeping with the ancestral custom.

HALAKHA

**Lulav nowadays – לולב בזמן הזה** – Nowadays the *lulav* is not taken on Shabbat at all, even on the first day of the Festival and even in Eretz Yisrael (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Lulav* 7:17–18).

**Willow branch today – ערבה בזמן הזה** – Since the mitzva of the willow branch is not explicitly written in the Torah, the Sages restricted their ordinance to taking it on the seventh day of *Sukkot* in commemoration of the Temple (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Lulav* 7:22).

**Priests with physical defects – כהנים בעלי מומין** – Some say that since in this case individuals with physical defects were permitted to enter the area between the Entrance Hall and the altar, it indicates that the prohibition against entering there in general is by rabbinic law. Such a prohibition is suspended for the sake of the mitzva. On that basis, it may be permitted for non-priests to enter there as well, given that the elevated sanctity of that area is by rabbinic law and not by Torah law (see Ritva and later authorities).

**An ordinance of the prophets and a custom practiced by the prophets – יסוד נביאים ומנהג נביאים** – The practical difference between the two is that if it is an ordinance of the prophets it would be appropriate to recite a blessing over its performance, just as a blessing is recited over rabbinic ordinances instituted throughout the generations, e.g., joining of courtyards, ritual washing of hands, and others, as the Torah commands one to obey the Sages. In contrast, a custom of the prophets indicates that a ritual was practiced by the prophets themselves and others followed suit and began practicing the same custom, although it was never formally instituted. In that case, as is the case with other customs, no blessing would be recited.

**The prophets reinstated them – תזוּרו ויסדוּם** – The later authorities discussed a fundamental aspect of this matter. From the Gemara in tractate *Temura* it is clear that a prophet may not introduce *halakha* by Torah law based on prophecy. In fact, according to the Rambam, doing so proves that the individual is a false prophet. If so, how could prophets reinstate a *halakha* transmitted to Moses from Sinai that was forgotten? Some explain that prophecy may be used to add or clarify a point that facilitates the performance of a mitzva and not the mitzva itself (*Mitzpe Eitan*). Others suggest that the intent here is that the later prophets reestablished the *halakha* not based on their prophecy but through reason and analysis (Rabbi Tzvi Hirsch Chajes).

**Yours say – דלכון אמרי** – The *Arukh* explains that Rabbi Yoḥanan said this to Hizkiya, who was also from Babylonia, meaning that one of the Babylonians transmitted this *halakha*.

אמר ריש לקיש: כהנים בעלי מומין נכנסין בין האולם ולמזבח כדי לצאת בערבה. אמר ליה רבי יוחנן: מי אמרה? מי אמרה?! הא איהו אמר, דאמר רבי אסי אמר רבי יוחנן משום רבי נחוניא איש בקעת בית חורטן: עשר נטיעות, ערבה, וניסוד המים הלכה למשה מסיני!

אלא: מי אמרה בנטילה, דלמא בוקיפה? מי אמרה בבעלי מומין, דלמא בתמימים?

אתמר: רבי יוחנן ורבי יהושע בן לוי, חד אמר: ערבה יסוד נביאים, וחד אמר: ערבה מנהג נביאים. תסתים דרבי יוחנן הוא דאמר יסוד נביאים, דאמר רבי אבהו אמר רבי יוחנן: ערבה יסוד נביאים הוא, תסתים.

אמר ליה רבי זירא לרבי אבהו: מי אמר רבי יוחנן הכי? והאמר רבי יוחנן משום רבי נחוניא איש בקעת בית חורטן: עשר נטיעות, ערבה, וניסוד המים הלכה למשה מסיני! אשתומם בשעה חדא" ואמר: שכתום וזוּרו ויסדוּם.

