



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

Rava said: Drinking vessels may be kept in the Sukkah; eating utensils must be taken outside the Sukkah. Earthenware jugs and wooden pails (of water) must be kept outside the Sukkah. A lamp may be placed within the Sukkah, while some say that it must be placed outside the Sukkah. The *Gemora* notes that there is no difference of opinion between them, as the former refers to a large Sukkah, and the latter refers to a small one (of seven by seven tefachim). [Once an earthenware lamp is used it becomes repulsive; in a large Sukkah, however, it is not so noticeable.] (29a1)

[**Halachah:** One should not bring large serving pots into the Sukkah unless the pots will be used during the meal. The Mishnah Berurah writes that according to some opinions these pots should not be brought into the Sukkah even during the meal. One can, however, bring small pots into the Sukkah. One should remove plates and pans from the Sukkah after the meal has ended so as not to belittle the sanctity of the Sukkah. One can, however, leave drinking cups inside the Sukkah.]

The Mishnah had stated: If rain had fallen The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: When a porridge of split beans would become ruined on account of the rain, one may leave the Sukkah.

Abaye was sitting before Rav Yosef in a Sukkah. The wind blew and brought down chips of wood into the food. Rav Yosef said to them: Remove my vessels from here (for I am leaving). Abaye said to him: But have we not learned in the *Mishna*: when the porridge would become ruined? He

answered him: For me, who is fastidious, this (the wood chips falling in) is like the porridge becoming ruined. (29a1)

[**Halachah:** The Rema rules that the amount of rain that is required to allow one to exit his Sukkah is the same amount of rain that would cause a person to exit his house if he had a leak in his roof.]

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: If one was eating in the Sukkah and it began to rain and he exited the Sukkah (and continued his meal in the house), we do not bother him to return to the Sukkah (even if the rain ceased) until he finishes his meal (and wishes to eat again). [The reason for this ruling is because it is considered distress for one to have to return to the Sukkah.]

If one was sleeping under (the s’chach) in the Sukkah and it began to rain and he exited the Sukkah (and went to sleep in the house), we do not bother him to return to the Sukkah (even if the rain ceased) until it becomes light.

The *Gemora* inquires: Does the *Baraisa* mean “until he awakens,” or “until it becomes light”?

The *Gemora* resolves this from a *Baraisa*: until it becomes light, and the first light of dawn arises. Why both of these times (when they in fact are two different times)? Rather, we must say that the *Baraisa* means as follows: until he awakens and the light of dawn has risen. (29a1 – 29a2)

The *Mishnah* had stated that raining on Sukkos is compared to a slave who comes to pour the cup for his master, and he poured a pitcher onto his face.

The *Gemora* inquires: Who poured the pitcher onto whom? The *Gemora* resolves this from a *Baraisa*: The master poured a pitcher onto his face and said, "I do not want your service." (29a2)

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: When the sun is stricken (either due to dark spots or an eclipse), it is a bad omen for the entire world. This may be illustrated by a parable. To what can this be compared? It is to a human being who made a banquet for his servants and put up for them a lantern. When he became angry with them, he said to his servant, "Take away the lantern from them, and let them sit in the dark."

It was taught in a *Baraisa*: Rabbi Meir said: Whenever the luminaries are stricken, it is a bad omen for the Jewish people, since they are accustomed to blows. This may be compared to a school teacher who comes to school with a strap in his hand. Who becomes apprehensive? He who is accustomed to being smitten daily.

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: When the sun is stricken it is a bad omen for idolaters; when the moon is stricken, it is a bad omen for the Jewish people, since the Jews calculate (the yearly cycle) by the moon and idolaters calculate by the sun.

If it is stricken in the east, it is a bad omen for those who dwell in the east; if in the west, it is a bad omen for those who dwell in the west; if in the midst of heaven it is bad omen for the entire world. If its face is red as blood, it is a sign that the (death by) sword is coming to the world; if it is like a sack, the arrows of famine are coming to the world; if it resembles both, the sword and the arrows of famine are coming to the world. If it is stricken at sunset, calamity will be delayed in its coming; if it is at dawn, it is

quickly on its way; but some say the order is to be reversed.

And there is no nation which is smitten that its angel are not smitten together with it, as it is written: And against all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgments.

But when the Jews fulfill the will of the Omnipresent, they need not concern themselves of all these omens, as it is written: *Thus said Hashem: Do not learn the way of the nations, and do not be dismayed at the signs of heaven, though the nations are dismayed at them.* This means that the idolaters will be dismayed (by these omens), but the Jews will not be dismayed.

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: On account of four things is the sun stricken: On account of the head of a Rabbinical court who died and was not eulogized fittingly; on account of a betrothed maiden who cried out aloud in the city (as she was being raped) and there was no one that saved her; on account of homosexual relations; and on account of two brothers whose blood was shed at the same time.

And on account of four things are the luminaries smitten: On account of those who perpetrate forged documents; on account of those who give false testimony; on account of those who rear small cattle in Eretz Yisroel; and on account of those who cut down (fruit producing) good trees.

And on account of four things is the property of homeowners given into the hands of the government: On account of those who retain in their possession bills which have been paid (so they can collect a second time); on account of those who lend money with interest; on account of those who had the power to protest (against wrongdoing) and did not protest; and on account of those who publicly declare their intention to give specified sums for charity and do not give.

