

11 Elul 5781  
August 19, 2021



Sukkah Daf 43

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

**Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

GEMARA: But why [should it be forbidden to carry the lulav on the Shabbos]? It involves only a mere movement,<sup>1</sup> why then should it not override the Shabbos?<sup>2</sup> — Rabbah answered: It is a restrictive measure, lest a man take [the lulav] in his hand and go to an expert in order to learn [the laws connected with it] and thereby he will be carrying it for four cubits through a public domain. And the same reason applies to the shofar, and the same reason applies to the megillah. - But if so, let it apply to the first day also? — ‘The first day’ you say? Didn’t our Rabbis institute that it should be taken in one’s home?<sup>3</sup> — That is quite correct as from after this enactment, but what can you answer regarding the time before the enactment? — The fact is that with regard to the first day, the obligation to take the lulav on which is Biblical even in the provinces, the Rabbis did not enact a restrictive measure, but regarding the other days [the command to take the lulav on which] doesn’t Biblically apply in the provinces, the Rabbis did enact a restrictive measure. - But if this is so, the same law should apply at the present time also? — We do not know when the new month was established.<sup>4</sup> But why should it not override the Shabbos for them since they know when the new month was established? — The law is indeed so; for in our Mishnah we have learned: If the first day of Sukkos fell on a Shabbos, all the people brought their lulavim to the Temple Mount, while in another Mishnah

we have learned [that they brought them] to the Synagogue, consequently you may deduce from these that the former refers to the time when the Temple was in existence, while the latter refers to the time when the Temple was no longer in existence. This is indeed conclusive. (42b3 – 43a2)

From where do we derive that [the taking of the lulav] is a Biblical obligation in the provinces? — From what has been taught: And you shall take teaches that the lulav must be taken in the hand of each one; to you teaches that it must be yours, thus excluding a borrowed or a stolen [lulav]; on the day implies, even if it be the Shabbos; first implies even in the provinces; the first teaches that it overrides the first day of the Sukkos only.

The Master said, ‘On the day implies, even if it be Shabbos.’ But consider: [The taking of the lulav] is ordinary carrying. Is a Scriptural verse then necessary to permit ordinary carrying? Rava answered: It was necessary to have it only with regard to the preliminaries of the lulav,<sup>5</sup> and this is in accordance with a ruling of that Tanna of whom it has been taught: The lulav and all its preliminaries override the Shabbos; these are the words of Rabbi Eliezer. What is the reason of Rabbi Eliezer? — Scripture says: ‘on the day,’ implying, even the Shabbos. But what

<sup>1</sup> The Rabbinical prohibition of muktzah.

<sup>2</sup> On what ground did the Rabbis institute a preventive measure against taking it?

<sup>3</sup> As stated in our Mishnah, and since it must be taken at home only, and not in the Synagogue, no one is likely to forget the prohibition against carrying it out.

<sup>4</sup> Having to rely on the messages from Eretz Yisroel which did not reach everywhere in time for Sukkos, the fifteenth of the month may consequently not be actually the fifteenth and one taking the lulav on that day might be transgressing the Shabbos.

<sup>5</sup> E.g., its preparation, its cutting from the tree and its binding.

do the Rabbis make of the expression, on the day'? - They need it to infer from it that on the day, [is the lulav to be taken] but not at night. Then from where does Rabbi Eliezer deduce that [the lulav is to be taken] by day, and not at night? — He deduces it from the conclusion of the verse: 'And you shall rejoice before the Hashem your God for seven days', 'days' imply, but not nights. And the Rabbis? — If deduction were made from this verse, I might have said that we ought to compare 'days' [mentioned here] with 'days' mentioned with regard to the Sukkah, so that just as there [the expression of] 'days' includes nights, so here also [the expression of] 'days' includes nights. And with regard to the Sukkah itself from where do we derive [that the expression of 'days' includes nights]? — From what our Rabbis have taught: You shall dwell in sukkos for seven days, the expression of 'days' includes also the nights. You say that the expression of 'days' includes also the nights, perhaps it is not so and 'days' implies but not the nights, and this is really logical. For the word 'days' is used here, and it is also used in connection with lulav so that just as there it means days and not nights, so here also it must mean days and not nights. Or take it another way: The word 'days' is mentioned here, and also in connection with the [seven days of the] Inauguration,<sup>6</sup> so that just as there it means days and also nights, so here also it must mean days and also the nights! Let us then see to what it is more comparable. We should deduce something whose performance is a matter of the whole day from something whose performance is a matter of the whole day, and let no proof be adduced from something whose performance is only for one moment. Or take it another way: We might deduce something which was ordained for future generations from something whose performance also was ordained for future generations,

<sup>6</sup> Of Aaron and his sons for the Kehunah.

