



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Succah, Daf לז – Daf לז

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
vl'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf לז-----38-----

MISHNA

- If one was traveling and did not have a lulav to use, when he gets home he must take the lulav, even if he first remembered in middle of his meal (he must interrupt his meal).
- If one did not take the lulav in the morning, he must do so in the afternoon, because the entire day is valid for performing the mitzvah of lulav.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Another Mishna says that one need *not* interrupt his meal to daven (or presumably to do any mitzvah), and he can wait until he finishes his meal!? **A: R' Safra** said, our Mishna is discussing where there is not enough time left in the day to allow him to wait until afterwards. That Mishna is discussing where there is still enough time in the day.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, the Mishnayos are not at all contradictory, because our Mishna is dealing with a D'Oraisa mitzvah, and the other Mishna is dealing with a D'Rabanan (which is why he need not interrupt his meal!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, the contradiction is from the second part of our Mishna which says that one may wait until the afternoon to take the lulav (which suggests that he need not interrupt his meal). To that contradiction, **R' Safra** said, the beginning of the Mishna is discussing where there is not much time left in the day, and the end of the Mishna is discussing where there is still sufficient time left in the day.
 - **Q: R' Zeira** asked, why must we say that the Mishna is contradictory? Maybe the Mishna means to say that l'chatchila one must interrupt his meal, but if he doesn't, he may still take the lulav all day? **A:** Rather, **R' Zeira** said, the contradiction being addressed is from our Mishna to the other Mishna that discusses davening (as we said originally). Although **Rava** asked that our Mishna is D'Oraisa and the other is D'Rabanan, that is not necessarily true. We could say that our Mishna is discussing a day other than the first day of Succos, in which case the taking of the lulav is also only D'Rabanan.
 - A proof to this is the fact that the Mishna said, "if one travels and doesn't have a lulav...". If we are discussing the first day of Yom Tov, how would one be permitted to travel? It must be that the Mishna is discussing another day of Succos.

MISHNA

- If one has a slave, a woman, or a minor read the hallel for him (and he intended to be yotzeh by listening to them and answering), he must repeat each word after them, and he should be cursed (for being so unlearned as to need to resort to these people so that he can be yotzeh).
- If one has an adult male read the hallel for him, he must only say "Hallelukah". In a place where the custom is to say the pesukim twice, one should say them twice. Where the custom is to say it once, he should say it only once. Where the custom is to end Hallel with a bracha, one should do so. One should follow the local custom.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, "in truth they said", a man may be yotzeh with the birchas hamazon said by his minor son, his slave, or his wife. However, the **Chachomim** said, a curse should come onto the person who is unlearned and needs his wife or children to say birchas hamazon for him.
- **Rava** said, we can learn some important halachos from the way that our custom dictates that hallel be said, and we can see how the original institution of the saying of hallel was performed.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The chazzan begins by saying “hallelukah”, and the people then repeat it after him. From here we learn that it is a mitzvah for the people to repeat the word “hallelukah” after the chazzan at the beginning of hallel.
- The chazzan says “halelu avdei Hashem”, and the people then say “halleluka”. From here we learn that if one is being yotzeh with the chazzan, he need only answer “hallelukah”.
- The chazzan says “hodu LaShem”, and the people repeat it after him. From here we learn that when being yotzeh with the chazzan, one must repeat the first phrase of each paragraph after the chazzan says it.
- The chazzan says “ana Hashem hoshiya na”, and the people then repeat it after him. From here we learn that if one is trying to be yotzeh with the reading of a minor, he must repeat everything that the minor says.
- The chazzan says “ana Hashem hatzlicha na”, and the people then repeat it after him. From here we learn that one may repeat the pesukim of hallel as he says it, if he so desires.
- The chazzan says “baruch habah” and the people respond “b’Sheim Hashem”. From here we learn the concept of “shome’ah k’oneh” (listening to something with intent to be yotzeh is as if one said it himself).
- **Q:** They asked, if one listened but did not respond (by saying halleluka, amen, etc., as would have been appropriate), is he yotzeh? **A: R’ Chiya bar Abba** answered, he is yotzeh.
 - **Bar Kappara** gave the source for this concept of “shome’ah k’oneh”. The pasuk says that Yoshiyahu read the words of the sefer. However, in actuality it was Shafan who read it to Yoshiyahu! We learn from here that we treat “shome’ah k’oneh”.
 - **Q:** Maybe Yoshiyahu read it after Shafan? **A: R’ Acha bar Yaakov** said, the pasuk later says that Yoshiyahu humbled himself when he heard the words of the sefer. This teaches that he did not read it himself.
- **Rava** said, one should not say “baruch habah” and then pause before saying “b’Sheim Hashem”. Rather, they should be said together as one statement.
- **Rava** said, one should not say “Yehei Shimei Rabbah” and then pause before saying “Mevarach”. Rather, they should be said together as one statement.
 - **R’ Safra** disagreed with both of these statements of **Rava**. He said, the second half of both these statements are clearly the concluding parts of the first half. Therefore, there is no problem, even if a pause is made.

