

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET  
ON SUCCOS - 5759

B'S'D'

To receive these Parsha sheets by e-mail, contact crshulman@aol.com and cshulman@cahill.com  
To subscribe to individual lists see [http://www - torah.org](http://www-torah.org) [virtual.co.il](http://virtual.co.il) [shamash.org](http://shamash.org)  
[shemayisrael.co.il](http://shemayisrael.co.il) [jewishamerica.com](http://jewishamerica.com) [ou.org/lists](http://ou.org/lists) [youngisrael.org](http://youngisrael.org) & 613.org

olas-shabbos@torah.org Olas Shabbos beShabbato: Rabbi Eliyahu Hoffmann <Hoffmann@torah.org> Sukkah - Finding the Real You  
In huts (Sukkos) you shall dwell for seven days. (Vayikra 23:42)  
Sukkos, the Festival of Huts, commemorates the shelters Hashem provided for the Jewish nation when they left Mitzrayim (Egypt) and entered the Wilderness (Midbar). Yet we may ask: What is really so noteworthy about these temporary booths that they deserve everlasting recognition? Normally one commemorates an event of distinction or inspiration, perhaps a miracle, but why commemorate the seemingly insignificant huts used by the 'leavers of Mitzrayim'?

To understand this, we must realize that Yetzias Mitzrayim/the Exodus from Egypt is significant on two levels. Simply, Yetzias Mitzrayim was our freedom from bondage. As we say in the Pesach Haggadah, "And had the Holy One, Blessed be He, not removed us from Egypt, we and our children would [still] be slaves to Pharaoh in Egypt." Yetzias Mitzrayim, however, was more than just freedom from physical bondage. It was also our release from spiritual bondage. Not simply that the Jews in Egypt were not free to practice their religion openly - that is likewise a result of physical bondage. Rather the Jews in Mitzrayim found themselves so steeped in pagan culture that they were unable to free themselves from the throes of their own yetzer hara/evil disposition. As Chazal, our Sages, describe it: They had sunken to the 49th level of tumah/impurity. Hashem, in taking them out of Mitzrayim, removed from them the shackles and chains of their own immorality, so that they could begin to serve Him and receive the Torah. Thus Yetzias Mitzrayim carries for us two distinct meanings: It commemorates our release from both physical and spiritual bondage. This second type of Yetzias Mitzrayim is in fact somewhat of an ongoing process. Our release from physical bondage was a one-time deal - it has lasted to this very day. But spiritual bondage as we have explained it - the spiritual limitations one experiences through captivity to his own physical/material/base desires - is a slavery from which most of us have yet to attain our ultimate freedom. Everyone's yetzer hara is different. But everyone knows that certain aspects of his character prevent him from achieving the spiritual heights to which he aspires. For some it may be laziness. For others pride, anger, lust, overindulgence, lack of self-confidence, shallowness, etc. We struggle with these and other types of spiritual bondage every day. Then comes Yom Kippur. The one day of the year where everyone tastes a bit of freedom from his yetzer hara. We don't eat, drink, or indulge in other pleasures - basically all we do is daven (pray) and spend our day re-connecting with Hashem, from Whom we have drifted throughout the year. It is a day, if you will, of Yetzias Mitzrayim - each person's release from the bondage of his own disposition. So what do we do after experiencing a day that so uplifts our spirits? A day of freedom from the physical desires and passions which so often cause us to sway from the straight path? It is written in Shulchan Aruch (624:5), "One should begin building his Sukkah immediately after Yom Kippur." We build a Sukkah. Simply explained, we do this to go straight from one mitzvah into the next. But there's more. Sometimes, Yom Kippur sends us into an identity crisis: Is this the real me? I mean, this is all very well one day a year - a day devoid of all the physical pleasures and yetzer haras I'm used to - but that's all. It can't be the real "me". I am human, and have certain limitations and weaknesses which just can't be avoided. Aren't I? Therefore, says the Sanzer Rav (Rabbi Chaim Halberstam z"l, Divrei Chaim p. 20), the Torah instructs us to build a Sukkah. The Sukkah is a temporary dwelling place; an abode devoid of all the luxuries and comforts to which we are accustomed. Yet this hut is to become our dwelling place. "Ba-sukkos teshvu, In Sukkos (huts) you shall \*dwell\*," as

the Gemara describes it: One must dwell in his Sukkah as he would in his primary residence (Tractate Sukkah 27a). The Torah is sending us a message: This is where you really belong. This is the real you! The "you" of Yom Kippur. The "you" minus the bad habits and the focus on materialism. The "you" for whom a simple Sukkah - lacking in physical grandeur yet rich in spiritual qualities and infused with Hashem's Presence - is more than enough. It's where you really belong. As we sit this Yom Tov in our Sukkos, surrounded by the "Shade of the Faithful One," perhaps it's appropriate to allow our thoughts to drift back to the sublime sanctity of Yom Kippur, to remind ourselves how right it felt to spend our day in total dedication to Hashem, without all the frills and luxuries of life in the Western world. And to absorb the holiness that permeates the walls of every Jew's Sukkah. And to remember - this is where I really belong. Have a good and fulfilling Yom Tov.

This week's publication was sponsored by Mrs. Pauline Rubinstein, in gratitude to Hashem for her successful surgery, and in prayer for a speedy recovery. Olas Shabbos. Copyright (c) 1998 by Rabbi Eliyahu Hoffmann and Project Genesis, Inc. The author is a Maggid Shiur (teacher) and Menahel (principal) in Mesivta Chassidei Bobov of Toronto. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway [learn@torah.org](mailto:learn@torah.org) 6810 Park Heights Ave. <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21215 (410) 358-9800 FAX: 358-9801

From: jschwrtz@ymail.yu.edu [Rabbi Jonathan Schwartz] Internet Chaburah-- Parshas Ha'azeinu, Zman sukkos (fwd)

Prologue: A prior chaburah as per a request...and its connection to misas Moshe and to chol hamoed is apparent. This week's chaburah is dedicated to the memory of Rus Elisheva bas Harav Chaim Ozer a.h.

Colliding emotions, conflicting mitzvos and nichum Aveilim

1. There is a machlokes between Rabbeinu Yona on the mishna in Berachos of "Kavru es hames" who learns that nichum aveilim is a mitzva deorisa based upon the concept of gemilas chessed based in the possuk of "V'hodata l'vanacha" and the Rambam (Avel 14:1) Who learns that the whole issue is a din D'rabbanan---although it should be noted that later in that same perek, the Rambam uses the possuk of V'havta l'reiacha Kamocha as the source (asmachta) for the din d'rabbanan seemingly agreeing with the premise for the din as an aspect of gemilas chessed.

2. The Mishnas Yaavetz in siman 37 (Yoreh Deah) deals with the sitra that we raised in the Rambam. According to the Rambam (Avel 14:7) the mitzva of Nichum precedes the mitzva of Bikur Cholim. The Rambam (Lulav 7:24) implies elsewhere that bikkur cholim precedes nichum aveilim. It seems that the Rambam (avel 14:7) bases his din on the gemara in Shabbos 152b which notes that a mes without minachamin (no one to mourn for him) has 10 people come for him, sit in his home and keep avilos for him. Others come ad areminachem these aveilim. (It appears that the Rambam sees this mitzva as a geder of Gemilas Chessed) The Raavad on location notes that there is no basis in halacha for this din as the 10 only must come visit -- do not become "K'aveilim" as the Rambam declares. The Lechem Mishna notes that the ten, acc. to the Rambam are made into Aveilim which Rav Jolti explains is because there is a twofold issue of nichum aveilim--a kavod hachaim and a kavod hameisim. Granted, if there are no chayim then there is no inyan of kavod hachaim but the ten replace them to allow the tzibbur to be oisek in kavod hamesim. (Perhaps this is why the gemara specifically sends ten to be naasa k'aveilim--for the chovas hatzibbur (eida hava 10 -- see this week's sedra "ad Masai L'eida, hara Hazos") Interestingly, The Meiri to Shabbos 152 actually uses this explain within the gemara-- you need 10 to come and sit in his place for kavod hames <In which case, if there are no aveilim, so bikkur cholim, a mitzva of gemilas chessed for living would in fact precede the gemilas chessed for the non-living, keep this in mind>.

See Moed Katan 27-- one can be minachem avel on a Yom Tov. according to Rav Hai Gaon (Sefer Hamanhig Hil. esrog siman 4:32) the nichum is done to relax the avel -- it is similar to the mitzva of nichum aveilim but in actuality isn't real nichum because there is no aveilus on Yom Tov. (Actually based upon Rav Hai, we see that there is a separate concept of relaxing the mindset of the avel when one comes to be minachem avel-- a similar concept is found in the Shelah (144:1) who notes that there isn't only a mitzva to be minachem rather to be misameach as well. Additionally, see

the Shut Shevet Halevi of Rav Vosner (Yoreh Deah 213) who, based upon the Zohar in parshas Korach, notes the necessity of a minachem to decide in his mind what and how he will be minachem the avel before he arrives at the beis ha'avel. This too, seems to be based upon the additional ability to relax or "cheer up" the avel that is incumbent upon the minachem acc. to Rav Hai).

However, according to Rav Jolti, we are minachem aveilim on Yom Tov for a different reason entirely. We are minachem to be yotzei the aspect of Kavod Hames -- Therefore we stand in the shura even on Chol Hamoed, as the Gemara notes, L'fitor es Harabim--See Rashi who notes that this is so that the aveilim will cry out "lichu l'bateichem" and look further at the Nimukei Yosef that notes that the aveilim become patur from making the shura later because the hava amina would hve been to say that they are still chiyav since they have not completed the issue of kavod hachayim (for the aveilim) only of kavod hamesim. Notwithstanding, they are patur. Either way, we see the stira is answered--during the regel, there is no din of avel only of kavod hames so Bikkur cholim will precede but otherwise, nichum aveilim which contains a 2 fold gimilas chessed to the living and to the deceased will precede bikkur cholim. Parenthetically Rav Jolti suggests that therefore Rabban Gamliel accepted tanchumim for his servant Tavi..namely, that the latter had no kerovim and the tanchumim was b'geder asara bnei adam (alternatively, you can use the explanation of the rashba to that gemara Berachos 16b that it was because avdo chaviv alav k'benei)

Based upon this explanation we can understand a strange din the Tur brings from Meseches Simachos. According to the Tur, If the body is re-interred (reburied) the original aveilim keep certain dinim (keriah for instance and other nehugei aveilos) for the day of reinternment. However, we do not stand on the shura and aren't minachem the aveilim. Instead those assembled say to each other "titsnachem" (simachos perek 12). Based upon our understanding, the day of reinternment is a day to be makpid on the kavod hames aspect of the minhagei aveilos. So although the aveilim keep the minhagei aveilos for a full day, it is b'geder kavod hames. They, therefore are aveilim not b'geder kerovim hamisablim rather b'geder asara bnei adam, like rabban gamliel. There is no shura for 10 bnei adam so there is no need for nchum to them. However in order to be yotzei the kavod hames aspect, the assembled should say titnachem to each other for the kavod hames that wafts in the area. (this sevara has basis in the shut Minchas Dovid 72-73 where the Minchas Dovid recommends that Nichum Aveilim not be done on the telephone because one is not yotzei the kavod hames aspects of the nichum if he is not in the place where the mes is being mourned <recall the gemara in shabbos that the 10 must go to the home of the deceased and be aveilim there>)