ומי אמר רבי יוחנן הכי? והאמר רבי יוחנן: דלכון אמרי, דלהון היא! לא קשיא:

Apropos the willow branch in the Temple, Reish Lakish said: **Priests with physical defects<sup>N</sup> enter between the Entrance Hall and the altar in order to fulfill the obligation of the mitzva of the willow branch.** Although due to their blemishes it is prohibited for them to pass there, as they circle the altar with the willow branches they inevitably pass between the Entrance Hall and the altar. **Rabbi Yoḥanan said to him: Who stated this halakha?** The Gemara wonders about Rabbi Yoḥanan's question: **Who stated it? Didn't Rabbi Yoḥanan himself state it? As Rabbi Asi said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Neḥunya of the valley of Beit Ḥortan: The halakha of the ten saplings, the mitzva of the willow branch in the Temple, and the mitzva of the water libation on the altar during the festival of Sukkot are each a halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai.**

Rather, Rabbi Yoḥanan's question was: **Who said that the mitzva is fulfilled by taking the willow branch and circling the altar? Perhaps the mitzva is only fulfilled by standing the willow branches upright surrounding the altar. Who said that the mitzva may be fulfilled even by those with physical defects? Perhaps it may be fulfilled only by unblemished priests.**

It was stated that there is a dispute between Rabbi Yoḥanan and Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi. **One said that the mitzva of the willow branch is an ordinance of the prophets, as Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi instituted it in the Temple as obligatory. And one said that the mitzva of the willow branch is an ancient custom practiced by the prophets<sup>N</sup> and adopted by others as well. It was not instituted as a binding ordinance. The Gemara suggests: Conclude that it was Rabbi Yoḥanan who said that it is an ordinance of the prophets, as Rabbi Abbahu said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The mitzva of the willow branch is an ordinance of the prophets. The Gemara concurs: Indeed, conclude that it is so.**

Rabbi Zeira said to Rabbi Abbahu: **Did Rabbi Yoḥanan actually say that? Didn't Rabbi Yoḥanan say in the name of Rabbi Neḥunya of the valley of Beit Ḥortan: The halakha of the ten saplings, the mitzva of the willow branch in the Temple, and the mitzva of the water libation on the altar during the festival of Sukkot are each a halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai? How then could he attribute the origin of the mitzva of the willow branch to the prophets? "He was astonished for a while"** (Daniel 4:16), **and after considering the apparent contradiction he said that indeed Rabbi Yoḥanan maintains that the mitzva of the willow branch is a halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai. However, over the course of time during the Babylonian exile they forgot some halakhot, including the mitzva of the willow branch, and then the prophets reinstated them.<sup>N</sup>**

The Gemara asks: **And did Rabbi Yoḥanan actually say that it is a halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai? And didn't Rabbi Yoḥanan say: Yours, i.e., the Babylonian Sages, say<sup>N</sup> that this ordinance is theirs, instituted by the Sages, and it is neither a halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai nor an ordinance instituted by the prophets. The Gemara answers: This is not difficult;**

## Perek IV

Daf 44 Amud b

### HALAKHA

**The taking of the willow branch – נטילת ערבה** – The mitzva of taking the willow branch in the Temple is a *halakha* transmitted to Moses from Sinai, and in the outlying areas it is a custom of the prophets (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Lulav* 7:20).

כאן – במקדש, כאן – בגבולין.

Here, where Rabbi Yoḥanan said that it is a *halakha* transmitted to Moses from Sinai, he is referring to the mitzva of the willow branch in the Temple; there, where he said that it was established by the prophets, he was referring to the taking of the willow branch in the outlying areas.<sup>H</sup>

What is its requisite measure – כַּמֶּה שִׁיעוּרָה – Since the *halakhot* of the willow branch used in the Temple are distinct from those of the willow branch used as one of the four species, it is necessary to inquire as to its exact requirements.

It is a custom of the prophets – מִנְהַג נְבִיאִים הוּא – Some explain that the custom originating with the prophets is not to recite a blessing on the willow branch (see *Sefer Yere'im*, *Sefer Mitzvot Katan*, and the commentary of Rav Yehuda ben Rav Binyamin HaRofeh). Although this explanation is a bit forced in this context, it does provide a solution to several other questions (see *Tosafot* and others).