-----Daf טל-----39-----

MAKOM SHENAHAGU LICHPOL

- A Braisa said, **Rebbi** would repeat words in hallel (from “Ana Hashem” and further), and **R’ Elazar ben Prata** would add words.
 - **Q:** What would he add? **A: Abaye** said, he would add to the doubling of **Rebbi**, by also doubling all the psukim beginning with “Odcha ki anisani” and further.

LIVARECH YIVARECH

- **Abaye** said, the bracha that is subject to custom is the bracha after hallel. However, the bracha before hallel, is a mitzvah to be said, like **R’ Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, one should make the bracha on a mitzvah “oiver lasiyasan” (before they are done).
 - **Q:** Where do we see the word “oiver” means “before”? **A: R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, a pasuk says “vayavor es hakushi” (he went before the kushi). **Abaye** said, a pasuk says “vehu avar lifneihem” (he went before them). Another pasuk says “vayavor malkam lifneihem” (their king went before them).

MISHNA

- If one buys a lulav from an ahm ha’aretz on shmita, he must ask the ahm ha’aretz to give him the esrog as a present, because he is not allowed to buy an esrog on shmita.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

GEMARA

- **Q:** What if he doesn't want to give it to him as a present? **A: R' Huna** said, he should pay him more for the lulav to compensate, and then have him give the esrog as a present.
 - **Q:** Why can't he just give him money for the esrog directly? **A:** One may not give money of shmita (which has restrictions on its permitted uses) to an ahm ha'aretz (we are afraid that he will use the money in a prohibited manner).
 - We find a Braisa that says this as well. The Braisa says one may only give shmita money to an ahm ha'aretz at a maximum in the amount needed for 3 meals (in which case it will be spent on food and will likely be treated with the restrictions placed on shmita money). The Braisa says, even this amount is only allowed when we know that the produce you are buying from the ahm ha'aretz came from lands left hefker for shmita. However, if it came from a guarded field, you may not give him even the smallest amount of money for the produce.
 - **Q: R' Sheishes** asked, a Mishna says that produce that we know to have come from a hefker field may be bought from anybody. The Mishna does not give any limitations, which would therefore suggest that such produce may be purchased from an ahm ha'aretz, and for even more than the amount of 3 meals!? **A:** The Mishna means that it may be purchased up the amount of money needed for 3 meals.
 - **Q:** Based on this reasoning, why are we allowed to purchase the lulav from the ahm ha'aretz in shmita? **A:** The lulav began to grow in the year before shmita, and is therefore not considered to be produce of shmita.
 - **Q:** The esrog also grew in the previous year!? **A:** With regard to an esrog, if it is picked in the shmita year it has shmita status.
 - **Q:** Although **R' Gamliel** and **R' Eliezer** argue with regard to what year an esrog belongs for purposes of ma'aser, they both agree that for shmita purposes it is considered to grow in the year that it began to grow on the tree!? **A:** Our Mishna follows the Tanna of a Braisa that says that the **Rabanan** say that an esrog's shmita status is determined based on the year that it was picked off the tree.