3. The Rov ztl. (shiurim L'zecher nishmas Avi Mori vol.2, Binyan Aveilos) noted that nichum does not set the actual peratei aveilos, rather it is the kiyum of aveilos that is the aspect that sets the tone for the aveilos (keep this in mind as well.) The Rov continued that the chalos ha'aveilos is the recognition of distance from hashem like a minuda (one in cherem) usually accomplished through some kiyum ha'aveilos (not an issur aveilos) that begins the process. See Nefesh HaRov (page 250) and B'ikvei Hatzon of <siman 38 footnote 3> who notes that we can strengthen our understanding of the kiyum beginning the aveilos with this case of someone who has no aveilim. (although the Rov's comparison to a minuda will need a short explanation) According to Rav Schachter, the Rov noted that it was the Rogatchover who implored the people of Dvinsk to be misabel when the Ohr sameach (meshech Chochma) passed away leaving no aveilim. Similarly, by adopted children who have no din of kibbud av v'em on adoptive parents b'mosom (see Rav melech Schachter's piece in the Journal of halacha and contemporary Society on adopted children), the rov felt that they should keep some form of aveilos as a kiyum ha'aveilos like the ten people and rabban Gamliel. (The only question remains if there are living aveilim, should one be misnadev a nidui l'shomayim acc. to the Rov? ) Rav Schachter expands on this point. It seems that the Shut Chasam Sofer (Orach Chayim 164) notes that an adopted child need not be machmir on keeping aveilos. However, it seems that the Pischei Teshuva and Rabbi Akiva Eiger (to the Rama on Yoreh Deah 374:6) disagree and note that one who wants to can be machmir and he is mikayem a kiyum ha'aveilos. The

Rov ztl. felt it may be a good idea for an adopted child to keep aveilos for a parent yet it isn't a chova. Rav Schachter notes that this is true only for aveilos shiva and sheloshim which contain kiyumim but for aveilos yud beis chodesh there are only issurim so there is no reason for an adopted child--or anyone being misnadev the aveilos--to keep the aveilos 12 months. This idea is found in the Gur Aryeh in Parshas VaYigash and (believe it or not) in the Meshech Chochma in Bo on the posuk of V'shamarta es ha chuka hazos l'moad-- namely that an eino mitzuev v'oseh applies only to 'aseh's not to 'lavin'

(Rav Willig shlita (quintres al ela siman 5:2) argues on this last point of Rav Schachter shlita noting the same chillik (between kiyum and issur by aveilos) as a difference between shiva and sheloshim. Rav Willig notes that there are only issurim in the period known as sheloshim. (Gihutz and tispores). The nafka mina between the 2 would be for the application of miktzas hayom k'kulo by sheloshim. Rabbi Baruch Simon Shlita explained the position of Rav Schachter as follows: Sheloshim is a kiyum in man's obligation to be minabel himself (I believe that Rav Schachter himself explained his position this way during the niddah shiurim last june zman) as opposed to 12 months which is all issur. The nafka mina is precisely the nafka mina between Rav Schachter and Rav Willig --- miktzas Hayom. You would be able to say it for sheloshim and not for 12 months.)< The down side to the kiyum/issur chillik is that by a regel where the kiyumim can't be kept, the aveilos can't be chal.

The Jerusalem Post <http://www.jpost.co.il/Columns/Article-1.html> Octr 1, 1998 Shabbat Shalom: Locked Out, or Locked In? By Rabbi Shlomo Riskin

Why do we trade in the white kittel (robe) of prayer for a hammer and nails? Four days ago we were soaring with angels, and now we've joined the carpenters' union! A fascinating comment by Rabbi Shlomo Carlebach on the nature of the Ne'illa prayer that ends Yom Kippur may provide an answer. Shlomo Carlebach was a larger-than-life figure, and although controversial in some quarters because of his anti-establishment posture, whoever heard him sing a song or tell a tale will never forget the experience. Of all his talents, perhaps his major strength lay in the fact that he was able to reach all kinds of Jews - religious, secular, feminists, even anti-religious. He probably brought back more Jews than any other figure of our time. Before picking up the guitar, he had a reputation as a brilliant talmudic scholar. But Reb Shlomo chose not to remain within the protective sanctity of the bet midrash (study hall); instead, he brought his haunting melodies and bittersweet stories to the masses. He touched the common, forgotten and often alienated Jew. And through his music he brought the loftiest messages of our faith to the deepest recesses of souls in the furthest outposts of the world. The climax of Yom Kippur, the most awesome day of the year, is the Ne'illa prayer, literally the "locking of the gates." With the waning of the sun, our last chance to enter the doors of the righteous is ending. Will we make it, or won't we? The tension in the synagogue is palpable. We have to concentrate, focusing all our strength on making those last moments count. Rabbi Carlebach, in his inimitably naive but provocative manner, would often comment that it's such a pity that so many Jews concentrate on not getting locked out; we ought be just as concerned about getting "locked in"!

What I believe he meant was that we dare not become so insular that we stop seeing what is right outside our window. Nationalism is undoubtedly an important tool for creating a society that works well, a shared determination to put a cultural vision into effect. But all too often the spirit of the law gets overlooked in the precise concern for the letter, and the line between nationalism and chauvinism can turn legitimate Jewish pride into contempt for others. One of the most striking examples of how such narrow mindedness can threaten our spiritual existence may be found in a Tosefta in Tractate Yoma (Ch. 1, Mishna 10). Generally, priests were chosen for the priestly duties on the Day of Atonement by the lottery system. But the very earliest function of the day was decided by a race between the various interested priests up the ramp; whoever got there first was rewarded with the

duty of removing the accumulated ash (trumat hadeshen). The Mishna and Tosefta record one such race: "There was an incident involving two priests running neck and neck. One of them tried to push the other out of the way; the one who was being out-distanced took a knife and struck his competitor in the heart. "R. Zadok came and stood at the doorway of the great hall of the Temple Mount. The great and pious sage said to the assembly: 'Listen to me, my brothers of the house of Israel. The Torah says, If you find a dead body between two cities... the elders and the judges go out and measure [the distance of the nearest city to where the corpse was found], and they are required to bring a sacrifice, the eglu arufa (Deut. 21: 1-9). Now let us go out and measure who has to bring the sacrifice.... "The entire nation cried out in tears. And then the father [of the priest struck in the heart] said: 'My son is still breathing, so the knife is not yet ritually impure, [and could therefore continue to be used.]' " Not only have the priests forgotten the peace which is the goal of the Temple ritual, but it would seem that the only matter of real concern - even to the father of the priest who was wounded - is not his son's life but rather the ritual purity of the knife! The story concludes: "Because of the sin of shedding blood, the Divine Spirit has been locked in, and the Holy Temple has been defiled."

In the Tosefta, the Hebrew for "locked in" is ne'ulat. R. Shlomo's commentary regarding how most of us are worried about being locked out when we should be more worried about being locked in could very well be based on this Tosefta. If we didn't get the message on Yom Kippur, along comes Succot four days later. For the next seven days we leave our locked homes, our predictable way of looking at the world, and experience a new relationship with nature. The very ritual items that we're commanded to bless are part and parcel of nature itself; they require no transformation on our part. We do not turn a ram's horn into a musical instrument, nor wheat into an edible food. The Four Species come straight from the fields.

Indeed, the booth we sit in has specific laws regarding its structure: the only material we can use for a roof are varieties of vegetation, making for a natural, humble and universal dwelling, and - although the material must be thick enough to cast more shade than sun - we must be able to see the stars. Furthermore, when the Temple still stood, 70 sacrifices were brought on Succot, corresponding to the 70 nations of the world. Jews were concerned even for those different from ourselves. Perhaps the open spaces of the Succa help prevent Israel, as well as the Divine Spirit, from becoming locked into a hermetically sealed Sanctuary. Shabbat Shalom and hag Sameah

shabbat-zomet@virtual.co.il Shabbat-B'Shabbato - Parshat Ha'azinu SHABBAT-ZOMET is an extract from SHABBAT-B'SHABBATO, a weekly bulletin distributed free of charge in hundreds of synagogues in Israel. It is published by the Zomet Institute of Alon Shevut, Israel, under the auspices of the National Religious Party. Translated by: Moshe Goldberg Correction and Apology: In the English translation of the "Nitzavim" issue of Shabbat-B'Shabbato we implied that Prof. Ze'ev Lev, the founder of the Jerusalem College of Technology, has passed away. We sincerely apologize for this mistake. We would like to take this opportunity to wish Prof. Lev a long and fruitful life.

TORAH, MITZVA, AND ... SOCIETY: Holiday Joy and a Grafted Etrog  
 by Rabbi Uri Dasberg The late Rabbi Chaim David Halevi, Chief Rabbi of Tel Aviv, saw once that a worshipper in his synagogue had a very handsome etrog. But, from the low price which the man had paid, he understood that it was what is known as "murkav," a product of grafting the etrog onto a different type of tree. The rabbi had no doubt that if he made some comment about this, it would spoil the man's holiday joy. Thus, the question was, which is more important, the possibility that it might be forbidden to use a grafted etrog or the mitzva of happiness on the holiday. The issue of a grafted etrog has been discussed only since the time of the later commentators. It was not raised by the Talmud or the earlier commentators, including the Shulchan Aruch, and this is in spite of the fact that the technique of grafting has been well known for many years. Even the Rama, who was so unsure of its suitability that he hesitated to permit a blessing for such an etrog, did not mention this issue in his comments on the Shulchan Aruch but only in response to a question. The only one of the commentators who implies that use of a grafted etrog is forbidden by Torah law is the Baal Halevush. His reasoning is that the act of making the graft is forbidden, and it should therefore be forbidden to use the fruits of such an act for a mitzva. However, grafting an etrog onto a similar tree, such as a lemon, does not violate the prohibition of mixing different species, and in this case there would be no reason to forbid use of the fruit. Others have suggested that a grafted etrog should not be used because the product is a mixture of two fruits, and the etrog is thus not whole. As an alternative, it has been suggested that the product of grafting is an entirely new fruit, and therefore cannot be called an etrog. These reasons are sufficient for a rabbinical ban on a grafted etrog, but do not constitute grounds for a definite Torah prohibition. There are also some rabbis who do not accept these prohibitions and fully permit the use of a grafted etrog. Those who do not use a grafted etrog also refuse to use one grown from seeds which were the product of grafting. There are certain known orchards which are accepted as

being from pure stock, with no mixture of grafted fruits at all. But even in this case, it is very difficult to be absolutely sure that there was no grafting of the etrog at some time in the distant past.

Because of all these considerations, there remained a measure of doubt whether the inexpensive etrog which the rabbi saw was suitable for use or not. On the other hand, there was no doubt in the rabbi's mind that by commenting he would spoil the joy of the holiday for the man. Rabbi Halevi therefore decided not to say anything, and he assumed that G-d would protect a simple trusting soul from sin. Reference: "Techumin," volume 18, page 328

parsha-insights@torah.org Parsha-Insights - Parshas Ha'azinu/Succos

"Am novol v'lo chacham {Foolish and unwise nation}..." Can we possibly compare any man-given gift to the ability to hear? To see? To walk? To live? Over and above all of those 'mundane' gifts, Hashem demonstrated His love for us by giving us the Torah -- the instructions through which this fleeting existence can be transformed into eternity. Transformed into a 'unity' with none other than Hashem Himself. Yet, we not only disregard these instructions, but we complain bitterly over the hardships that we encounter in life. We're unsatisfied with the watch that we've been handed... Are we so unlike the groom who's behavior we found so appalling...