Shape of the willow branch – צוּרַת הָעֵרְבָה – Rav Tzemaḥ Gaon explains that the willow branch evokes the lips, as its leaves are shaped like lips. Indeed, each of the four species represents a different part of the human body. This idea can be found in various old liturgical poems in Sephardic prayer books. Beating the willow branch on the ground serves as atonement, to a certain degree, for sins that one committed with his mouth, similar to the verse: “Let him put his mouth in dust; perhaps there is hope” (Lamentations 3:29).

## PERSONALITIES

Aivu – אֵיבּוּ – According to Rashi, Aivu, who transmits the *halakha* here in the name of Rabbi Elazar bar Tzadok, is Aivu, father of Rav. Rav's lineage is only partially known; however, it is known that his grandfather, Rabbi Abba bar Aḥa, had five sons, each of whom was a Torah scholar in his own right. The youngest and most significant of them was Rabbi Ḥiyaya. The grandchildren of Rabbi Abba bar Aḥa were among the foremost scholars of the following generation.

Aivu immigrated to Eretz Yisrael to study Torah there, and he, like his son, was privileged to have statements cited in his name in the Gemara.

As was the custom in those days, Rav named his descendants after his parents and other relatives, and one of Rav's grandchildren was named after Rav's father, Aivu.

אָמַר רַבִּי אָמִי: עֵרְבָה צְרִיכָה שִׁיעוּר, וְאֵינָה נִשְׁלֶת אֲלָא בְּפָנֵי עֲצָמָה, וְאֵין אָדָם יוֹצֵא יָדָיו חוּבְתוֹ בְּעֵרְבָה שְׁבִלּוּלָב. כִּיֹּן דְּאָמַר מַר: אֵינָה נִשְׁלֶת אֲלָא בְּפָנֵי עֲצָמָה – פְּשִׁיטָא דְּאֵין אָדָם יוֹצֵא בְּעֵרְבָה שְׁבִלּוּלָב!

מִהוּ דְתִימָא: הֲנֵי מִלִּי – הֵיכָא דְלָא אֲגַבְהִיהּ וְהָדָר אֲגַבְהִיהּ, אֲבָל אֲגַבְהִיהּ וְהָדָר אֲגַבְהִיהּ – אֵימָא לָא. קָא מְשַׁמַּע לֵו. וְרַב חֲסֵדָא אָמַר רַבִּי יִצְחָק: אָדָם יוֹצֵא יָדָיו חוּבְתוֹ בְּעֵרְבָה שְׁבִלּוּלָב (בְּיוֹם טוֹב הָרִאשׁוֹן שֶׁל חַג).

וְכַמֶּה שִׁיעוּרָה? אָמַר רַב נַחֲמָן: שְׁלֹשָׁה בְּדֵי עֲלִין לַחֲוִין. וְרַב שֵׁשֶׁת אָמַר: אֲפִילוּ עֲלָה אֶחָד וּבַד אֶחָד. עֲלָה אֶחָד וּבַד אֶחָד סְלִקָא דְעֵתְךָ! אֲלָא אֵימָא: אֲפִילוּ עֲלָה אֶחָד בְּבַד אֶחָד.

אָמַר אֵיבּוּ: הֲוֵה קְאִימְנָא קַמִּיהּ דְרַבִּי אֲלֵעוּר בַּר צְדוֹק, וְאֵייתִי הֵהוּא גְבַרָא עֵרְבָה קַמִּיהּ, שְׁקִיל, חָבִיט חָבִיט וְלָא בְרִיךְ. קְסַבְר: מְנַהֵג נְבִיאִים הוּא. אֵיבּוּ וְחִזְקִיָּה בְּנֵי בְרַתִּיהּ דְרַב אֵייתוּ עֵרְבָה לְקַמִּיהּ דְרַב, חָבִיט חָבִיט וְלָא בְרִיךְ, קָא סַבְר: מְנַהֵג נְבִיאִים הוּא.

§ Rabbi Ami said: The willow branch taken to fulfill the mitzva requires a certain measure, and it is taken only in and of itself<sup>H</sup> and not with the *lulav*, and a person does not fulfill his obligation with the willow branch that is bound with the *lulav*.<sup>H</sup> The Gemara asks: Since the Master said: It is taken only in and of itself, it is obvious that a person does not fulfill his obligation with the willow branch that is bound with the *lulav*. Why are both statements necessary?