-----Daf 40-----

- **Q:** From the previous conversation it would seem that a lulav would be subject to shmitta if it began its growth in the shmitta year. A lulav is like a piece of wood, not food, so why is it subject to shmitta at all!? A Braisa says that wood collected for purposes other than eating is not subject to shmitta! **A:** The pasuk regarding shmitta says "l'achem l'achla". We learn from here that the shmitta restrictions only apply to things whose benefit comes about at the time of its use. That is why firewood is not subject to shmitta (because its benefit comes about after it is already burned and has become coals). A lulav's primary use is for a broom. That benefit comes at the time of its "consumption, and it is therefore subject to the shmitta restrictions.
 - Whether the shmitta restrictions apply to firewood is actually a machlokes Tanna'im. A Braisa says, one may not use shmitta produce for laundering. **R' Yose** says such use is permitted. The basis for the **T"K's** opinion is because the pasuk says that the shmitta produce must be used "l'achla" (for eating), and not for any other use. **R' Yose** says, the pasuk says "l'achem", which teaches that any use is permitted, even for laundering. The **T"K** says that the "l'achem" teaches that shmitta produce must be used in a way so that its benefit comes at the time of consumption. (For the same reason, the **T"K** would also hold that firewood would not be subject to shmita, because its benefit always comes after its consumption). **R' Yose** says that "l'achla" teaches that one may not use shmita produce for medicine.
 - **R' Yose** understands the pasuk as coming to allow laundering and disallow medicine, because laundering is something that all people need to do, whereas medicine is something only needed by sick people.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- We see from this Braisa that the T”K says that the shmita restrictions do not apply to firewood, and R’ Yose says that they would.
- Based on this Braisa, we can determine that the Braisa that says that “l’achla” teaches that one may not use shmita produce for a medicine, for sprinkling, or to induce vomiting, must follow R’ Yose, because according to the T”K the Braisa should have also listed laundering as a prohibited use.
- R’ Elazar said, the shmita status of produce only transfers onto money through a purchase transaction. R’ Yochanan said, the status can even be transferred upon a verbal transfer onto the money.
 - R’ Elazar’s view is based on the fact that the Torah wrote “bishnas hayovel hazos” right next to “v’chi simkiru mimkar”. This teaches that the produce can only be deconsecrated through a purchase transaction.
 - R’ Yochanan’s view is based on the pasuk that says “ki yovel hee kodesh”. This teaches that just like kodashim can be verbally deconsecrated onto money, the same is true for shmitta.
 - Q: How does R’ Yochanan explain the pasuk brought by R’ Elazar? A: He uses it for the drasha of R’ Yose bar Chanina, who says that the Torah wrote about Yovel next to the pasuk of “v’chi simkiru mimkar” to teach that if one does not adhere to the halachos of shmita (he does business with the produce), eventually he will become poor (he will have to sell his possessions).
 - Q: What does R’ Elazar do with R’ Yochanan’s pasuk? A: He says that it teaches that just as the kedusha of kodashim can be transferred to money and then to whatever is purchased with the money, the same is true with the kedusha of shmitta.
 - There is a Braisa that says like R’ Elazar. The Braisa says that the pasuk of “tihiyeh” teaches that the original shmita fruit and the item used last in the exchange have shmita status, but anything in between does not. The Braisa explains, if one buys meat with shmita produce, they both have the status of shmita. If he then buys fish with the meat, the meat loses its shmita status, and the fish gets shmita status. If the fish is then exchanged for wine, which is then exchanged for oil, it is always the original fruit and the last items exchanged that have shmita status. Now, from the fact that the Braisa gives its examples in terms of where one “bought” the item, we can learn that only through a purchase transaction does the shmita status get transferred.
 - There is a Braisa that says like R’ Yochanan. The Braisa says that the Chachomim say, that ma’aser and shmita produce may be deconsecrated onto slaughtered animals. Now, from the fact that the Braisa says the shmita may be “deconsecrated”, it is a proof to the view of R’ Yochanan.

-----Daf נ”ד-----41-----

- R’ Ashi said, the machlokes between R’ Elazar and R’ Yochanan is only regarding transferring the kedusha from the original shmita produce. However, all would agree that once we are dealing with the object that itself only received the kedusha via transfer, that the kedusha can be transferred further by purchase transaction or by verbal transfer. Although the Braisa that was brought earlier as a proof to R’ Elazar seemed to say that each step of transfer was done through a purchase, that was only said that way to be consistent with the case of the transfer from the original shmita produce.
 - Q: Ravina asked R’ Ashi, a Braisa suggests that even the transfer of kedusha from money which has shmita status (which itself is transferred kedusha) must be done through a purchase transaction!? A: R’ Ashi must have meant that the machlokes is only with regard to a transfer other than from the original fruit. However, all would agree that the transfer of kedusha from the original fruit must be done via a purchase transaction. Although the Braisa that was brought earlier as a proof to R’ Yochanan seemed to say that shmita produce may be transferred via verbal de-consecration, the Braisa was actually referring to the money that itself had transferred kedusha, not the original produce itself.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- In the times of the Beis Hamikdash, the arbah minim were taken all 7 days in the Beis Hamikdash, and only one day outside of the Beis Hamikdash. When the Beis Hamikdash was destroyed, **R' Yochanan ben Zakai** instituted that the arbah minim should be taken all 7 days in all places, as a remembrance to the Beis Hamikdash. He also instituted that the new produce (“chadash”) should not be eaten the entire day of the 16th of Nisson.

GEMARA

- **Q:** From where do we learn that we are supposed to make a remembrance for the Beis Hamikdash? **A:** **R' Yochanan** said, the pasuk says that the goyim denigrated Zion by saying that there is no one who yearns for it. From here we learn that it is proper to yearn for it by creating a remembrance.