In the Yalkut Shimoni, Rabi Yanai and Raish Lakish teach that there is no gehinom {hell} in the world to come, rather the day itself burns the wrongdoers. The Siftei Chaim offers a very penetrating understanding of this statement. The clarity of truth that will be revealed on that day will force everyone to clearly recognize and admit to their true standing. This clarity of truth will 'burn' all of the illusions that we so willingly entertain throughout our lives. Rav Dessler writes that he heard from the Saba of Kelem's son that a person brings to the World to Come 'suitcases filled with money'. Only to find out upon arrival that it is counterfeit. We think we have what to show for ourselves in the World to Come. However, under this penetrating glare of the clarity of truth, we realize that we've come empty-handed. So many and so much of our actions were based on and mixed with impure and ulterior motives. Rav Dessler's father owned large tracts of forests during the time of the Communist Revolution. Seeing where things were heading he sold all of his properties. With cash-filled suitcases he hoped to cross the border and start his life anew. Only to find out that a new ruble had been declared and that his suitcases were filled with worthless paper. This is the greatest punishment of the World to Come -- the recognition of the truth in the clearest way imaginable while no longer having the ability to change things... The Mahara"l writes that the fire of gehinom is the regret felt deep, deep inside when one realizes where he could have been and sees where he actually is. That realization is the greatest pain imaginable -- far greater than any 'fires' that we can conjure.

The Yalkut Shimoni continues and teaches that it is the mitzva of succah which provides the insight needed to maintain the proper clarity and focus while still alive. While still having the ability to change things. It is succah which can prevent us from becoming an "Am novol v'lo chacham"... The Yalkut continues and states: At that time, Hashem makes a succah for the tzaddikim {righteous} and shelters them there. On Sukkos, we are commanded to abandon our permanent dwellings and move into temporary ones. We live in the succah -- there we eat, drink and sleep. All of the mundane actions of life are transformed into mitzvos. The succah forces us to focus on the fact that our whole world is nothing more than a temporary dwelling. And if in that temporary dwelling all of our 'mundane actions' are directed toward serving Hashem, then we won't have the burning regret over what could have been. The succah which protected a person from the tempting illusions of this world will protect the person in the World to Come. The cognizance of this world's transience will foster our maintaining this proper perspective. It won't allow us to become an "Am novol v'lo chacham"...

May you have a wonderful Shabbos and a meaningful and joyous Sukkos,  
 Yisroel Ciner Parsha-Insights,  
 Copyright (c) 1998 by Rabbi Yisroel Ciner and Project Genesis, Inc. Rabbi Yisroel Ciner is a Rebbe [teacher] at Neveh Zion, http://www.neveh.org/, located outside of Yerushalayim. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave. http://www.torah.org/ Baltimore, MD 21215 (410) 358-9800

yated-usa@mailserver.ttec.com "Lima'an Yeidu" Sukkos Thoughts by

Rabbi Lipa Geldwerth As Yom Kippur Leaves The Ramoh closes Hilchos Yom Ha'Kippurim (624) with the Minhag of the Midakdeikim. "There are those who take pains to begin the building of their Sukkos on Motzei Yom Kippur without delay." Yet, in the following paragraph he opens Hilchos Sukoh (625) by re-stating the very same custom, albeit with a more prescriptive term, "Mitzvah" "It is a Mitzvah to set up the Sukoh immediately after Yom Kippur."

The Ramoh in bringing this Inyan both in Hilchos Yom Ha'Kippurim, as well as in Hilchos Sukos clearly indicates that in his view the initial construction of the Sukoh pertains to Yom Kippur no less than it does to Sukkos. Let us explore that connection.

The Aderes Eliyahu, in discussing the Posukim of Ma'aseh Bereishis, reveals the existence of a particular window of time. Being that the solar year exceeds the lunar year by ten full days, there exists a, hitherto undefined, span of time. The Gr"a z"l states that these ten "extra" days somehow correlate to our Aseres Yimei Tshuva. How? Perhaps we can understand its meaning in the following context. The hour most propitious to achieve complete Kaporoh for even the most "unforgivable" sins is Ne'iloh. Then the Melech Malchei Ha'Melochim is the Don Yechidi. The singular Divine Judge in absolute Rachamim hears our pleas undisturbed by the prosecutorial Heavenly Tribunal (Meshech Chochmoh to Shuvoh Yisroel). Neiloh, the Yerushalmi in Ta'anis rules, is to begin as the sun descends, though still visible above the tree-tops. Perhaps there is an additional significance to Neiloh and the setting sun. Sun and Shade

The Haftorah just read during Minchah relates the struggles of Yonah. Finally, having left the city behind, he settles to its east creating for himself a Sucoh. The Gr"a explains: the essential requirement of a Sucoh lies in the Halochoh, "Tzilosoh Merubah Mi'Chamosoh", shade must exceed the sunlight. The sun, source of all worldly bounty, represents the Olam Ha'Zeh. It sustains earth and serves as the timepiece for the nations who live by the solar year. Klal Yisroel which is commanded to rise above the earthly, looks to its lunar counterpart and is Mi'Kadeish the Levonoh. Yonah sought to block out that solar Olem ha'Zeh radiance and live in the pare-earthly shade, "Tzilosoh Merubah Mi'Chamosoh". His Sucoh constituted an oasis of Olam Ha'Boh, beyond the sun. Yonah hoped to sit Li'Maloh min Ha'Shemesh, in the Shade of Emunah immersed in Torah, soaring above the gravitational forces of the Shemesh.

Our Sucos are built upon the same critical precept, "Tzilosoh Merubah Mi'Chamosoh". Our Sucos, our new homes, are not mere re-locations. They are the unearthly spheres to which we are moved to commemorate the other-worldly Ananei Ha'Kovod in which Klal Yisroel was housed and nestled. These are the very Ananei Ha'Kovod which were recalled as the Eigel Ha'Zohov hurled us from the precipice of Har Sinai, only to be returned after "Solachti" of the first Yom Kippur and its Luchos Shnios " (Gr"a, opening to Shir Ha'Shirim). Straddling Two Worlds

Sitting in one's Sucoh, residing in one's personal Ananei Ha'Kovod, the sun and its natural rays are eclipsed by simple, pure S'chach which dare not be Mikabeil Tumah. In effect, one creates his own Tziloh Di'Memehemusoh. Yet, the Mishnah teaches us that if he fails to bring his table into that Sucoh and it remains behind in his all-year residence there is a Machlokes whether he is able to fulfill the Mitzvah of Sucoh. Beis Hillel sees no critical problem; Beis Shamai disqualifies the Mitzvah (Such 28). The Gemorrah explains: we fear that a man sitting in a Sucoh while nourishing himself from an indoor table is likely to be drawn back, after that table. Eventually, he will find himself Chutz li'Sucoh (Sucoh 3).

Remarkably, contrary to the general principle of Halocho Ki'Beis Hillel, the Halochoh here remains in accordance with Beis Shamai (Rif, Rambam. Shulchan Oruch). Why must we paskin like Beis Shamai?

The Malbin (Parshas Chukas) lends a new meaning to this Machlokes. Beis Hillel Bidivod allows the needs of Olam Ha'Zeh alongside a transplanted Olam Ha'Boh. Man can reside in an other-worldly setting and yet reach back into the "real" world for sustenance without fear of falling back. Beis Shamai forbids such a perilous co-existence. Of course Man requires his table, his nourishment, and his maintenance. However, you can never survive living in two worlds. Man cannot sit in Olam Ha'Boh with his feet dangling in Olam Ha'Zeh. Rather, Beis Shamai rules, hoist your table on your back and carry it into

your new Sucoh. Accommodate the realities of Olam Ha'Zeh only within the context of a Sucoh that eclipses the dangerous rays of the Shemesh. "Teishvu Ki'En Toduru", bring in all your proper Keilim. "Kol Ezech Bi'Yisroel", there is room for all who wish to dwell within the elastic confines of Ananei Ha'Kovod. This is the exclusive, yet not exclusionary, Ohel Torah which is the source of Zman Simchoseinu. There exists a well-known Klal as set forth by the Ari Ha'Kodosh z"l: Halochoh Ki'Beis Hillel here and now, Bi'Zman Ha'Zeh. Yet, Li'Osid Lo'voh, in the World-to-Come the Halochoh will be Ki'Beis Shamai. Thus in the critical definition of Sucoh with its defiance of Shemesh, and Man's inability to live on the great divide between these two Olomos, no wonder the Halochoh is already according to Beis Shamai (Tzitz Ha'Sodeh). "Bilvad She Yi'Chadesh Bo Dovor" (Rosh, Sukkah I)

An "old Sucoh requires Chidush. "Ein Kol Chodosh Tachas Ha'Shemesh, Tachas Kshiv, Shani Li'Eiloh" ((Koheles I, Zohar Ha'Kodosh, Lech Licho). "There is nothing new under the sun, declares Shlomo ha'Melech. "Under the sun," explain the Chaza"l, "but beyond is different." Beyond the sun's forces the laws of nature do not apply. Rav Hutner z"l explains, for as below the sun Chidush is impossible, so above the sun the absence of Chidush is similarly impossible. Therefore, "Ei Efshar Li'Beis Ha'Medrosh Blo Chidush" (Chagigah, 3) a Beis Medrosh whose entire essence is Li'Maloh Min ha'Shemesh, cannot be without Chidush.

"Shivti Bveis HashemKi Yitzpineini Bi'Suko" (Tehilim 27) We are to strive for the essence of Chidush both within the Daled Amos Shel Halochoh, and within the Zayin Tefochim of Sucoh. Aseres Yimei Tshuvoh vs. The Solar Year Klal Yisroel had finished counting its lunar year, and Rosh Ha'Shonoh was upon us. Ten days remained with which to define ourselves. Ten days which if misapplied can belong to the Shemesh, and if harnessed can give us wings to soar beyond. These, the Gr"a teaches us, are the Eseres Yimei Tshuvoh of the cosmos itself.

Will we reject the synthetic trappings of the two worlds and rise above the mortal coils of Tevah, thereby conquering the sun. Or will we fall back. The climax of this struggle ends in the 25th hour of the longest day. Yom Ha'Kodosh. Neiloh and slowly, the sun surrenders into the night as the victorious Shofar resounds, announcing the prospect of Kaporoh. Still huddled in other worldly garments we, Bi'Simchah, rush forth to be Mikadeish the conquering Levonoh. Then immediately we begin the joyous Avodah of re-constructing our Ananei Ha'Kovod. Against the backdrop of a moon-lit sky Yom Kippur and the Aseres Yimei Tshuvah conclude with the pounding of hammers recreating Tzilosoh Merubah Mi'Chamosoh and Chidush.

---

machon\_meir@virtual.co.il As of Now The Togetherness of Succot

Succot, which is fast approaching, is the "time of our happiness" (Succot Shemoneh Esreh) because on Succot we all unite together. Israel unite together, as is alluded to by the four species. The etrog [citron], which has flavor and a pleasant scent, corresponds to those people who have both Torah and good deeds to their name. The lulav [palm frond], which has flavor but no scent, corresponds to those who have good deeds but no Torah. The hadas [myrtle], which has a pleasant scent but no flavor, corresponds to those who have good deeds but no Torah. The aravah [willow], which has neither flavor nor scent, corresponds to those who have neither Torah nor good deeds. Despite the differences between people, we bind them all together, and only together can we fulfill the mitzvah of the four species.

