



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

### Succah Daf Mem

- **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 "lachem 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 "lachem", which teaches that any use is permitted, even for laundering. The **T"K** says that the "lachem" 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.
    - 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 "tithiyeh" 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**.