V'SHEIHEI YOM HANEIF

- **Q:** Why did he institute that the entire 16th day of Nisson should be assur to eat chadash? **A:** The concern is, that when the Beis Hamikdash is rebuilt and one will need to wait for the bringing of the Omer to begin eating the chadash, he will not wait. He will think, that since the year before (when there was no Beis Hamikdash) he was allowed to eat the chadash on the morning of the 16th, there should be no change in this year (he will not realize the significant difference between the years). By requiring one to wait until after the day of the 16th, he assured that no one will eat the chadash before the bringing of the Omer.
 - **Q:** When would the Beis Hamikdash have to be rebuilt to validate this concern? If it is built during the day of the 16th, he was already allowed to eat at sunrise on the 16th, and there is no concern. If it is rebuilt on the 15th, he should have only instituted that one may not eat until chatzos, because we have learned that one who is not in Yerushalyim may eat the chadash at chatzos on the 16th (even in the times of the Beis Hamikdash), because we can presume that the korbon was already brought at that point in time!? **A:** The concern is for the possibility of the Beis Hamikdash being rebuilt on the night going into the 16th, or right before that night, in which case the Omer may be delayed in being brought (due to the short amount of time for preparation), in which case the Omer will not be brought before chatzos.
 - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, that reason for the view of **R' Yochanan ben Zakai** is that he holds like **R' Yehuda**, that eating chadash on the 16th is actually assur D'Oraisa (based on the pasuk of “ahd etzem hayom hazeh”).
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Yochanan ben Zakai** and **R' Yehuda** argue about this in a Braisa, so how can we say that they shared the same view? **A:** **R' Yehuda** was mistaken into thinking that **R' Yochanan** meant that the prohibition of eating chadash on the 16th was only D'Rabanan, which is why he argued. However, in truth, **R' Yochanan** held that it is assur D'Oraisa.
 - **Q:** The Mishna said that **R' Yochanan instituted**, which means that it is not D'Oraisa!? **A:** The Mishna means that he darshened the pasuk and instituted that the people should follow the Halacha that he felt was a D'Oraisa.

MISHNA

- If the first day of Succos falls out on Shabbos, the people bring their arbah minim to shul before Shabbos. They then get to shul early on Shabbos and find their own set of arbah minim, since one is not yotzeh with another's set on the first day, only on the other days of Succos.
- **R' Yose** says, if the first day of Succos falls on Shabbos and one mistakenly carries his lulav in the reshus harabim, he will be patur, because the mistake happened due to his being preoccupied with another mitzvah.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that one must use his own lulav on the first day of Succos? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk of “u'likachtem” teaches that the chiyuv is on every individual to take a lulav. The pasuk of “lachem” teaches that it must belong to the person, which teaches that one can not be yotzeh with a borrowed lulav on the first day of succos, unless the owner gave it to him as a gift. The Braisa says, a number of Tanna'im were once traveling on a boat and only **R' Gamliel** had a set of arbah minim, which he had purchased for 1,000 zuz. He used it to be yotzeh the mitzvah and then gave it as a present to **R' Yehoshua**. He used it to be yotzeh and then gave it as a

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

present to **R' Elazar ben Azarya**, who did the same and then gave it to **R' Akiva**. He did the same and then gave it back to **R' Gamliel**.

- **Q:** Why was it important for the Braisa to say that it was returned to **R' Gamliel** at the end? **A:** It is teaching us that if one gives a present on the condition that it be returned, it is considered to be a full-fledged gift and the recipient is the legal owner of the item while he has it, provided that he returns it. This is like **Rava** said, that if one gives his lulav to another as a gift with the condition that it be returned, if it is returned, the recipient is yotzeh his mitzvah. If it is not, he is not.
- **Q:** Why did the Braisa have to say that **R' Gamliel** spent 1,000 zuz? **A:** It teaches us how much mitzvos were beloved by them.
 - **Mar bar Ameimar** told **R' Ashi**, “My father loved the mitzvah so much that he would hold the lulav while he davened”.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that one may not hold something in his hand while he is davening (because it distracts him)!? **A:** He may not hold regular items, because they distract him. However, holding an item of a mitzvah (like a lulav) is permitted, because it doesn't distract him.
 - A Braisa says, **R' Elazar bar Tzadok** says, the custom of the people of Yerushalayim was that they would carry the lulav when they left their house, when they went to shul, when they said shema, when they davened shmoneh esrei, when they went to visit the sick or comfort mourners. However, when they went to learn Torah, they would send the lulav home with their sons or servants. We see from here how careful they were with mitzvos.

-----Daf דל-----42-----

R' YOSE OMER YOM TOV...