The forefathers unite together with their descendants. On each day of Succot, we host in the succah one of the fathers and leaders of our nation: Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Aaron and David. Daily, one of the chief shepherds of our people is a guest of honor in our succah and bestows his strength on those seated there. All together take shelter under the wing of the Divine Presence, patriarchs and descendants. And just as we think about our forefathers and the early generations who stand at the base of the Jewish People and who have bequeathed their good spirit to us, their descendants, so do the faithful shepherds of the nation think about us and take joy in their descendants sitting in the succah, especially in the succot of Eretz Yisrael. It therefore says, "He shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the

heart of the children to their fathers" (Malachi 3:24). Israel and the nations are bound together as well, with a connection alluded to by the seventy bulls brought in the Temple on Succot. These seventy bulls alluded to the seventy nations. We are all bound together -- all Jews are bound together, and the Patriarchs and their descendants, and Israel and the nations. The day is not far off when the Temple will be rebuilt and all will see that Hashem, the G-d of Israel is King, and His dominion is over all -- On that day will the L-rd be One and His name One. With blessings for a happy holiday, And longing for complete redemption, Rabbi Dov Bigon

Israel and the Nations Rabbi Yitzchak Shilat We were commanded in the Torah to sacrifice on Succot a total of seventy bulls, which our sages say (Succah 55b) correspond to the seventy nations. (The number seventy is taken from Parshat Noach, where all the nations descended from Shem, Cham and Yefet are listed.) Succah 55b continues: "Rabbi Yochanan said: Woe to the pagan nations, for they destroyed without knowing what they were destroying. When the Temple stood, the altar would atone for them. But who atones for them now?" It turns out that the sacrifice of bulls by Israel served to atone for the nations. With this we can explain the words of the Prophet Zechariah, brought in the Haftarah, that in the future all the nations will come to Jerusalem to celebrate the Succot festival, and that a non-Jew who does not come with his family will be punished. Why is this so regarding precisely Succot? We have to understand that this is precisely when the nations must come to the Temple, because the sacrifices of the holiday atone for them, and how can one's sacrifice be brought if one is not standing there himself? The idea of Israel's connection to and responsibility for all of the nations should not surprise us. It is explicit in the Torah at Israel's first selection as a people, when G-d told Abraham that he would one day become a great nation (Genesis 12:3): "All of the nations of the earth will be blessed through you." This is an inseparable part of the essence of selection. We were not chosen only for ourselves, in order to be different, supreme, etc. Rather, we were chosen so that all the nations of the earth would be blessed through us.

We find the same at the second great occasion of Israel's selection, the Sinai Revelation (Exodus 19:6): "You shall be to Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." Just as the priests, the kohanim, do not stand apart from the people, rather, their task is to shower holiness upon the whole nation, so too, the task of a "kingdom of priests" among the nations of the earth is to influence and to teach the whole world by setting a spiritual example, "for the sake of G-d's praise and glory" (Jeremiah 13:11), so that "all the nations stream to the Temple" (Isaiah 2:2).

This basic idea sometimes seems utopian and far from reality. Even so, it is still the sole reason that the Bible became the "book of books" of all mankind; that billions of people switched from idolatry to monotheism, and that mankind never ceases to take an interest in what is happening to the Jewish People in their land. Let us understand that the struggle over Eretz Yisrael in our generation is a struggle with far-reaching historical-philosophical ramifications. The renaissance of the Jewish People in their land is, when all is said and done, a highly significant phase in the lives of all nations. We must recognize how great is our mission, and we must explain it. We must not relate to it in petty terms of "territories" and "negotiations." If we relate properly to ourselves and to our mission, then the nations as well will recognize and be aware that our mission is to bring a blessing to the whole world, "a blessing in the midst of the land" (Isaiah 19:24).

---

hamaayan@torah.org Hamaayan / The Torah Spring Edited by Shlomo Katz 13 Tishrei 5759 Sponsored by mblewischarities in honor of the Woodside Congregation (Silver Spring, Md.) Interim rabbi, Harav Chaim Schwartz shlita An Astonishing Midrash Iyov/Job was complaining about his suffering, but when he saw that the third wall of a sukkah need be only one tefach/handsbreadth wide, he immediately felt better. R' Zvi Elimelech of Dinov explains: We read in Tehilim (39:6), "Behold like handsbreadths You made my days." This teaches that the dimensions of the sukkah (which are measured in

tefachim/handsbreadths) allude to the types of activities that man engages in during his life. How so?

Man's activities can be divided into three categories: tov/that which is good for him; mo'il/that which is helpful to him; and arev/that which is desirable to him. Man may engage in the first two categories as much as he wants, writes R' Zvi Elimelech, but the third category should be used only as necessary. This is alluded to by the minimum design criteria for a sukkah. A sukkah must have two complete walls, plus a third wall which is a tefach wide. This alludes to the fact that man may engage in a full measure of those activities which are "tov" and mo'il," but should only engage in a small measure of those activities which are "arev."

In order to successfully limit his participation in the third category of activities, man must realize that his life in this world is fleeting. This is alluded to by the sukkah, which must be at least seven tefachim wide by ten tefachim high (approximately 28 inches by 40 inches). After Yom Kippur, when man has repented, he moves into the flimsy sukkah to demonstrate his awareness that during the seventy (7x10) years of his life, he should not feel at home in this world, but should feel like a traveler passing through.

When Iyov/Job learned this lesson, it made his suffering easier to bear. Once one recognizes that this life is only a way station, he does not expect it to always be comfortable or pleasant. (Bnei Yissaschar: Ma'amarei Tishrei 10:19)

Why is it sufficient for a sukkah to have only three walls? After all, the sukkah commemorates the Clouds of Glory which surrounded Bnei Yisrael in the desert, and they made four walls! The answer is that we need an opening to leave the "Clouds of Glory" in order to earn a living. The generation of the Exodus did not have that need. When Iyov lost all of his wealth, he was upset with himself. Why had he bothered?

Why had he not devoted his whole life to learning Torah instead? But when he saw that the sukkah has only three walls, he realized that Hashem intends for some people to leave the bet midrash and work. This made him feel better. (Binat Nevonim)

Hamaayan, Copyright (c) 1998 by Shlomo Katz and Project Genesis, Inc. Posted by Alan Broder, [ajb@torah.org](mailto:ajb@torah.org). The editors hope these brief 'snippets' will engender further study and discussion of Torah topics ("lehagdil Torah u'leha'adirah"), and your letters are appreciated. Web archives are available starting with Rosh HaShanah 5758 (1997) at <http://www.torah.org/learning/hamaayan/>. Text archives from 1990 through the present are available at <http://www.acoast.com/~sehc/hamaayan/>. Donations to HaMaayan are tax-deductible. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway [learn@torah.org](mailto:learn@torah.org) 6810 Park Heights Ave. <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD

---

perceptions@torah.org Parashas Ha'Azinu is the last parshah read on a Shabbos (Zos HaBrochah is read on Simchas Torah), and therefore, it is the parshah that always precedes the holiday of Succos. However, the connection is deeper than this, as the Pri Tzaddik reveals: "The Tikunei Zohar (Tikun 13) only counts 53 parshios and excludes Zos HaBrochah from the counting, because from there begins the Oral Law, which is why it is read on a Yom Tov when they sanctify the time. Therefore, this parshah (Ha'Azinu), which includes both the Written Law and the Oral Law, is read on the Shabbos before Succos [because it says] "In His shade I delighted and there I sat, and the fruit of His Torah was sweet to my palate" (Shir HaShirim 2:3)--the "shade" of the Holy One, Blessed is He, is the Written Law, the Temple, and the Mishkan; the "shade" of Faith (tzelah d'mehimnusa) is the Oral Law ... Shabbos itself incorporates both the Written and Oral Law because it was on Shabbos that Torah was given, and the seventh day is [associated with] the Oral Law." (Pri Tzaddik, Ha'Azinu 1)

In other words, Parashas Ha'Azinu is a perfect lead-in to the holiday of Succos, during which we sit in the shade of the succos we have built. The shade provided, says the Talmud, reminds us of the special "Clouds of Glory" that enveloped the Jewish people as they traveled in the desert during the exodus from Egypt. These clouds were special Divine protection against the dangerous elements of the desert, and were indicative of G-d's love and desire for the children of Avraham. These clouds were also called "tzelah d'mehimnusa"--shade of Faith--another name for the Oral Law.

It is as if to say that when one learns the Written and Oral Law, they warrant special Divine protection comparable to the Clouds of Glory. It is both the Written and Oral Law together that create the proper spiritual environment that allows the Jew to rise above the mundane world to a higher spiritual plain. This, according to the Pri Tzaddik,

is not unlike Parashas Ha'Azinu itself which acts as "bridge" between the rest of the parshios and Zos HaBrochah--between the Written Law and Oral Law--and Shabbos, which is a unique spiritual reality that encompasses both.

Even in the posuk mentioned above: "In His shade I delighted and there I sat, and the fruit of His Torah was sweet to my palate" (Shir HaShirim 2:3) There is another allusion to Succos. As Rashi explains (quoting the Midrash), the esrog tree (see Tosafos, Shabbos 88a) is shunned by all people when the sun beats down because it provides little shade. So too, says the Midrash, did all the nations refuse to sit in the "shade" of G-d on the day of the giving of Torah--all people, that is, except the Jewish people.

Perceptions, Copyright (c) 1998 Rabbi Pinchas Winston and Project Genesis, Inc. Rabbi Winston teaches at both Neve Yerushalym (Jerusalem) - <http://www.torah.org/neve/> and Neveh Tzion (Telzstone) - <http://www.neveh.org/> Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway [learn@torah.org](mailto:learn@torah.org) 6810 Park Heights Ave. <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21215 (410) 358-9800

daf-hashavua@shamash.org Daf-hashavua Ha'azinu 5759/1998 United Synagogue - London (O) the Electronic Version of this Document Is Provided By: Brijnet - British Jewish Network - Uk Branch of Shamash

**LEISHEV BASUKKAH** - Some Dinim for Sukkah Dwelling Rabbi E Mirvis - Finchley Synagogue The Torah commands us: You shall dwell in booths for seven days (Vayikra 23:42). "Dwelling" implies living in every respect. Ideally, therefore, one should inhabit one's sukkah as one would one's home. We consequently maximise our sukkah-dwelling experience through eating, drinking, sleeping and studying in this special booth. While acknowledging the significance of observing this precept in its ideal form, and appreciating the infusion of spirituality that accompanies it, we adopt a pragmatic, commonsense approach to conditions which challenge its observance. We would surely not stay in our homes if there was water dripping through the roof on to our heads. As the sukkah becomes one's "home" for the festival, one is similarly not expected to sleep in the booth when it is raining or simply too cold to go out. One is likewise exempt from eating one's meals in the sukkah when inclement weather makes this task unbearable.

If necessary, we make an exception on the first night. Our sages draw a parallel between Pesach and Sukkot: Both festivals fall on the 15th day of the month. This shared full-moon timing gives rise to another similarity. On Pesach it is halachically imperative to eat matzah on the first night, as it says: "On that night you must eat matzot" (Shemot 12:18). Similarly, it is incumbent upon us to have a meal in the sukkah on the first night, regardless of circumstances. So, if there is no sign of rain subsiding, one enters the sukkah to make kiddush and, after washing, has a kezayit, (size of an olive), of bread to eat there, following which the rest of the meal can be consumed indoors.

In the same way as one occasionally has a bite outside one's home, so may one have a drink, some fruit or a light snack outside the sukkah. When eating a set meal with food made from the five types of grain, i.e. wheat, barley, rye, spelt, oats, one is required to eat in a sukkah. According to the Magen Avraham, even when eating food from these grains as a snack, a sukkah should be used. Generally speaking, it is praiseworthy for one to be particular to eat every morsel and drink every drop in a sukkah throughout the festival.

It is our custom to invite ushpizin to be our guests in the sukkah. According to this kabbalistically inspired procedure, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Aaron and David are welcomed, in turn, on each day. Each one of these great Biblical characters provides ongoing inspiration to us in their own unique way. The greatest joy that a parent can have is to see his progeny following in his footsteps. The mitzvah of leishev basukkah involves an enormous amount of effort and devotion to detail. We invite our ushpizin to "witness" our enthusiastic commitment, and enjoy the nachas of seeing the Jewish people, millennia later, living true to the values that they transmitted, through the example they set.