<sup>7</sup> Why was no preventive measure enacted in its case as in that of lulav?

<sup>8</sup> Taking it on all the seven days, though this is not specifically mentioned in the Torah, since the period indicated may refer to other forms of rejoicing.

but let no proof be adduced from the Inauguration which does not apply for future generations! [This is, therefore, an open question, but] Scripture explicitly repeats 'You shall dwell' in order to teach a gezeirah shavah. It is stated here: You shall dwell, and with regard to the [seven days of] Inauguration it is also stated: 'You shall dwell', so that just as in that case the word 'days' includes also the nights, so here also 'days' includes the nights. (43a2 – 43b1)

The Mishnah had stated: The aravah . . . seven days. How is this? Why does the [ceremony of the] aravah on the seventh day override the Shabbos?<sup>7</sup> — Rabbi Yochanan answered: In order to publish the fact that it is a [commandment] of the Torah. But if so, in the case of the lulav also, why should it not override the Shabbos in order to publish the fact that it<sup>8</sup> is a [commandment] of the Torah? — In the case of lulav there is a restrictive enactment on account of the reason of Rabbah. But if so, let us make the same restrictive enactment with regard to the aravah also? — In the case of the aravah the emissaries of the Beis din would bring it, but the lulav is entrusted to everyone. But if so, ought it not to override [the Shabbos] on any day? — [If that were done] people would come to hold the lulav in light esteem.<sup>9</sup> Then why shouldn't [the aravah] override [the Shabbos] on the first day of Sukkos? — It will not be clear [that it is the mitzvah of the aravah that overrides the Shabbos, for] people might say that it is the lulav which overrides it.<sup>10</sup> But why shouldn't the Shabbos be overridden on any one of the other days? — Since [the permission to override the Shabbos] was removed from the first day, it was transferred to the seventh.<sup>11</sup> But if so, why should it not override it at the present time also? — We do not know

<sup>9</sup> Since it overrides the Shabbos only the first day.

<sup>10</sup> The inference might be made that the overriding of the Shabbos is mainly due to the lulav and only incidentally to the separate aravah.

<sup>11</sup> Another conspicuous day. The middle days are not so conspicuous as the first and the seventh.

when the new month was established.<sup>12</sup> But in their case since they know when the new month was established, why should it not override [the Shabbos]? — When Bar Hedyah came, he explained that this never happened.<sup>13</sup> When, however, Ravin came and all the company that used to go down [from Eretz Yisroel to Babylon] they stated that it did happen, and that it did not override [the Shabbos]. Doesn't then the original difficulty arise? — Rav Yosef answered: Who says that [the ceremony of] the aravah is [performed] by the taking of it? Perhaps it is done by its being fixed [to the sides of the altar].<sup>14</sup>

Abaye raised an objection against him: The rites of the lulav and the aravah [continued for] six [days] or seven. Doesn't [this imply that the aravah is] as the lulav, just as the [ceremony of the] lulav is [performed] by its being taken, so is that of the aravah performed by its being taken? — What an argument! The rite of each may have been carried out according to its own particular rules.

Abaye raised a further objection against him: Every day they walked round the altar once, but on that day they walked around it seven times. Doesn't this mean, with the aravah? No, with the lulav. But didn't Rav Nachman state in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha [that they circled] with the aravah? — The other answered him: He told you, 'with the aravah' and I say 'with the lulav'.

It was stated: Rabbi Elazar stated [that the circle was made] with the lulav; Rav Shmuel bar Nassan citing Rabbi Chanina stated [that it was made] with the aravah. And so said Rav Nachman who had it from Rabbah bar Avuha: With the aravah.

<sup>12</sup> The day we assume to be the seventh may in fact be the sixth, and the Shabbos is thus overridden on the wrong day.

<sup>13</sup> The date of the beginning of the month was so arranged that the seventh day of Sukkos never coincided with the Shabbos. This was effected by adding a day to the previous month or to any other of the preceding months.