- **Abaye** said, **R' Yose** would only say he is patur if he was not yet yotzeh the mitzvah. If he was, and he carried it out on Shabbos, he would be chayuv a chatas.
 - **Q:** The minute he picks it up he is yotzeh, so how could he ever carry it out before being yotzeh? **A:** **Abaye** said, if he carries it upside down he is not yet yotzeh. **A2: Rava** said, if he carries it in a keili (e.g. a bag) he is not yet yotzeh.
 - **Q: Rava** said one is yotzeh if he carries it through a medium!? **A:** He will only be yotzeh if he carries it through a medium in a respectful way (like through a hardkerchief). However, if he carries it out in a disrespectful way (like by carrying it in a keili), he would not be yotzeh.
- **R' Huna** said, **R' Yose** would also say, if one mistakenly placed an Olah bird in a pile of Chatas birds, and a Kohen then mistakenly ate the Olah bird, thinking it was a Chatas, he would be patur (because he was busy fulfilling the mitzvah of eating the Chatas birds).
 - **Q:** That is exactly the same thing that **R' Yose** said regarding carrying out the lulav into the reshus harabim on Shabbos!? **A:** We would have thought that the cases are different. In the case of lulav he is actually performing a mitzvah, but in the case of the Olah bird, although he is attempting to do a mitzvah, when he eats it he is not performing a mitzvah. **R' Huna** therefore teaches that he would be patur in this case as well, because he was busy with the mitzvah of eating the Chatas birds.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, that **R' Yose** says, if one shechts an unchecked animal for a Korbon Tamid on Shabbos, he is chayuv. According to what we said, since he was attempting to do a mitzvah, even though a mitzvah was not done, he should be patur!? **A:** That case is different. We learned in the name of **Rav**, that that case was where he took the animal from a pen of only unchecked animals. Therefore, he was negligent in taking an animal from there for the Tamid, and is therefore chayuv.

MISHNA

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A woman may take the lulav from her son or husband on Yom Tov, and the lulav may be placed back into water even on Shabbos. **R' Yehuda** says, on Shabbos it may be returned to the existing water, on Yom Tov one may even add some fresh water, and on Chol Hamoed one may even totally change the water.
- A minor who knows how to shake the lulav is chayuv in the mitzvah of lulav.

GEMARA

- **Q:** It seems obvious that a woman may take the lulav!? **A:** We would think that since a woman is not chayuv in the mitzvah of lulav, it should be considered as muktzeh for her. The Mishna teaches that since it is an object of mitzvah for the men, it is not muktzeh for her.

KATAN HAYODEAH L'NANEYA

- A Braisa says, a minor who knows how to: shake the lulav is chayuv to do so; wrap himself in a talis is chayuv to do so; guard his body while wearing tefillin, his father should buy him tefillin; speak, his father should teach him Torah and Kriyas Shema.
 - **Q:** What “Torah” should he teach this young child? **A: R' Hamnuna** said, he should teach him “Torah tziva lanu Moshe morasha kehilas Yaakov”.
 - **Q:** What is meant by “Kriyas Shema”? **A:** The first pasuk of Shema.

The Braisa continues, if a minor knows how to watch his body from becoming tamei, we may eat tahoros that have touched his body (other than his hands). If he even knows how to watch his hands from becoming tamei, we may eat tahoros that have touched his hands. If he smart enough to be able to answer whether he has been in contact with tumah, then if there is a safek whether he became tamei: if the safek is in reshus harabim, we consider it to be tahor, and if the safek is in reshus hayachid, we consider it to be tamei. If a Kohen who is a minor knows how to “duchan”, and in fact does so, we may give him terumah in public. If a minor knows how to shecht, we may eat something that he shechts.

- **R' Huna** said, that is only if an adult is there at the slaughter and sees that it was done properly. If a minor is able to eat a kezayis of grain, his wastes are considered disgusting and one must move 4 amos away from them to daven.
 - **R' Chisda** said, that is only if he can eat the kezayis “bichdei achilas peras”.
 - **R' Chiya the son of R' Yeiva** said, this Halacha applies to the wastes of an adult even if he can't eat that amount of grain “bichdei achilas peras”.

If a minor can eat a kezayis of meat, he may be counted in a group for the Korbon Pesach. **R' Yehuda** says, he must also be intelligent enough to throw away a stone that is given to him, and to keep a nut that is given to him (he must be able to understand the difference between something that is edible and something that is inedible).

HADRAN ALACH PEREK LULAV HAGAZEL!!!

PEREK LULAV V'ARAVAH -- PEREK REVI'I

MISHNA

- The mitzvos of lulav and aravah (circling the Mizbe'ach with the aravos) are sometimes done for 6 days in the Beis Hamidash and sometimes for 7 days. The mitzvos of Hallel (saying the complete Hallel) and Simcha (eating Shelamim meat) are done for 8 days. The mitzvos of succah and the offering of water on the Mizbeach (“nisuch hamayim”) are done for 7 days. The playing of the flute is done for 5 days or 6 days.
 - The mitzvah of lulav is done 7 days when the first day of Succos falls out on Shabbos (in which case the mitzvah is done on Shabbos). The mitzvah is only done 6 days when the first day of Succos falls on a day other than Shabbos (because the mitzvah will not be done on Shabbos Chol Hamoed).
 - The mitzvah of aravah is done 7 days when Hoshana Rabbah fall on Shabbos. It is only done 6 days when Hoshana Rabbah falls on another day of the week.
 - How is the mitzvah of lulav done when the first day of Succos falls on Shabbos? The people bring their lulavim to the Har Habayis on Friday and give them to the attendants, who place them on benches in an orderly fashion. The Elders leave theirs in a special chamber. The people are taught to say, “Whoever

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

gets my lulav tomorrow should take it as a present from me”. The next day the attendants throw them in front of the people, and they would grab them and hit each other in the process. When Beis Din saw that this could lead to danger, they instituted that everybody should shake their lulav in their house, and not bring it to the Har Habayis.