Typeset in-house and published by United Synagogue Publications Ltd.

Yeshivat Har Etzion Israel Koschitzky Virtual Beit Midrash (Vbm) Yhe-holiday: Special Holiday Packages Sukkot Package

This shiur is dedicated in memory of our grandmother, Baila bas Yosef, who was niftara a year ago on Shabbat Chol Hamoed Sukkot, 17 Tishrei. - David and Aviva Friedlander, Teaneck, NJ

Shaking the Lulav during Hallel based on a shiur by Harav Aharon Lichtenstein Summarized by Mordechai Safrai Translated and Adapted by Rav Eliezer Kwass

**QUESTION** The standard procedure on Sukkot is to recite the blessing over the lulav and etrog, shake it ("na'anuim"), and then say Hallel with a minyan, shaking the lulav while saying, "Hodu LaShem ki tov" and "Ana HaShem hoshia na." In a situation where not everyone has a lulav and etrog, it is not always possible to both say Hallel with a minyan and shake the lulav during Hallel at the appropriate points. What does one do in such a situation? In other words, what is to be preferred if one is confronted by two options: 1. saying Hallel with a minyan but without the four species in hand; 2. or saying Hallel privately with the four species?

**THE ISSUES** The answer demands dealing with three central questions: A. What is the status of shaking the lulav in general, and specifically during Hallel? B. What is the halakhic advantage of saying Hallel with a minyan? C. When there is a conflict between these two halakhot, shaking the lulav and saying Hallel with a minyan, which of them is preferable?

**SHAKING THE LULAV** Two general approaches to shaking the lulav present themselves: 1. Shaking the lulav is a custom instituted by the Sages, not an essential part of the mitzva of lulav. The Ba'al Ha-ittur compares shaking the lulav to searching for chametz, which is not an essential part of the mitzva - the mitzva is DESTROYING the chametz. 2. Shaking the lulav is part of the mitzva of taking the lulav. Whether it is an additional level of the mitzva or an essential element of the definition of the mitzva, a complete "netilat lulav" (taking the lulav) can only be achieved through both taking and shaking. The mishna in Sukka (42a) says that a child who knows how to shake the lulav is obligated in the mitzva. In that context, the gemara (ibid.) compares the age when children begin shaking the lulav with the age when they begin wearing tzitzit. The age given for wearing tzitzit seems to be when the child is capable of performing the act of the mitzva, i.e. wearing the tzitzit. We can therefore infer from the mishna's formulation ("a child who knows how to shake the lulav is obligated in lulav") that shaking the lulav is of the essence of the mitzva. Is this true on a biblical level, or is this the rabbinic definition of the mitzva? The mishna (Sukka 29b) says that only a lulav that has three handbreadths (tefachim) to shake is kosher. The gemara explains that the mishna means that besides three handbreadths, a kosher lulav must include an extra tefach for shaking. This clearly implies that shaking the lulav is an essential aspect of the mitzva; the dimensions for fulfilling the mitzva of lulav are determined based on the ability to shake it properly. This would seem to imply that shaking the lulav is part of the biblical definition of the mitzva, for all dimensions of mitzvot (shiurim) are of biblical status. On the other hand, it is possible that the mitzva of ACTUALLY shaking the lulav is itself rabbinic, and on a biblical level all that is required is the lulav be long enough to shake. The dimensions of the lulav, though biblical, only demand the ABILITY to shake. This is the Ba'al Ha-ittur's approach; and we do not find any rishon who disputes it.

The gemara (Pesachim 7b) says that a person fulfills the mitzva of the four species merely through lifting them. A number of Rishonim ask: how we are able to make the blessing over the lulav after lifting it; are we not supposed to perform mitzvot only AFTER saying the blessing? Tosafot answer that since after the blessing we are still INVOLVED in the mitzva through shaking the lulav during Hallel, our blessing is considered to be "before the performance of the mitzva." It is not clear what Tosafot believe: Do they see the shaking of the lulav as an essential part of the mitzva - and therefore we consider the blessing as having preceded the mitzva? Or do they understand the rule requiring blessings to precede mitzvot very loosely - even though the mitzva itself has already been

fulfilled through lifting, the blessing is considered properly done as long as something related to the mitzva is still to come? Tosafot in Sukka (39a) reject this answer because, according to them, shaking the lulav is only "makhshirei mitzva" (usually translated as preparations for the mitzva; here, probably non-essential elements of the mitzva). It is unclear from their statement whether they see shaking the lulav as merely a non-essential part of the mitzva or as a totally independent custom that therefore does not affect fulfillment of the mitzva of lulav itself. The expression "makhshirei mitzva" implies that shaking is an ancillary element. The gemara uses a similar expression with regards to pulling the lulav off the tree - unquestionably an ancillary element of the mitzva. [It is possible that the text of the Tosafot should read "mi-shiarei ha-mitzva," of the remnants of the mitzva - an expression that appears in other Rishonim - and not "makhshirei ha-mitzva."] The Ba'al Ha-Maor refers to shaking the lulav as "shiarei mitzva." The gemara (Menachot 93b) implies that "shiarei mitzva" is still considered part of the mitzva. For example, "semikha" (laying on of hands) on a sacrifice is "shiarei mitzva." A sacrifice offered without performing "semikha" atones, but not ideally (the gemara's expression is "kipeir ve-lo kipeir", it atones and does not atone). Rabbeinu Tam (Sefer Ha-yashar, #406) also calls shaking the lulav "shiarei mitzva" and quotes an opinion that one does not fulfill the mitzva without shaking. According to Rabbeinu Tam, though, "shiarei mitzva" here is identical to that referred to in Zevachim 52a - remnants of a sacrifice's blood; the dispute about whether they are essential to the sacrifice or not also applies to lulav. In any case, whether or not shaking is ESSENTIAL, Rabbeinu Tam considers it part of the mitzva, and therefore prefers solving the problem (like we do today) by holding the etrog upside down until saying the blessing.

**SHAKING THE LULAV DURING HALLEL** Even if we assume, as emerges from most of the sources, that shaking the lulav is essential to the mitzva, it does not necessarily follow that shaking the lulav during Hallel is essential to the mitzva. The gemara in Berakhot (30a) indicates that shaking the lulav during Hallel is not essential. It says that if one rises early for a journey, "they should give him a lulav and he should shake it." In context, it is pretty clear that he does not say Hallel. The Meiri in Sukka indeed sees the shaking at the time of the blessing as the essential one, and shaking during Hallel as only an addition which enriches the joy of Sukkot.

The Ba'al Ha-Ittur, on the other hand, understands that the basic rule of shaking the lulav entails shaking during Hallel. It is only in extreme situations, like the gemara's case of one who must rise early to travel, that one can fulfill the mitzva by shaking independently of Hallel.

This raises a crucial theoretical question - is shaking the lulav during Hallel one of the reof HALLEL or part of the mitzva of taking the LULAV? The same question arises in conjunction with Tosafot's explanation of why the lulav is shaken during Hallel - based on the verse, "Then all of the trees of the forest will sing out." Does the mitzva of lulav - "the trees of the forest" - require that they sing out; or when we sing out during Hallel, must we also involve the trees of the forest? The Meiri is a bit clearer but still leaves room for doubt. He says that shaking the lulav is meant to arouse joy. He seems to mean the joy of Hallel, but it is possible that the mitzva of lulav, about which the Torah says, "You should rejoice before God," requires joy. The Rambam sees shaking as part of the mitzva of taking the lulav. In his presentation of the mitzva of lulav, he writes how and where to shake it.

**HALLEL WITH A MINYAN** The second aspect of our question involves determining the status of saying Hallel with a minyan. There are two possible understandings of how Hallel is enhanced when said with a minyan: 1. Even though the mitzva of Hallel is identical whether fulfilled in private or with a minyan, there is always more "kevod Shamayim," honor of God, when mitzvot are done with a larger group. This is based on the verse, "In a multitude of people, the king is honored." This applies to all mitzvot, not just Hallel. By reciting Hallel with a minyan we accomplish an extra, independent halakhic and religious goal. 2. The mitzva of Hallel is essentially different when it is performed with a minyan. The mishna in

Erkin mentions a list of days when "the individual finishes (i.e. recites a complete) Hallel." This seems to leave room for reciting Hallel privately. However, the Sefer Ha-manhig quotes the Behag as saying that the meaning of "individual" here is not a private individual, but rather a minority of the Jewish people, in contrast to "rabbim," the majority of the Jewish people. According to the Behag's opinion, an individual cannot say Hallel alone. Even though the Behag's opinion is a lone voice and not accepted as authoritative halakha, there is still evidence that Hallel said in public is essentially different than in private. From a number of talmudic passages, and from the Rambam's Mishneh Torah (Hilkhot Chanuka 3:12-13), it seems that the proper way to say Hallel is the way it was done during the Exodus from Egypt - one person leads and the rest of the group answers after him. This is only possible with a group. These sources imply that without this, Hallel is somehow deficient.

**HALLEL WITH A MINYAN OR WITH A LULAV?** We now have the resources to deal with our original question, whether it is preferable to say Hallel with a minyan or to say Hallel with a lulav, when it is not possible to accomplish both. Answering the question must take into account the different approaches we presented regarding the status of shaking the lulav and regarding saying Hallel with a minyan. If shaking the lulav is not an essential part of the mitzva, it can be done independently of Hallel - and it is obvious that saying Hallel with a minyan is preferable to saying it with a lulav. Likewise, if the reason for saying Hallel with a minyan is only to enhance the mitzva by doing it as a group, and shaking the lulav is essential to the mitzva - one should obviously prefer saying Hallel with a lulav over saying it with a minyan. Our situation is more complicated, though, because the sources seem to indicate that shaking the lulav is essential to the mitzva and Hallel is essentially different when said with a minyan. If so, how do we decide when confronted with a situation where both of them cannot be fulfilled?

Understanding the nature of the conflict depends on how we understand the importance of shaking the lulav during Hallel. If, as the Meiri seems to say, shaking the lulav is one of the laws of Hallel - then we are confronted with a conflict between two different rules of Hallel, which will be difficult to decide. What will make the best Hallel, one said with a minyan or with the shaking of the lulav? On the other hand, if shaking the lulav is part of the mitzva of lulav, as the Rambam says, then the conflict is between two different mitzvot, lulav and Hallel, and we have guidelines how to deal with such conflicts.

When there are conflicts between different mitzvot, two principle come into play: 1. that which is more constant and frequent ("tadir") takes precedence; 2. that which has more holiness ("mekudash") takes precedence. The mitzva of Hallel is certainly more frequent than lulav, but the mishnayot in Zevachim on the subject of precedence rule that frequency is only preferred when the two mitzvot in conflict are of equal importance. On the first day, the mitzva of lulav is clearly to be favored, because lulav is of biblical force on the first day of the holiday (everywhere, not just in the Temple). Hallel is a rabbinic mitzva (according to the Rambam; the Behag disagrees). Even on the rest of the days of the holiday, lulav might still be on a higher level than Hallel because lulav has basis in a biblical mitzva. [We would have to assume that Rabban Yochanan ben Zakai's decree to take the lulav all seven days of the holiday even outside the Temple is an expansion of the biblical mitzva - either the Temple mitzva or the first day's mitzva - and not a pure rabbinic law to remember the destruction of the Temple.]

Based on a cold analysis, most approaches would prefer shaking the lulav during Hallel over saying Hallel with a minyan. However, it is emotionally difficult to leave the congregation for the public recitation of the Hallel. There is also not an open and shut case in favor of lulav. Therefore, it is highly recommended that everyone acquire their own four species to be able to shake the lulav during Hallel and not to enter the conflict at all. Another way to solve the problem is for two people to swiftly pass the lulav from one to the other so both can shake during the congregation's Hallel.

