

6 Elul 5781
August 14, 2021



Sukkah Daf 38

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

MISHNAH: If a man was on a journey and had no lulav with which to perform the mitzvah, when he comes home he should take it [even if he is] at his table. If he did not take the lulav in the morning, he should take it even in the afternoon, since the whole day is valid for [taking] the lulav. (38a1)

GEMARA: You said that he should take it [even if he is] at his table. This then means that he must interrupt [his meal for the purpose]. But isn't this in contradiction with the ruling: If they have begun they need not interrupt [it]? — Rav Safra replied: There is no contradiction; the latter statement refers to where there is still time [to perform the mitzvah] during the day, while the former refers to where there is [otherwise] no time.

Rava retorted: What difficulty is this? Is it not possible [that the difference in ruling is due to the fact that] the former is a Biblical mitzvah while the latter [i.e., the daily Shemoneh Esrei] is only Rabbinical? Rather, said Rava, if a difficulty at all exists, it is this: [The ruling] He should take it when he comes home [even if he is] at his table, clearly shows that he must interrupt [his meal], while [the ruling] subsequently taught: If he did not take the lulav in the morning, he should take it even in the afternoon shows, [does it not], that he need not interrupt [his meal]? [To this] Rav Safra might well reply that there is no difficulty: The latter refers to where there is still time during the day, the former where there is [otherwise] no time.

Rabbi Zeira retorted: What difficulty is this? Perhaps it is a mitzvah to interrupt [one's meal for the purpose of taking the lulav] but if one did not interrupt it one should take [the lulav] at any time in the afternoon, since the whole day is valid for the taking of the lulav? Rather, said Rabbi Zeira, [the

incongruity] indeed is as we said previously; and with regard to your difficulty [why the reply was not given that] the former was a Biblical mitzvah while the latter was only Rabbinical, the fact is that here we are dealing with the second day of Sukkos [the obligation of taking the lulav on] which is only Rabbinical. - A deduction [from the wording of our Mishnah] also [shows that this is so], since it teaches: If a man was on a journey and had no lulav with which to perform the mitzvah. Now if it could possibly have been assumed to refer to the first day of Sukkos, [the difficulty would arise] is it permitted [to travel on that day]? (38a1 – 38a2)

MISHNAH: If a slave, a woman, or a minor recited [the hallel] to him, he must repeat after them what they say, (and a curse be upon him). If an adult recited to him, he responds after him [only] Halleluyah. Where the custom applies to repeat [the verses], he should repeat; [where the custom is] to say them only once, he should say them once; [where the custom applies] to recite the blessing, he should recite the blessing. Everything is dependent on local custom. (38a3)

GEMARA: Our Rabbis have taught: It has truly been laid down that a [minor] son may recite [the Bircas Hamazon] for his father, a slave may recite it for his master, and a wife for her husband; but the Sages said, May a curse come upon that man whose wife and [minor] sons have to recite the blessing for him! (38a4)

Rava said: One can deduce important decisions from the [present] custom of [reciting the] Hallel. [Thus], since he says Halleluyah and they respond Halleluyah, it may be inferred that it is a mitzvah to answer Halleluyah. Since he says, Praise Him, you servants of Hashem, and they [again] respond Halleluyah, it may be deduced that if an adult recites [the

Hallel] for one the latter responds Halleluyah. Since he says, Give thanks to Hashem, and they respond, Give thanks to Hashem, it may be inferred that it is a mitzvah to make a response of the beginning of the sections. So it was also stated: Rav Chanan bar Rava ruled: It is a mitzvah to make a response of the beginning of the sections. He says, Please, Hashem, bring salvation now, and they answer, Please, Hashem, bring salvation now, it may be inferred that if a minor was reciting it for him, the latter answers after him what he says. Since he says, Please, Hashem, bring success now, and they respond, Please, Hashem, bring success now, it may be inferred that if a man wishes to double [the verses] he may. Since he says, Blessed be he that comes, and they answer, In the name of Hashem, it may be inferred that he who listens is as though he responded. (38a4 – 38b2)

They enquired of Rabbi Chiya bar Abba: If one listened but did not make the responses — what is the law? — He answered them: The Sages, the Scribes, the leaders of the people and the expounders laid down that if a man listened though he did not make the responses he has fulfilled his obligation. So it was also stated: Rabbi Shimon ben Pazzi citing Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi who had it from Bar Kappara stated: From where do we know that he who listens is as though he responds? From what is written: Even all the words of the scroll which the King of Judah has read. For was it Yoshiyahu that read them? Was it not, in fact Shaphan who read them, as it is written: And Shaphan read it before the king. Consequently, it may be inferred that he who listens is as though he responds. But perhaps Yoshiyahu read it after Shaphan had read it? — Rav Acha bar Yaakov replied: This cannot be thought of, since it is written: Because your heart was tender, and you did humble yourself before Hashem, when you heard what I spoke¹ "When you heard', not 'when you did read'. (38b2 – 38b3)

Rava ruled: One should not say Blessed be he that comes' and then [pause and] say 'in the name of Hashem,' but 'Blessed be he that comes in the name of Hashem' all together. (Rav Safra said to him: 'Moshe! Do you speak correctly? The fact

is that both here and there, it is the conclusion of the clause and the pause does not matter'.)

Rava ruled: One should not say, 'May His great Name' and then [pause and] say, 'be blessed' but 'May His great Name be blessed' all together. Rav Safra said to him: 'Moshe! Do you speak correctly? The fact is that both here and there it is the conclusion of the clause and the pause does not matter'. (38b3 – 39a1)

DAILY MASHAL

One of the last pesukim of Hallel (Tehillim 118:25) is "*Ana Hashem Hoshia Na, Ana Hashem Hatzlicha Na*--Please Hashem Save Us Now, Please Hashem Bring Us Success Now". Although this is one complete Pasuk, when reciting Hallel, we take the first half and repeat it twice (being led to do so, many times mellifluously, by the Shaliach Tzibbur), and then take the second half of the Pasuk and repeat it twice. Since there is a principle in Halacha which generally disallows taking parts of Pesukim (*Kol Pasuk Delo Posak Moshe Anan Lo Paskinan*), why do both the Shatz and the Tzibbur publicly do so--when a simple and effective alternative would be for the Shaliach Tzibbur to recite the entire Pasuk twice and for us to repeat it either after each recitation or twice after both recitations? Why do we break up the "Hoshia Na" aspect of the Pasuk from the seemingly very-much-related "Hatzlicha Na" which succeeds it in the second half of the Pasuk? We look forward to your thoughts. By Hakhel.