-----Daf ל"ג-----43-----

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why is it assur to handle the lulav in the Beis Hamikdash on Shabbos? At most, the lulav is muktzeh, which is only an issur D’Rabanan (which is not even a gezeirah which prevents possible violation of an issur D’Oraisa), and there is a mitzvah D’Oraisa to shake the lulav on Shabbos as well!? **A: Rabbah** explains, there is a gezeirah that one may carry the lulav to an expert who can show him how to shake it, and thereby carry it 4 amos in reshus harabim. This is the same reason that we don’t blow the shofar on Rosh Hashanah that falls on a Shabbos, and the reason we don’t read megillah on Purim that falls on a Shabbos.
 - **Q:** If so, why do we shake the lulav on Shabbos when it is the first day of Succos? **A:** The **Rabanan** had instituted that when the first day of Succos falls on Shabbos, the people should shake the lulav in their homes (because of the dangers described in the Mishna), therefore it would not lead to carrying in reshus harabim.
 - **Q:** Why did they allow the lulav to be taken on Shabbos before the **Rabanan** instituted that it should be taken at home? **A:** With regard to the first day of Succos, where there is a mitzvah D’Oraisa to take the lulav everywhere, the **Rabanan** were not goizer to stop the taking of the lulav. With regard to the rest of the days of Succos, where the mitzvah of lulav only applies at the Mikdash, the **Rabanan** were goizer on Shabbos that the lulav should not be taken.
 - **Q:** If so, even today, after the Churban, the **Rabanan** should not be goizer and the lulav should be taken on Shabbos!? **A:** In Bavel we are not sure when the first day of Yom Tov is (which is why the institution of 2 days of Yom Tov began) and therefore we can’t override Shabbos, since the day we think is Yom Tov may actually not be Yom Tov.
 - **Q:** In Eretz Yisrael the taking of the lulav on the first day should override Shabbos!? **A:** This is correct. Even after the Churban, the people of Eretz Yisrael take the lulav on the first day of Succos that falls on Shabbos.
- **Q:** How do we know that D’Oraisa the taking of the lulav must be done everywhere (even not in the Mikdash)? **A:** A Braisa says, the word “ulikachtem” teaches that every person has a chiyuv to shake the lulav. “Lachem” teaches that it may not be borrowed or stolen. “Bayom” teaches that it must be done even on Shabbos. “Rishon” teaches that it must be done everywhere, even when not by the Mikdash. “**HA**rishon” teaches that this overrides Shabbos only on the *first* day of Succos.
 - **Q:** The only issur associated with taking a lulav on Shabbos is that it may be muktzeh. We need a pasuk to allow muktzeh (which is only D’Rabanan)!? **A: Rava** said, the pasuk is necessary according to **R’ Eliezer** in a Braisa who says that even the preparatory acts for the lulav, which are an issur D’Oraisa to do on Shabbos (e.g. cutting the lulav from the tree, tying the minim together), also override Shabbos, based on the pasuk of “bayom”.
 - The **Rabanan** who argue on **R’ Eliezer** (and prohibit such preparatory acts on Shabbos) say that “bayom” teaches that the mitzvah of lulav may only be performed by day, not by night. **R’ Eliezer** learns this restriction from the pasuk that says “shivas **yamim**”. The **Rabanan** say that this pasuk can’t teach that because we would learn “yamim” from the word “yamim” stated regarding the mitzvah of succah, that just as succah must be performed by day and night, the same would be for lulav.
 - This halacha of succah is learned out via a gezeirah shava (on the word “teishvu”) from the days of “Miluim”. Just as there it was day and night, so too succah is day and night.