[This is a summary of a shiur given on Shabbat Parashat Nitzavim-Vayeilekh 5750; it has not been reviewed by Harav Lichtenstein.]

Sukkot Package Part 2 Yeshivat Har Etzion Israel Koschitzky Virtual Beit Midrash (Vbm) <http://www.vbm-torah.org/sukkot.htm>

Discomfort as an Exemption from the Mitzva of Sukka, Part 1 The Source of "Ha-mitzta'er Patur Min Ha-sukka" by Rav Mordechai Friedman

It is a well-known principle that one who experiences discomfort is exempt from sitting in the sukka. But defining this is no easy task. What level of discomfort must be reached before one may leave the sukka? Why does the mitzva of sukka contain this special exemption, while all other mitzvot of the Torah do not? If one constructed the sukka in a manner that it affords little protection from the elements, is he then exempt from sitting in it? These are but a few of the questions of "mitzta'er" (one experiencing discomfort) which commonly arise every year. In this shiur, we will examine the source, nature and practical applications of this exemption.

**I. THE SOURCE OF THE EXEMPTION** The mishna (Sukka 28b) states: "All seven days, one makes his sukka [a] permanent [abode] and his house [a] temporary [one]. If it rains, when may one leave? When the mikpeh (a thick porridge) becomes spoiled." The gemara elaborates: "Our rabbis taught in a beraita: 'All seven days, one makes his sukka [a] permanent [abode] and his house [a] temporary [one]. How so? If he has nice vessels or bedding, he brings them into the sukka. He eats, drinks and lingers in the sukka.' What is the source for this? Our Rabbis taught in a beraita: 'Teshvu ke-ein taduru' (i.e., when the Torah states, 'You shall SIT (teshvu) in the sukka' [Vayikra 23], it should be like a regular residence). From here they said, 'All seven days one makes his sukka [a] permanent [abode] ...' Although the gemara examines the source of the first halakha of the mishna, it does not even ask what is the source for the second point of the mishna. "Teshvu ke-ein taduru" seems to be a derasha that describes the proper mode of living in the sukka - adding on to the simple obligation of sitting.

**1) TOSAFOT** The gemara (26a) states: "Our Rabbis taught in a beraita: Day travelers are exempt from sukka during the day but are obligated at night ... Travelers during the day and night are completely exempt from sukka ... Guards of fields and orchards are exempt during both day and night. [The gemara asks:] Let them make sukkot there and stay in them? Abaye says, 'Teshvu ke-ein taduru.' Rava says, 'A hole in the fence calls to the thief.'" The Tosafot (s.v. Holkhei) explain: "All this is learnt from the derasha of 'teshvu ke-ein taduru' - a person living in his home does not refrain from travel (and sleeping outdoors). The law of mitzta'er being exempt [from sukka] is similarly derived from 'teshvu ke-ein taduru' - for a person does not take residence in a place where he suffers." From these beraitot and the Tosafot's explanation, we form the following conclusion: "Teshvu ke-ein taduru" does not only EXPAND but also LIMITS the obligation of sukka. On the one hand, it obligates us to set up a permanent type of atmosphere, and on the other hand, it exempts watchmen, travelers or sufferers from using the sukka in a way that would not be normal in home living. In addition to the Tosafot, many other Rishonim follow this view of 'Teshvu ke-ein taduru' as the source of the exemption of mitzta'er (see endnote #1).

**2) MAHARIK** There is, however, another approach to understanding the source of mitzta'er. As noted, the gemara on 28b conspicuously does NOT expand the derasha of "teshvu ke-ein taduru" to include the exemption of rain, even though it quotes that derasha as the source for the first law of the mishna (to use the sukka in permanent fashion). According to the Rishonim's understanding, here would be the perfect place to do so. Furthermore, the variations of mitzta'er appear many times throughout the gemara - but without the derasha of "teshvu." It is mentioned only once by Abaye, and even there, Rava does not seem to concur. (However, most Rishonim explain Rava in a way that he accepts "teshvu" as the source of mitzta'er.) Add to these points the SIMPLE reading of the following gemara (25b): "... Rav Abba bar Zavda said in the name of Rav: 'A mourner is obligated in sukka.' [The gemara asks:] This is obvious! [The answer:] I might have thought since Rav Abba bar Zavda said in the name of Rav that a mitzta'er is exempt from the sukka, [the mourner] should be considered a mitzta'er. That is why Rav came to teach that this law [of mitzta'er being exempt] applies when it is 'tza'ara de-mimeila' (to be explained), but here [the mourner] is causing himself to suffer - and therefore he is required to settle his mind [i.e., overcome his suffering]." Rashi and most Rishonim explain "tza'ara de-mimeila" to mean "suffering arising from sitting in the sukka." The mourner's suffering is unrelated to the question of whether he is inside or outside the sukka - and so, he has no exemption. But a simpler reading of the gemara would be that "tza'ara de-mimeila" means "suffering from an external source" - it not under his control and so he is exempt. However, if it is an internal source of suffering, he is expected to overcome it and fulfill the mitzva. The problem is that nowhere among any of the mitzvot of the Torah is discomfort or even suffering a reason to exempt someone from a mitzva. (This is why the Rishonim who base the special exemption of mitzta'er on "ke-ein taduru" need to explain "tza'ara de-mimeila" as stemming from the sukka itself.) The Maharik (Responsum 178) offers another explanation: mitzta'er is exempt because of his inability to CONCENTRATE on the mitzva. Again, we must ask: this exemption does not apply to any other mitzva! Here, the Taz offers an explanation based on the Bach's (his father-in-law) unique definition of the mitzva of sukka. According to the Bach, in addition to all the physical actions of sleeping, eating, etc., one must also think to himself, "I am doing this to commemorate the fact that Benei Yisrael sat in sukkot as they left Egypt." As the Torah says (Vayikra 23:42): "You shall dwell in sukkot seven days ... that your generations may know that I made Benei Yisrael dwell in sukkot when I brought them out of the land of Egypt." Thus, according to the Bach, specifically THIS mitzva has a clear requirement of KNOWING - not only as a REASON for the mitzva, but as part of the ACTION of the mitzva.

Until now, we have seen two views regarding the source of the exemption of mitzta'er: 1) "Teshvu ke-ein taduru" - the very nature of the mitzva precludes fulfillment in an uncomfortable manner (Rashi, Tosafot, Ritva, etc.); 2) a mitzta'er cannot concentrate properly on the commemoration of sukka - which, in this mitzva, is essential (Maharik according to the Taz). Although the peshat of a few portions of gemara fits nicely with the second approach, the majority of Rishonim adopt the first approach. The two different sources have a clear effect on the very nature of the exemption of mitzta'er. What are the practical differences between them?

**II. PRACTICAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TWO APPROACHES 1) DISCOMFORT UNRELATED TO THE SUKKA** One practical difference was already touched upon -

discomfort that is not affected by sitting in the sukka. The Sefer Yere'im points out that the exemption of mitzta'er applies only if his discomfort will be relieved when he leaves the sukka. This is in keeping with his and other Rishonim's understanding of the law of mitzta'er stemming from "ke-ein taduru." The Maharik, on the other hand, would exempt a any mitzta'er, such as an ill person, even though his discomfort would not be relieved by exiting the sukka. The Rema (OC 640:4) rules in accordance with the Yere'im (and the Mordechai), while the Taz (ad loc., s.k. 8) seems to accept BOTH exemptions mitzta'er, and as a result exempts an ill person from the sukka even when his discomfort is unaffected by being in the sukka! The Rema would not exempt such a person. 2) HOW UNCOMFORTABLE IS MITZTA'ER? Another practical difference between these two views of mitzta'er might be the level of discomfort required in order to be exempt. According to the Maharik, a mitzta'er is exempt if he experiences such a level of discomfort that he is unable to think clearly about the Jews' sojourn in sukkot in the wilderness. According to most Rishonim, on the other hand, the intensity of discomfort would only need to be enough to be abnormal for home living. As Tosafot said, "A person does not take residence in a place where he suffers."

I would now like to expand on this point. We can relate to two separate questions: A) What TYPE of discomfort is considered mitzta'er? B) Within each accepted type - what INTENSITY of discomfort is considered mitzta'er?

**A) TYPES OF MITZTA'ER** The Rid viewed all the various examples of mitzta'er mentioned in the gemara, other than rain, to be exemptions exclusively for people with extraordinarily sensitive constitutions ("istanis"). Rain alone gives discomfort to ALL people; the other incidents are subjective. All normal people must bear and overcome the discomforts of smell, wind, flies, heat, etc. The Emek Halakha (ch. 30) raises the same point. Most poskim (e.g. Tur and Beit Yosef) follow the view stated by the Hagahot Ha-asheiri that ALL these cases found in the gemara apply to all people. These poskim seem to have accepted a maximal understanding of "ke-ein taduru." The Rema (OC 640:4), quoting the opinion of the Terumat Ha-deshen, states: "A person who cannot sleep in the sukka because he is discomforted by not being able to straighten out his hands and legs, is NOT considered mitzta'er and must sleep there despite the fact that he needs to fold his hands and legs ... And a person cannot say, 'I am a mitzta'er,' other than in situations that are the norm for people to be mitzta'er." Thus, when a person suffers from cramped living space, or from another discomfort that is unique to him, he must bear the discomfort and stay in the sukka. This Terumat Ha-deshen, along with the view of the Rid quoted above, are two examples of opinions which hold that under some situations a person would have to fulfill the mitzva even as he suffers in the sukka. This is despite the fact that they both agree that only normal living is required by "Teshvu ke-ein taduru." Perhaps we can explain that they believe that the law of mitzta'er is not subjective. "Ke-ein taduru" helps define the normal obligation of the mitzva - a sukka should be used the way normal people would use a house. The wording of the Rambam and later the Shulchan Arukh seems to oppose the Rema. In defining mitzta'er, they state, "Who is a mitzta'er? He who cannot sleep in the sukka due to the wind, flies, fleas and the like." There is no mention of a norm for mitzta'er - just the inability to sleep, due to the various disturbances mentioned in the gemara. The additional "and the like" suggests that ANY other type of sleep disturbance would qualify. They seem to believe that "ke-ein taduru" is a criterion aimed at the individual, describing the required mode of fulfilling the mitzva. Thus, anyone suffering, in ANY way, is not fulfilling "ke-ein taduru" and is therefore exempt.

Until now, we have focused on the question of what TYPE of disturbance can be considered mitzta'er. We have seen several approaches: 1) The Rid limits mitzta'er for normal people to rain alone, and for the "istanis" it is expanded to include the additional list mentioned in the gemara. 2) The Rema includes all disturbances mentioned in the gemara as well as others, as long as they are universally recognized disturbances. 3) The Rambam and Shulchan Arukh hold that any type of disturbance from sleep would be mitzta'er.

**B) INTENSITY OF DISCOMFORT** Now let us focus on the INTENSITY of discomfort required for the exemption of mitzta'er. As we saw in the first part of the shiur, according to most Rishonim, "ke-ein taduru" is the source of mitzta'er. Such being the case, the formula of the Yere'im makes logical sense: "If a person is not expert in determining how much rain would ruin porridge ("mikpeh"), he can just ask himself, 'If this amount of rain were entering my house, would I leave it?'" This approach seems to contain an inherent difficulty: when choosing a home, how many people would choose to live in a house that only matched the amenities of a sukka? In other words, no common sukka is ever truly "ke-ein taduru." Surely, when God set down the mitzva of sukka with the provision of "ke-ein taduru," He still expected a CERTAIN amount of sacrifice of home living comfort. The Tur (OC 625) relates that God specifically placed the mitzva of sukka in the month of Tishrei, the beginning of the winter, to show that we do not sit in the sukka for comfort but rather in order to fulfill the command of God. Surely, a certain level of discomfort is to be expected. I believe that that the Rambam (and Shulchan Arukh) head off this problem in their clearly stated criteria of: a) "not being able to sleep;" and b) "until the rain ruins the porridge." According to them, mitzta'er is exempt from using the sukka when his discomfort leads to an INABILITY to perform the basic living functions of sleeping and eating in the sukka.