The Gemara answers: It is necessary lest you say that this applies only to a case where he did not lift the willow branch bound with the *lulav* and then lift it again to fulfill the mitzva of the willow branch; however, in a case where he lifted the *lulav* and then lifted it again, say no, he fulfills his obligation with the willow branch in the *lulav*. Therefore, he teaches us that even if one takes the four species a second time with the express intent of fulfilling the mitzva of the willow branch, he did not fulfill his obligation, as he must take the willow branch by itself. And Rav Hisda said that Rabbi Yitzḥak said: A person fulfills his obligation with the willow branch that is bound with the *lulav* on the first day of the festival of *Sukkot*.

Rabbi Ami said that the willow branch requires a certain measure. The Gemara asks: And what is its requisite measure?<sup>NH</sup> Rav Naḥman said: It is three branches of moist leaves. And Rav Sheshet said: It is even one leaf and one branch. The Gemara wonders about the statement of Rav Sheshet: Does it enter your mind that one takes a single leaf and a single branch separately? Rather, emend Rav Sheshet's statement and say: One fulfills his obligation even with one leaf on one branch.

§ The Gemara relates that Aivu,<sup>P</sup> father of the *amora* Rav, said: I was standing before Rabbi Elazar bar Tzadok, and a certain man brought a willow branch before him to fulfill the mitzva. He took it and waved it; he waved it and did not recite a blessing.<sup>H</sup> This indicates that he holds that the mitzva of the willow branch is a custom of the prophets<sup>N</sup> and is therefore performed without a blessing. Similarly, the Gemara relates that Aivu and Ḥizkiya, sons of the daughter of Rav, brought a willow branch before Rav to fulfill the mitzva. He waved it; he waved it and did not recite a blessing.<sup>N</sup> This indicates that he, too, holds that it is a custom of the prophets.

## HALAKHA

The willow branch... is taken only in and of itself – עֵרְבָה... The minimum measure for the willow branch is one leaf on one branch. However, Rav Hai Gaon writes that it is de-testable to use such a branch, and it is preferable to take a willow branch that meets the requirements for the willow branch taken with the *lulav*. Any factor that invalidates a willow branch in the *lulav* invalidates it for this purpose as well (Ran). Based on the teachings of Rabbi Yitzḥak Luria, the custom is to take five willow branches (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim* 664:4).

A person does not fulfill his obligation with the willow branch that is bound with the *lulav* – יוֹצֵא יָדָיו חוּבְתוֹ – One does not fulfill his obligation to take the willow branch by using the one that is bound with the four species, even if he lifted the *lulav* twice with the intent to fulfill the mitzva of the willow branch the second time (*Tur*, citing Rambam). Others say that he does fulfill his obligation (*Tur*, citing *Avi HaEzri* and Rosh). However, one should certainly take a separate willow branch *ab initio* (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim* 664:2, 6).

The requisite measure of the willow branch – שִׁיעוּר הָעֵרְבָה –

The minimum measure for the willow branch is one leaf on one branch. However, Rav Hai Gaon writes that it is de-testable to use such a branch, and it is preferable to take a willow branch that meets the requirements for the willow branch taken with the *lulav*. Any factor that invalidates a willow branch in the *lulav* invalidates it for this purpose as well (Ran). Based on the teachings of Rabbi Yitzḥak Luria, the custom is to take five willow branches (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim* 664:4).

He waved it and did not recite a blessing – חָבִיט וְלָא בְרִיךְ: No blessing is recited when taking the willow branch nor when waving it. The custom is to beat the willow branch on the ground. Based on the teachings of Rabbi Yitzḥak Luria, the custom is to beat it on the ground five times (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim* 664:2, 4).

Hoe [mekashkeshin] the olive groves – מקשקשין בכרמיה: The *Arukh* and Rashi in *Mo'ed Katan* write that the gerunds *kishkush* and *iddur* that appear in *Mo'ed Katan* both mean hoeing. The difference is that *kishkush* is the term used for an olive grove, while *iddur* is the term for a vineyard.