ARAVAH SHIV’AH KEITZAD

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Why does the aravah process (bringing them and having the Kohanim circle the Mizbe'ach with them) override Shabbos? **A: R' Yochanan** said, we allow this to publicize that this process is a mitzvah D'Oraisa (it is not written in the Torah, but was taught to us via a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai).
 - **Q:** Lulav should override Shabbos for this reason as well. For it too is not fully described in the Torah!? **A:** Lulav does not override Shabbos because of the gezeirah of **Rabbah** (that one may come to carry it in the reshus harabim).
 - **Q:** Why don't we have that same gezeirah for the aravah process? **A:** The aravos are brought by the messengers of Beis Din and the process is done by the Kohanim (neither group of which we have to be concerned will carry or need to go to an expert to learn). Lulav, on the other hand, is a mitzvah performed by all.
 - **Q:** If so, why does the aravah process override Shabbos only on the last day of Succos? **A:** If it overrode Shabbos on every day of Succos, people would consider this process important and lulav unimportant.
 - **Q:** Why didn't they say that it overrides Shabbos only on the first day of Succos (like lulav)? **A:** People would think that it is lulav that is overriding Shabbos, and aravah is merely accompanying the lulav process, and that is why it overrides Shabbos.
 - **Q:** Why is it the 7th day that was chosen to allow Shabbos to be overridden when it falls on that day? **A:** The **Rabanan** chose the most noticeable days, which are the first and last. Since (as explained) it can't be the first day, they instituted that it be the last day.
 - **Q:** For the same reason we should allow this to be done on Shabbos after the Churban as well!? **A:** In Bavel we are not sure of the dates, and therefore we can't override Shabbos, since the day we think is the 7th day may actually not be the 7th day.
 - **Q:** In Eretz Yisrael the taking of the aravos on the 7th day should override Shabbos!? **A: Bar Hedyā** said, the 7th day of Succos can never fall out on a Shabbos. **A2: Ravin** said, it can fall on Shabbos, but the aravah process would not override Shabbos after the Churban.
 - **Q:** Why does it not override Shabbos!? **A: R' Yosef** said, the mitzvah of the aravah process is not simply taking an aravah, it is the standing up of the aravos around the Mizbe'ach, which obviously can't be done today.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, our Mishna groups lulav with aravah, presumably teaching that just as taking the lulav is the mitzvah, the taking of the aravah is the mitzvah as well!? **A: R' Yosef** said, make no such presumption. It may be that the mitzvah of lulav is accomplished by its taking and the mitzvah of aravah is done by its standing around the Mizbe'ach.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Mishna says that every day of Succos the Kohanim circled the Mizbe'ach one time, and on the 7th day they circled it 7 times. Presumably the Mishna is referring to their circling of the Mizbe'ach with the aravos. We see that the aravos were held in the hand and walked around the Mizbe'ach!? **A: R' Yosef** answered, the Mishna is referring to their walking around with their lulav.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** said they circled the Mizbe'ach with the aravos!? **A: R' Yosef** responded, **R' Nachman** said that, but I disagree.
 - We find that **R' Elazar** says they circled with their lulav, and **R' Shmuel bar Nossan in the name of R' Chanina**, and **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** said they circled the Mizbe'ach with the aravos.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says that once, when the 7th day of Succos fell on a Shabbos, the Baisusin took the aravos on Friday and placed them under rocks to try and prevent the Kohanim from waving them the next day. From this Braisa we see that the aravos were not just stood up, rather they were waved!? **A: TEYUFTA.**
 - **Q:** Based on this, the people of Eretz Yisroel should be allowed to override Shabbos even after the Churban with the taking of the aravah on the 7th day of Succos!? **A:** The

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Rabanan wanted all of Klal Yisrael to follow one set of halachos. Since the people outside Eretz Yisrael can't override Shabbos (because they don't know the dates for certain), the people in Eretz Yisrael also can't override Shabbos for the aravah process.

- **Q:** The people of Eretz Yisrael override Shabbos for the mitzvah of lulav when the first day falls on Shabbos and yet the people of Bavel don't!? **A:** They don't override Shabbos for lulav either.
- **Q:** There is one Mishna that says that when the first day of Succos fell on Shabbos the people would bring their lulavim to the Beis Hamikdash on Friday. Another Mishna says they would bring it to shul. Presumably the difference between the Mishnayos is that the second Mishna refers to after the Churban. We see that they still overrode Shabbos for the mitzvah of lulav!? **A:** Both Mishnayos are discussing when the Beis Hamikdash stood. The second Mishna is discussing the people who lived far from the Har Habayis and could not go there on Shabbos. They would bring their lulavim to shul.