Rav said: On account of four things is the property of homeowners destroyed: On account of those who defer payment of the laborer's hire; on account of those who steal the hired laborer's wages; on account of those who remove the yoke (of responsibility) from off their necks and place it on the necks of their fellows; and on account of arrogance. And the sin of arrogance is equivalent to all the others, whereas of the humble it is written: But the humble shall inherit the earth, and delight themselves in the abundance of peace. (29a2 – 29b1)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, HAYASHEIN

MISHNAH: A stolen or dry lulav is invalid. One that came from an asheirah or from a subverted city, is invalid. If its top was broken off or its leaves were detached, it is invalid. If its leaves were merely separated, it is valid. Rabbi Yehudah says: He should tie them up at the top. The palms of the iron mountain are valid. A lulav which is three tefachim in length, long enough to wave, is valid. (29b3 – 29b4)

The *Gemora* notes: The *Mishnah* taught unequivocally that a stolen or dried lulav is invalid whether it is on the first day of the festival or on the second day of the festival. The *Gemora* asks: It is understandable why it is invalid when it is dry, for the Torah states: *hadar* – beauty, and this is required for seven days, and now that it is dry, it is lacking in beauty; but regarding a stolen lulav, it is understandable why it is invalid on the first day, for the Torah states *lachem* – for yourselves, and that means it should be from your own property, but why is it invalid on the second day of the festival (when there is no requirement of “lachem”)?

Rabbi Yochanan answers in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai: One cannot use a stolen lulav even on the second day of Sukkos because it is a mitzvah that is brought about through the violation of a negative prohibition. This is based on that which is written: *You bring the stolen, the*

lame and the sick animal... (shall I accept it, says Hashem?). The ‘stolen’ is thus compared with the ‘lame’: just as the lame can never be rectified (and on account of its blemish, it can never be offered as a korban), so too that which is stolen can never be rectified - that is irrespective of whether the stolen animal is used before the owner despaired of recovering it or afterwards. Now, it is understandable that it is invalid when it is being offered before the owner despaired of recovering it, for the Torah states: *when a man will offer from among yours,* and this animal does not belong to him (the thief); but when it is being offered after the owner despaired of recovering it, why is it unfit, the thief should have acquired it through the owner's abandonment? Rather, it must be (that it is ruled to be unfit) because it was brought about through the violation of a prohibition. [This principle applies by lulav as well.] (29b4 - 30a1)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

The Four Species and Hashem's Name

Rashi writes that a dry lulav is invalid because the mitzvah must be *mehuderes*, performed with a beautiful object, as it is said *this is my G-d and I shall beautify Him*, and we learn from this verse that one should beautify himself before HaShem when fulfilling a mitzvah.

Tosfos questions the words of Rashi from the Gemara earlier on Daf 11b that states that the mitzvah of glorifying a mitzvah is only a Halachah *l'chatchila*, preferable, but the mitzvah is not invalidated if one uses an object that is not beautiful for a mitzvah. The Gemara there states that it is preferable to tie the lulav with the hadassim and the aravos. If one does not tie the lulav with the other species, however, he has still fulfilled the mitzvah.

Rav Aharon Yosef Weingarten in the *Sefer HaYovel L'Chasam Sofer* suggests an answer to resolve the question of Tosfos on Rashi. The Gemara in Gittin Daf 20 states that if one wrote the name of Hashem in a Sefer

Torah without the proper sanctity, it is invalid. The Gemara explains that the reason for this is because of the verse that states *this is my G-d and I shall beautify Him*.

The Bais Yosef in Orach Chaim 651 rules that one must join the esrog with the lulav in order to fulfill the mitzvah. The Bais Yosef cites the *Rikanti* who claimed that this secret was revealed to him in a dream. On the first night of Sukkos, a Chasid by the name of Rabbi Yitzchak appeared to the *Rikanti* and the *Rikanti* noticed that Rabbi Yitzchak was writing the Name of Hashem, but Rabbi Yitzchak wrote the letter *hey* separate from the first three letters. The *Rikanti* told him that this was incorrect and Rabbi Yitzchak responded that this is what is being done in the community of the *Rikanti*. The *Rikanti* protested and wrote the name of Hashem correctly. The *Rikanti* did not comprehend the meaning of the dream until the following morning when he observed the people in his community holding the esrog distant from the lulav. The *Rikanti* recalled the Medrash in Parashas Emor that states that the four species allude to the Name of HaShem. Just like the Name of HaShem must be written with all the letters adjacent to each other, the four species must also all be held together.

This, then, could be the possible explanation for the opinion of Rashi. A dry lulav will be invalid *ex post facto* because it is lacking in the mitzvah of *this is my G-d and I shall beautify Him*, as the mitzvah of lulav is akin to writing the Name of HaShem. This approach is also found in the *Sefer Shaarei Orah* from Rav Meir Bergman.

DAILY MASHAL

Alive and Praising Hashem

The Mishnah states that a dry lulav is invalid, and the Gemara explains that the reason why it is invalid is because the Torah requires that the four species be *hadar*, beautiful, and a dry lulav is not beautiful. The Yerushalmi states that the reason why a dry lulav is invalid is because

it is said (Tehillim 115:17) *the dead cannot praise HaShem*. What is the connection between the four species and praising HaShem? It is said (Ibid 96:12-13) *the field and everything in it will exult; then all the trees of the forest will sing with joy. Before HaShem, for He will have arrived, He will have arrived to judge the earth*. The Medrash states that these verses allude to the idea that after the judgment of Rosh HaShanah and Yom Kippur, one takes the trees of the forest, i.e. the lulav. It is said that *the trees of the forest will sing with joy*, and this alludes to the idea that the lulav is used to praise HaShem. Additionally, Rabbeinu Bachye (Vayikra 23:40) writes that the four species are fresh and alive, and the Torah and its recipients are alive, and we take the four species that have life and we praise HaShem, Who is referred to as the Living G-d.