Rava said to Rav Yitzchak the son of Rabbah bar Bar Chanah: Son of Torah! Come, and I will tell you of an excellent statement which your father made. With reference to what we have learned: 'Every day they walked around the altar once, and on that day they went around seven times', your father citing Rabbi Elazar stated: [This was done] with the lulav.

He raised an objection against him: The obligation of the lulav overrides the Shabbos on the first day, and that of the aravah on the last day. On one occasion the seventh day of the [ceremony of the] aravah fell on a Shabbos, and they brought shoots of aravos on the Shabbos eve and placed them in the courtyard of the Temple. The Boethusians, having discovered them, took and hid them under some rocks.<sup>15</sup> On the following day, some of the amei ha-aretz discovered them and removed them from under the stones, and the Kohanim brought them in and fixed them in the sides of the altar. [The reason for hiding the aravos was that] the Boethusians do not admit that the beating of the aravah overrides the Shabbos. Thus we see clearly that [the performance of the aravah ceremony is] in the taking of it? — This is a refutation. Then why should it not override [the Shabbos]? — Since with us it does not override [the Shabbos] it does not override it with them either. - But is there not the first day of Sukkos on which [the obligation of the lulav] does not override the Shabbos for us, but does it for them? — I will answer! For them also it does not override [the Shabbos]. Doesn't then a contradiction arise between those two Mishnahs, since one teaches 'all the people brought their lulavim to the Temple Mount', and the other Mishnah teaches [that they brought them] to the Synagogue, and we answered, did we not, that the one referred to Temple times and the

<sup>14</sup> And since now there is no altar and the service cannot be properly performed, the Shabbos may not be overridden.

<sup>15</sup> Knowing that the Sages would not remove the stones on the Shabbos, hoped thereby effectively to prevent a ceremony in which they did not believe.



other to the time after the destruction of the Temple? — No; both refer to Temple times, but there is nevertheless no contradiction since the one refers to the Sanctuary<sup>16</sup> and the other to the provinces.<sup>17</sup> (43b1 – 44a1)

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### *Aravos on Shabbos*

The Gemara states that the Chachamim would always ensure that the seventh day of Sukkos, known as Hoshanah Rabbah, would not occur Shabbos.

Tosfos wonders why it was more important to ensure that the seventh day of Sukkos not occur on Shabbos as opposed to ensuring that Rosh HaShanah or the first day of Sukkos do not occur on Shabbos. On both Rosh HaShanah and the first day of Sukkos there are biblical mitzvos to perform. The Chachamim should have been more concerned with ensuring the observance of these mitzvos than ensuring the continuity of the aravah mitzvah which is only a rabbinical institution to commemorate the mitzvah that was performed in the Bais HaMikdash.

Tosfos answers that there was no concern that people would assume that the mitzvah of blowing shofar on Rosh HaShanah and taking the lulav on the first day of Sukkos were rabbinical in nature. Regarding the mitzvah of aravah, however, if the seventh day of Sukkos would occur on Shabbos and the aravah would not be taken, people would view the custom as irrelevant and they would not take the aravah in the future. Furthermore, if the seventh day of Sukkos occurs on Shabbos, there would not be another opportunity to take the aravah, because one would not be able to take the aravah on Shemini Atzeres

because it may be an independent festival and taking the aravah would contradict the theme of the day. Regarding the mitzvah of shofar and lulav, however, one would be able to perform the mitzvah on the second day of the festival.

## DAILY MASHAL

### *Sukkah and the Mishkan*

The Gemara states that the obligation to dwell in a Sukkah is by day and by night. This is derived by employing a *gezeirah shavah* from the *Miluim*, the inauguration of Aharon and his sons into the service of the Mishkan.

It is noteworthy that the sefarim write that the Sukkah reflects the Bais HaMikdash, so it is appropriate that we derive the mitzvah to dwell in the Sukkah from the Mishkan.

A further association between Sukkos and the Mishkan is that the Vilna Gaon is of the opinion that we celebrate Sukkos on the fifteenth of Tishrei because that is when the Clouds of Glory returned to shield the Jewish People. The Clouds of Glory were a sign that HaShem was pleased with the Jewish People, and the building of the Mishkan was also a sign that HaShem had forgiven the Jewish People for worshipping the Golden Calf.

<sup>16</sup> Which speaks of carrying the lulav 'to the Synagogue'.

<sup>17</sup> After the destruction of the Temple, however, no such messengers were sent forth, so that the taking of the lulav on the Shabbos is forbidden inside as well as outside Eretz Yisroel.