As long as one is still able to sleep and eat, albeit uncomfortable or below home standard, he is still obligated. In support of this understanding, let us examine the opinion of the Gra. When the Rema mentions that only a normal mitzta'er is exempt, the Gra cites as his source the mishna, "If it rains, when can one leave the sukka? When the porridge spoils." From this, the Gra points out, we see that all discomfort from the rain LESS THAN this intensity does not qualify as mitzta'er. This, too, would seem to oppose the view of the Yere'im - that ANY deviation from home living is mitzta'er.

To conclude, let us note that the more lax opinions in defining both the boundaries as well as the intensity of mitzta'er are actually strict regarding the building requirements of a sukka. If you accept the Rambam's (and Shulchan Arukh's) opinion that ANY type of subjective disturbance is mitzta'er, or that of the Yere'im that any intensity of disturbance which would cause you to leave your house exempts you from sukka, then you are required to build your sukka in a way that will avoid any such disturbance. This would practically translate into better sukka insulation (or even heating), security, cleanliness and bug repellent, to name a few. Since people today are accustomed to higher living standards, the level of mitzta'er changes accordingly. The Shulchan



Arukh (640:4), quoting the Rosh, addresses this specific point by stating: "Mitzta'er is exempt from the sukka ... [all this is] only if the discomfort came by chance after he made the sukka there. But initially, he should not make his sukka in a place of bad smells or wind and then say, 'I am mitzta'er.'" The Rema (ad loc.) goes one step further. Quoting the Mordechai (the original source is the Yere'im, ch. 421, p. 239b), he says: "If he initially constructed [it] in a place that makes him a mitzta'er regarding eating or drinking or sleeping; or if he cannot perform one of these functions due to fear of thieves when he is in the sukka; then he does not fulfill [his obligation] in that sukka at all - even the functions that he is not mitzta'er for - since this is not 'ke-ein de'era' (similar to normal living), because he cannot perform all his [normal] needs." This pesak is supported by many poskim (Magen Avraham; Levush; Mishna Berura [see Sha'ar Ha-tziun, s.k. 25]) and raises MANY practical questions. We will relate to these questions in Part Two of this shiur, when we investigate the nature of the exemption of mitzta'er.

Endnotes: (1) See Tosafot s.v. Pirtza; and 28b s.v. Teshvu; Ritva 25a s.v. Kholin, Rashi and Ran ad loc.; Responsa of the Rashba IV:78; Ramban, V23:42; Yere'im chapter 421, p. 239b, to name a few. This author was not able to find a single Rishon who disagreed.

"Ha-mitzta'er Patur Min Ha-sukka," Part II The Nature of the Exemption By Rav Mordechai Friedman

In the last shiur, we explored the source of the exemption of a mitzta'er from dwelling in the sukka. We saw that a number of practical halakhot may depend on what the exact source is. In this shiur, we will build on the previous material in order to further define the exact nature of this exemption.

The gemara (Sukka 27a) states: "... It is stated here (in the parasha of sukka) 'chamisha asar' (the fifteenth day of the month) and it is stated 'chamisha asar' in [the parasha of] Pesach. Just as there [on Pesach], the first night is obligatory and the rest are non-obligatory, so too here [on Sukkot], the first night is obligatory and the rest are non-obligatory." The Ran (Alfas 12b) summarizes two prevalent views found among the Rishonim as to the exact obligation derived from Pesach: a) to eat a minimum measure of bread in the sukka on the first night; b) to do so even in the event of rain. This second opinion is held by the Rosh (Berakhot 49b), the Michtam (on Sukkot, in the name of Rav Shelemya of Lunel), the Terumat Ha-deshen (95), and Mahari Weill (191). The Rashba (Responsa IV:78) refutes this opinion of the Rosh: "We say teshvu ke-ein taduru' - and the Torah never obligated us to eat in the sukka aside from the way a man would do so in his home! And if this opinion were true (i.e. that we must eat in the sukka on the first night even if it is raining), it would be impossible not to have clearly stated it in the Gemara."

As mentioned in the first shiur, the rule of "ke-ein taduru" is the generally accepted source of mitzta'er. In explaining the Rashba, the Gra (OC 640) says, "A sukka, when it rains, is not a sukka." This brings the issue to a sharper focus. The sukka as an OBJECT is defined as a place where one could live in a fashion similar to his house. The Rashba's question is on the mark. How could the Rosh see an obligation to sit in the sukka in the rain if the definition of the mitzva is to dwell in the sukka in the way one would dwell in his home? Surely, a person would leave his home if the roof literally leaked like a sieve! The opinion of the Rosh (and others) can be understood if they view "ke-ein taduru" not as a criterion of the OBJECT, but rather as a description of the mode of obligation upon the PERSON. A person is obligated only to carry out normal home living in the sukka. Then, the derasha of "chamisha asar" can come to ADD an additional obligation of eating in the sukka even though it is in an abnormal, non-"ke-ein taduru" fashion. We have so far seen that while the Rosh understood that "ke-ein taduru" exempts the PERSON from eating in a wet sukka, the Rashba viewed "ke-ein taduru" as disqualifying the OBJECT. The gemara (29a), however, poses a problem for the Rashba: "Our Rabbis taught in a beraita: If one was eating in the sukka and it started to rain, and he left the sukka [and then it stopped raining], the Halakha does not trouble him to return [to the sukka] until he finishes his meal."

Until now, we have only seen cases where one is considered to be mitzta'er while dwelling in the sukka. Now we have a case where one is mitzta'er before entering the sukka - and this is caused only indirectly by the sukka! It is easy to understand how the Rosh would read this gemara. "Ke-ein taduru" focuses on the obligation of the person. A person need not interrupt his meal to return because he would not do so in a parallel situation involving a return to his house. If, however, mitzta'er is only a disqualification of the object of the sukka when it rains, as we explained the Rashba, then as soon as it stops raining - the sukka becomes a sukka once again. One should be required to return IMMEDIATELY to the sukka! (Interestingly, the Yerushalmi [ad loc.] relates that Rabban Gamliel and Rabbi Eliezer would leave and return all night long as a result of the rain. This would be in keeping with our explanation, thus far, of the Rashba.) I believe that there are two possible ways to explain the Rashba: 1. The Rashba believes that there are really two facets to the law of mitzta'er. The first, as we explained, is a disqualification of the sukka as a viable abode. The second is in accordance with the Rosh. In other words, the Rashba agrees with the understanding that mitzta'er is an exemption of the person's obligation but ALSO believes it to be a disqualification of the object. Thus, both halakhot - rain on the first day disqualifying the sukka, as well as the exemption from interrupting a meal once the rain stops - are explained by these two facets of mitzta'er. 2. It is possible, however, to explain both of these halakhot as stemming from ONE basic understanding of "ke-ein taduru." Until now, we assumed (as the Gra hinted) that the Rashba interpreted "ke-ein taduru" as disqualifying a sukka during rain from the point of view of its definition as an object. All the Rashba actually wrote was: "We say teshvu ke-ein taduru - and the Torah never obligated us to eat in the sukka aside from the way a man would do so in his home." It is therefore quite possible to explain that "ke-ein taduru" defines a person's required relationship to the sukka during these seven days. One's true obligation is not simply to perform the isolated acts of sitting, eating and sleeping in the sukka, but rather "ke-ein taduru" refers to the sum of all these acts - "All seven days, one makes his sukka a permanent abode and his house a temporary one." These are the very words cited by the gemara following the mishna about leaving the sukka due to rain. We can now understand the other halakha of not needing to interrupt a meal in the house as soon as the rain stops. To do so would be unnatural behavior. Any use of the sukka in an abnormal fashion gives does not contribute to his relating to the sukka as a permanent abode. According to the Rosh, if it rains on the first day, one is nevertheless obligated to remain in the sukka because "ke-ein taduru" limits a person's obligation to individual acts of normal living; it does not define his overall

relationship. Therefore, the derasha of "chamisha asar" can add to the person's obligation at the point where "ke-ein taduru" left off.

The Rashba, however, sees "ke-ein taduru" not as a limitation, but rather as a definition of the basic nature of the mitzva. "Chamisha asar" can only add to the existing obligation - but cannot redefine the whole act of the mitzva. This "holistic" approach would consider rain, interruption of a meal to enter the sukka, mitzta'er, choleh, and properly furnishing the sukka not as five individual halakhot learnt from "ke-ein taduru," but rather as five manifestations of the basic definition of the mitzva of sukka: to make the sukka your permanent abode for seven days. To summarize what we have seen thus far: A) The Rosh and others view "ke-ein taduru" as a limitation of the person's obligation. B) The Rashba either 1) accepts the above but adds on an additional law learnt from "ke-ein taduru" - a disqualification of the object of the sukka (as in the case of rain), or 2) sees "ke-ein taduru" as a master definition of the mitzva of sukka - to relate toward the sukka as your permanent abode for seven days. We have seen one very practical halakhic difference: 1. RAIN ON THE FIRST NIGHT

The Rema (OC 639:5) follows the Rosh: one must eat a ke-zayit of bread on the first night in the sukka, even if it rains. The Shulchan Arukh, by omitting this point, seems to follow the Rashba. The following are additional practical halakhic differences: 2. IF IT STOPS RAINING ON THE FIRST NIGHT

According to the Rashba, one needs to eat in the sukka during the rain. What is the halakha after it stops? Must one return to the sukka to finish his meal or to sleep? This would depend on the two possible explanations we offered. A) If we see "ke-ein taduru" as teaching us two separate halakhot, then the object's disqualification ends once the rain stops. At that point, there should be no difference between the Rashba and the Rosh (who sees "chamisha asar" as overriding the other facet of "ke-ein taduru"). B) If we accept the "holistic" view that the mitzva is to relate to the sukka as one would his home, then interrupting one's meal or sleep to re-enter the sukka would not contribute to this fulfillment. 3. THE MITZTA'ER WHO CHOOSES TO REMAIN

According to the first explanation of the Rashba, that a sukka in the rain ceases to be considered a sukka - a person sitting in the rain is accomplishing nothing beyond getting wet. (What about other forms of discomfort? There are two possibilities: 1) even cold or flies void the object as a sukka; or 2) we can differentiate between rain, which universally disqualifies the sukka as a shelter or home, and wind, which, since some people would not be mitzta'er, cannot be seen as an objective disqualification of the object.) According to our second explanation, as well, it would be futile to use the sukka in an unnatural way that does not contribute to relating to it as your home. However, according to the Rosh, "ke-ein taduru" merely exempts a person from sitting in the sukka; but if he chooses to remain, it is still a kosher sukka and the physical act of sitting there IS the act of the mitzva.

With regard to this question, the Hagahot Maimoniot (Sukka ch. 6) quotes the famous Yerushalmi: "Anyone exempt from something who nonetheless does it is called a simpleton." Rav Ovadia Yosef (Yabia Omer I:39) disagrees and says that this rule applies only when his actions will bring about some leniency. In this case, the Yerushalmi's stricture would apply only if his "oneg yom tov" (mitzva of having pleasure on Yom Tov) is adversely affected. Otherwise, he may stay and fulfill the mitzva. 4. ONE WHOSE LIGHTS GO OUT ON YOM TOV

If one's lights go out on Yom Tov or Shabbat and he finds himself in the dark, is he considered a mitzta'er? The Rema quotes the Terumat Ha-deshen who holds that: a) to eat in the dark is mitzta'er; b) to go to your neighbor's sukka is also mitzta'er because of the embarrassment and discomfort.