-----Daf 72-----44-----

- **Q: Abaye** asked, why do we (after the Churban) shake a lulav for 7 days as a remembrance for the Mikdash, but don't do the same for the aravah (we only do that on one day)? **A: Rava** said, it is because one is yotzeh the mitzvah of aravah by taking the aravos that are tied with the lulav.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, those aravos are being taken for the purpose of the mitzvah of lulav!? Don't try to answer that he puts down the lulav and takes it a second time for the purpose of the mitzvah of aravah, because that is never done!? **A: R' Zvid in the name of Rava** said, lulav is a mitzvah D'Oraisa, and we therefore make a remembrance for 7 days. Aravah is a D'Rabanan and a one day remembrance is therefore considered to be sufficient.
 - **Q:** Noone says aravah is D'Rabanan! **Abba Shaul** learns it from the pasuk that says "arvei nachal" – referring to 2 aravos (one referring to the aravos of the lulav and one referring to the mitzvah of aravah). The **Rabanan** learn it from a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai, as said by **R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan in the name of R' Nechunya!**? **A: R' Zvid** meant that lulav is a mitzvah D'Oraisa even away from the Mikdash, and we therefore make a remembrance for 7 days. Aravah is a D'Rabanan away from the Mikdash, and a one day remembrance is therefore considered to be sufficient.
 - **Reish Lakish** said, Kohanim who have a mum (who typically may not enter the area between the Mizbe'ach and the Ullam) may enter the area between the Mizbe'ach and the Ullam to walk around the Mizbe'ach holding the aravah, as part of the aravah process.
 - **Q: R' Yochanan** asked, who said this may be done?
 - **Q: R' Yochanan** himself said this is a D'Oraisa, which would mean that this may be done!? **A:** He meant to ask, who says the aravah must be carried around the Mizbe'ach by all Kohanim? Maybe the mitzvah is to stand the aravos around the Mizbe'ach, which can be done by one Kohen on behalf of all the Kohanim. And, who says that a Kohen with a mum may be part of the aravah process altogether? Maybe it must be done by Kohanim without a mum!
 - There is a machlokes between **R' Yochanan** and **R' Yehoshua ben Levi**: one says the aravah process was instituted by the Nevi'im (which would have the status of a D'Rabanan), and the other says it was a custom of the Nevi'im (in which case a bracha would not be said).
 - We can bring a proof that **R' Yochanan** is the one who said that it was instituted by the Nevi'im, because **R' Avahu** said that **R' Yochanan** said that the aravah process was instituted by the Nevi'im.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Zeira** asked, we find (as stated earlier) that **R' Yochanan** says that the aravah process is a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai!? **A: R' Avahu** answered, the Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai was forgotten in Bavel and the Nevi'im then reinstated the process.
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Yochanan** said that the people of Bavel were much more well versed in Torah and did not forget their learning during the years in Bavel!? **A:** The Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai was said only in regard to the aravah process at the Beis Hamikdash. The Nevi'im instituted that it be done outside the Mikdash as well.
- **R' Ami** said: 1) the aravah used for the aravah process needs to be of a certain minimum measurement, 2) it must be taken alone (not tied to anything else), and 3) one cannot be yotzeh with the aravah of the lulav.
 - **Q:** Numbers 3 seems to be obvious after stating number 2!? **A:** The chiddush is, that even if the lulav is taken for the mitzvah of lulav, placed down, and then taken again for the mitzvah of aravah, he would still not be yotzeh.
 - **R' Chisda in the name of R' Yitzchak** said, one can be yotzeh the mitzvah of aravah with the aravos of his lulav.
 - **Q:** What is the required amount for the mitzvah of aravah? **A: R' Nachman** said, three branches of moist leaves. **R' Sheishes** said, even one leaf and one branch.
 - **Q:** Can it even be thought that one leaf or one branch is enough? **A:** He meant one leaf *on* one branch.
- **Ayvu** said, he was once by **R' Elazar bar Tzadok** and saw that he waved the aravah without making a bracha. This would mean that he held the aravah process was a custom of the Nevi'im. **Rav** did the same when he waved the aravah.
- **Ayvu** said, he was once by **R' Elazar bar Tzadok** and a man came and said that workers would hoe his vineyards for him in shmitta, and he would pay them with his olives. The man wanted to know whether this was proper to do. **R' Elazar** told him this was not proper, because produce of shmitta cannot be used to pay one's obligations. **R' Elazar** advised him that he should leave the olives for the poor, and pay the workers from his own pocket.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that one may not hoe the land in shmitta!? **A: R' Ukva bar Chamma** said, **R' Elazar** allowed the hoeing that covers the roots (and prevents them from drying up). The Braisa is referring to hoeing for the purpose of softening the ground to strengthen the trees.
- **Ayvu** said in the name of **R' Elazar bar Tzadok**, a person should not walk more than 3 parsas on Friday, so that he has time to prepare for Shabbos.
 - **R' Kahana** said, this is only said in regard to someone who is walking home (they are not expecting him and will not have food prepared for him if he walks in late). However, one who is travelling to an inn (and has his own food with him) may walk even more. **Others** says that **R' Kahana** said, this was said *even* in regard to one walking to his house (and certainly for one walking to an inn).

MITZVAS LULAV KEITZAD

- Someone taught a version of our Mishna in front of **R' Nachman**, that the attendants would organize the lulavim on the roofs over the benches on the Har Habayis. **R' Nachman** said to him, "the lulavim would get dried out on the roof! It must be that they placed them on the benches themselves (protected from the sun by the roofs)".
 - **Rachba in the name of R' Yehuda** said, the Har Habayis had a double row of benches, one row within the other.