Is it appropriate or inappropriate – אריך או לא אריך: The commentaries explain this in several ways. In fact, the owner of the field need not have taken any action, as it is permitted for the poor to enter the olive groves and eat the olives growing there during the Sabbatical Year. Whatever labor they choose to perform on their own is of no concern to the owner of the grove. However, the owner was asking whether, by allowing this activity to continue, he might be causing others to sin. Therefore, he did not ask whether it was prohibited to allow them to continue; rather, he asked whether it was appropriate to allow them to continue. Consequently, Rabbi Elazar bar Tzadok praised him for following a straight path and for going beyond the letter of the law (*Arukh LaNer*).

More than three parasangs – יותר משלש פרסאות: The commentaries and halakhic authorities discussed this distance extensively. In *Arukh LaNer* the question is raised with regard to the meaning of this specific distance and why it was selected. Some explain that its significance is related to the time that it takes to walk that distance. If one who departs in the morning walks no more than three parasangs, the majority of the day will remain for him to prepare his Shabbat meals (see Rambam). Others explain that this measure is specifically with regard to walking, as opposed to traveling on horseback or in a wagon. If one walks a greater distance, he will grow weary and will not have the strength to prepare for Shabbat.

## LANGUAGE

Parasang [*parsa*] – פרסה: Called a Persian mile in the ancient world, this measurement was adopted in a number of languages, including Greek, Syriac, and in this case the Jewish dialect of Aramaic. It appears that the word comes from the Middle Iranian *frasax*. In the talmudic system of measurement, one *parsa* equals four *mil*.

## BACKGROUND

Small fried fish – נקסא דהרסנא: Fried fish was a popular dish in Babylonia and was commonly eaten by the poor. It was made from small, flour-coated salted fish, fried in oil with vinegar.

אמר איבו: הוה קאימנא קמיה דרבי אלעזר בר צדוק, אתא לקמיה ההוא גברא. אמר ליה: קרייתא אית לי, כרמיה אית לי, ויתיא אית לי, ואתו בני קרייתא ומקשקשין בכרמיה ואוכלין בויתא, אריך או לא אריך? אמר ליה: לא אריך. הוה קא שביק ליה ואזיל. אמר: כדו הויתי דיירי בארעא הדא ארבעים שנין, ולא חמית בר אינש מהלך בארחון דתקנן כדון. הדר ואתי ואמר ליה: מאי מיעבד? אמר ליה: אפקר ויתיא לחשוביא, ותן פריטא לקשקשי כרמים.

וקשקשי מי שרי? והא תנא: "והשביעת תשמטנה ונטשתה." "תשמטנה" – מלקשקש, "ונטשתה" – מלסקל! אמר רב עוקבא בר חמא: תרי קשקשי הוו, חד סתומי פילי, וחד אברויי אילני. אברויי אילני – אסור, סתומי פילי – שרי.

אמר איבו משום רבי אלעזר בר צדוק: אל יהלך אדם בערבי שבתות יותר משלש פרסאות. אמר רב כהנא: לא אמרן אלא לבייתה, אבל לאושפוייה – אמאי דנקיט סמיך.

ואיכא דאמרי, אמר רב כהנא: לא נצרכא אלא אפילו לבייתה. אמר רב כהנא: בדידי הוה עובדא, ואפילו כסא דהרסנא לא אשכח.

"מצות לולב ביצוד." תני תנא קמיה דרב נחמן: סודרין על גג האיצטבא. אמר ליה:

Apropos the exchange between Aivu and Rabbi Elazar bar Tzadok, the Gemara cites another *halakha* that was transmitted in the same manner. Aivu said: I was standing before Rabbi Elazar bar Tzadok, and a certain man came before him and said to him: I have villages, I have olive groves, and I have olives, and the villagers come and hoe the olive groves<sup>hh</sup> during the Sabbatical Year and eat from the olive trees. Is it appropriate or inappropriate<sup>h</sup> to allow this to continue? He said to him: It is inappropriate. As the man was leaving him and going on his way, Rabbi Elazar bar Tzadok said: I have already resided in this land for forty years and I have not seen a person walk in a path as straight as this man does. The man came back to Rabbi Elazar bar Tzadok and said to him: What should I do to ameliorate the situation? He said to him: Declare the olives ownerless for the poor, and give *perutot* coins to hired laborers as payment to hoe the olive groves.<sup>h</sup>

The Gemara asks: Is hoeing olive groves permitted during the Sabbatical Year? But wasn't it taught in a *baraita* that it is written: "But the seventh year you shall let it rest and lie fallow" (Exodus 23:11); meaning you shall let it rest from hoeing, and lie fallow from clearing the field of rocks? Apparently, hoeing is prohibited during the Sabbatical Year. Rav Ukva bar Hama said: There are two types of hoeing, one whose objective is to seal cracks in the ground and one to enhance the trees' health. Enhancing the trees' health is prohibited; sealing cracks is permitted, as it is merely to prevent the trees from dying and not to accelerate their growth.

An additional *halakha* was transmitted in the same manner. Aivu said in the name of Rabbi Elazar bar Tzadok: A person should not walk on Shabbat eves<sup>hh</sup> more than a distance of three parasangs [*parsaot*].<sup>hh</sup> Rather, he should reach the place where he will stay on Shabbat early enough to ensure that he will have meals prepared for Shabbat. Rav Kahana said: We said that restriction only with regard to a case where he is returning to his house. However, if he is going to an inn, he relies on the food that he took with him. As he cannot assume that he will find lodgings with food, he brings food sufficient for his needs. Therefore, it is permitted for him to travel a greater distance.

Some say that Rav Kahana said: This restriction that one may not walk a distance of more than three parasangs on Shabbat eves was required even with regard to one traveling to his house, and all the more so with regard to one traveling to an inn, as he cannot assume that he will find food there. Rav Kahana said: There was an incident that happened with me where I traveled a distance to reach my home on Friday and I did not find even small fried fish [*deharsena*]<sup>h</sup> to eat in the house. One must prepare for Shabbat well in advance of the onset of Shabbat.

§ The mishna continues: How is the mitzva of *lulav* fulfilled in the Temple when the first day of the Festival occurs on Shabbat? The mishna then explains how the attendants arrange their *lulavim* on the bench in the Temple. The *tanna* who recited *mishnayot* in the study hall taught a version of the mishna before Rav Nahman: The attendant arranges them on the roof over the bench in the Temple. Rav Nahman said to him:

## HALAKHA

Hoe the olive groves – מקשקשין בכרמיה: With regard to one who hoes under olive trees during the Sabbatical Year, the following distinction applies: If he does so to enhance the trees' health, it is prohibited. However, if he does so to seal the cracks in the ground and to prevent the trees from dying, it is permitted (Rambam *Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhot Shemitta VeYovel* 1:7).

Wages for labor during the Sabbatical Year – שבר מלאכה – בשביעית: One who performs permitted labor in another's field during the Sabbatical Year may not receive payment from the

fruit of that field as his wages. This is in order to avoid the appearance that the fruit is being used for commercial purposes (Rambam *Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhot Shemitta VeYovel* 1:16, 6:11).

Walking on Shabbat eve – הליכה בערב שבת: One may not walk more than a distance of three parasangs on a Friday, to ensure that he will arrive at his destination in time to prepare for Shabbat. There is no difference whether he is going home or going elsewhere, as most of the early authorities ruled in accordance with the latter version of Rav Kahana's statement. However, if

one is in an unsettled area where he will be unable to prepare for Shabbat, it is preferable that he travel to a settled area, even if that entails walking more than three parasangs (*Beit Yosef*). If one sent word of his planned arrival for Shabbat, it is also permitted for him to travel farther (*Beit Yosef*, based on Rabbeinu Yeruham). The custom is to be lenient in situations where one is riding in a carriage or similar modes of transportation (*Bah*). In recent years, when it is customary to prepare more expansive Shabbat meals, this *halakha* is not observed at all (*Magen Avraham*, based on *Aguda; Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 249:1).