If a person nonetheless decides to go next door to eat, can he make a berakha of "leishev ba-sukka?" It might depend on considerations explained above. The Mishna Berura quotes the Elya Rabba who says that unless he is comfortable being in his friend's sukka (and is therefore not mitzta'er), he should not say a berakha. The Chayei Adam holds that one should overcome his discomfort, go to his friend happily and comfortably, and say the berakha. When in doubt, the rule is not to say the berakha.

Part III: An Inherently Uncomfortable Sukka

At the end of part I of this shiur, we cited an interesting pesak of the Rema (in the name of the Mordechai, who follows the Yere'im): "If he initially constructed [his sukka] in a place that makes him a mitzta'er regarding eating or drinking or sleeping; or if he cannot perform one of these functions due to fear of thieves when he is in the sukka; then he does not fulfill [his obligation] in that sukka at all - even the functions that he is not mitzta'er for - since this is not 'ke-ein de'era' (similar to normal living), because he cannot perform all his [normal] needs." The Chakham Tzvi (ch. 94) disagrees with this pesak and feels that "ke-ein taduru" does not necessitate an all-purpose type of sukka. A sukka which serves one function is sufficient. He proves his point from the accepted halakha that a sukka on the bow of a boat and a sukka seven tefachim (approx. 65 cm) by seven tefachim are both kosher, despite the fact that a person would be mitzta'er when trying to sleep there. (The Rema, however, holds that a sukka seven by seven tefachim does NOT make one mitzta'er regarding sleeping!) What is the root of their dispute? The words of the Chakham Tzvi are revealing: "Teshvu ke-ein taduru" does not refer to the style of the sukka or to how it is constructed, but rather to the way it should be properly used; on this [point], it is said that it should be 'ke-ein dira' (similar to normal dwelling)." The Chakham Tzvi seems to align himself with the Rosh, who feels that one must eat a measure of bread in the sukka on the first night even if it rains. He disagrees with the Yere'im, whom he understands as believing that "ke-ein taduru" (at least in one facet) qualifies the definition of the OBJECT. (In other words, he thinks that the opinion of the Yere'im is identical to the Gra's understanding of the Rashba, who rejected the notion of sitting in the rain.) It is possible, however, to explain the view of the Yere'im in accordance with our second explanation of the Rashba. Namely, "ke-ein taduru" does not qualify the OBJECT, but rather defines the way one must relate to his sukka (i.e. as a permanent residence). Since we normally have one house for ALL functions (eating, sleeping, etc.), we can only regard a similar type of sukka as our permanent abode for the duration of the holiday.

In truth, the words of the Yere'im are: "Initially, [this type of one-purpose structure] is not a sukka (lo havi sukka), since it is set up to cause tza'ar (discomfort)." It is also possible, if less likely, that the Rashba disagrees with the Yere'im's assumption that the sukka must be able to satisfy all our normal living functions. To the contrary, our modern houses are structured in such a way that each room serves a separate function; thus, having every function in one room or sukka is not "ke-ein taduru!" HALAKHA LE-MA'ASEH

The Yere'im's disqualification of a sukka constructed uncomfortably, seemingly even bi-she'at ha-dechak (when one is hard-pressed), is followed by the Mordechai, Rema, Magen Avraham and Levush. This would require a person to a) select his site carefully, and b) construct a warm

and secure sukka. The Pri Megadim, Mishna Berura, and Arukh Ha-shulchan say that if there is no possible alternative, one can use it and make a berakha. I conclude with a challenge for our readers. The Rema holds like the Rosh that one must sit in the rain to eat a ke-zayit - and make a berakha - on the first night. This indicates a rejection of the view that there is a law of "ke-ein taduru" which disqualifies the OBJECT. Yet, the Rema also holds like the Yere'im who disqualifies a sukka that is not multi-functional! I welcome any solutions and hope to send out some, unedited, to readers of the YHE-Halakha list. Chag sameach.

---

innernet@virtual.co.il INNERNET MAGAZINE OCTOBER 1998

"THE 4 SPECIES OF SUCCOS" by Rabbi Nosson Scherman

The holiday of Succos begins Sunday evening, Oct. 4, and continues until Monday evening, Oct. 12, 1998. (In Israel, the holiday ends Sunday evening, Oct. 11.)

Aside from the mitzvah to sit in a Succah, the holiday features a mitzvah to wave the special "Four Species" - the Esrog (citron), Lulav (palm branch), myrtle branches and willow branches. What is the significance of this unusual mitzvah?

The concept of peace is related to the Four Species of Succos. The Midrash likens the Four Species to various major organs of the human body. The myrtle leaf is shaped like an eye and the Esrog like a heart. As the Sages have taught, these two organs can unite in a perverted partnership of sin. The eye sees and the heart lusts, with the result that the person's better instincts are inundated by the power of his temptations. The willow leaf is shaped like a mouth, the organ of speech, which is the tool of Torah, prayer, and encouragement, but which is so often corrupted into a weapon that tears away at man's spiritual fiber. The straight, tall Lulav resembles man's spinal column, the organ through which all the brain's impulses are conveyed to the rest of the body. By combining these species in the performance of a mitzvah, we symbolize our repentance and desire for atonement. Every sin finds atonement when man takes a tool he once used for evil and converts it to good. One who had squandered funds on gluttony and debauchery must use his wealth to support worthy causes. One whose barbed mouth had inflicted pain on defenseless victims must learn to use the divine gift of speech for holy and helpful ends. The taking of the Four Species, which symbolize major organs, represents this resolve to utilize the body and its emotional and intellectual drive for the good -- and thereby, the mitzvah is an instrument of atonement.

There is another organism in addition to the individual human body: the national organism of Israel with its many kinds of people. The Four Species symbolize them all. The Esrog is a desirable food containing both taste and pleasant aroma; it symbolizes righteous people who possess both Torah and good deeds. The Lulav, the branch of a date palm, is odorless but it produces nourishing food, it symbolizes the scholar who possesses Torah knowledge but is deficient in good deeds. The fragrant, tasteless myrtle leaf represents common people who possess good deeds, but lack Torah scholarship. Finally, the odorless, tasteless willow leaf symbolizes someone who lacks both Torah and good deeds. The nation is often -- too often -- divided, but God wishes it to be a community of Israel. When all segments of Israel come together in the service of the common goal of national dedication to His will, then everyone belongs, from the august Esrog to the lowly willow. And when every shade and manner of Jew joins with every other in pursuit of that good, then God accepts their common repentance. The Midrash calls the Lulav a triumphant symbol of Israel's vindication in the judgment of Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur. But the Lulav has no efficacy when it stands alone. Only when the Four Species are held together -- symbolizing peace and harmony -- has the commandment been performed properly. Only when man is at peace within himself and at peace with his fellows can he rejoice in his personal and national festival of completion. This is why the Four Species were chosen to symbolize Israel's victory over the internal and external enemies that condemn and attack it.

UNIVERSAL CONCERN In this quest for peace, Israel does not limit itself to its own national interests. The Mussaf ("additional") offerings of Succos include 70 bulls that are sacrificed to bring Heavenly blessing upon the 70 nations. The Jewish mission to the nations was expressed in our earliest history in the name of the Patriarch Abraham, whose name is scripturally described as an acronym of a phrase meaning "spiritual father of the multitude of nations" (see Genesis 17:5). The chosenness of Israel lies in its

sole responsibility to carry out all the commandments of the Torah. Thereby it is to serve as an example of Godly service and be a leader to the other nations. When they submit to Israel's leadership, they, too, will experience the blessings prophesied for Messianic times; as we say in the prayers of Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur: "May they [the nations] form a single band to do Your will with a perfect heart." The 70 offerings of Succos display Jewish concern for all humanity. The Jewish national title "Yeshurun" (from the word "yashar," meaning upright or just) literally means "those who make others upright." It expresses the national mission to bring the message of justice to the world at large. Were it to refer only to Israel's own status as an upright nation, the word would have been "Yesharim" - upright ones. May we all be blessed with a meaningful and spiritual Succos holiday!

Excerpted from the book, "Succos - It's Significance, Laws and Prayers." Reprinted with permission. Published by ArtScroll/Mesorah, Brooklyn, NY.

Web: www.artscroll.com InnerNet Magazine is published monthly as an on-line digest of fascinating articles from the Jewish world. Topics include relationships, spirituality, personal growth, philosophy, incredible true stories, and special editions for the Jewish holidays. (C) 1998 InnerNet Magazine www.innernet.org.il

---

weekly-halacha@torah.org WEEKLY-HALACHA FOR 5759  
SELECTED HALACHOS By Rabbi Doniel Neustadt A discussion of Halachic topics related to the Parsha of the week. For final rulings, consult your Rav.

#### PERSONAL GROOMING ON CHOL HA-MOED

While it is generally forbidden(1) to perform nearly all of the 39 prohibited Shabbos and Yom Tov Labors on Chol ha-Moed(2), the Sages did allow almost all Labors which are needed to satisfy a person's physical needs, tzorech ha-guf, or his festival needs, tzorech ha-moed(3); such as cooking, driving a car(4), repairing eyeglasses(5), washing a dirty floor(6) or vacuuming a rug(7).

A notable exception to this general rule are two Labors related to one's personal grooming: doing laundry and shaving/haircutting. These were specifically prohibited by a Rabbinical edict even though they clearly fall under the category of personal or festival needs and ought to be permitted. The Talmud(8) explains that these restrictions were enacted in order to force people to be properly groomed in honor of Yom Tov. Were it permitted to do laundry or to take a haircut on Chol ha-Moed, many people would wait for the less hectic days of Chol ha-Moed to attend to these matters, and enter the Yom Tov without being as well dressed and groomed as they ought to be. In order to prevent this from happening, the Rabbis prohibited doing laundry or taking a haircut on Chol ha-Moed(9).

Rabbinical edict notwithstanding, already in Talmudic times the Sages allowed for certain exceptions in cases of duress. The Mishnah permits one who arrives from overseas or is released from captivity right before Yom Tov to wash his clothing and cut his hair on Chol ha-Moed. A special allowance was also made for certain hardship cases, such as washing small children's clothes. But the exceptions to the rule are few and specific; indeed, even a good "excuse" for not attending to these matters before Yom Tov, such as a last minute emergency, is not considered sufficient grounds for an exception(10). So it behooves us to clearly identify the few legitimate exceptions, and not automatically "assume" that our case is one of them:

CUTTING HAIR ON CHOL HA-MOED IS PROHIBITED... For both men and women(11). By a Jewish or non-Jewish barber(12). Whether one took a haircut right before the festival began [and now wishes to trim it further] or not(13). Whether one normally shaves everyday or not(14). Even if one fell ill, was detained at his place of work or had any other unforeseen emergency on Erev Yom Tov(15).

CUTTING HAIR ON CHOL HA-MOED IS PERMITTED... For children under bar/bas mitzvah, if the long hair causes them distress or discomfort(16). For an upsheren of a three-year old(17). On any part of the body except the head and beard. Thus it is permitted to trim a mustache(18) or tweeze eyebrows(19). For medical reasons(20).

DOING LAUNDRY ON CHOL HA-MOED IS PROHIBITED... Whether done by hand, machine(21) or dry-cleaning. Whether done by Jew

or non-Jew. Even if one did not have a chance to do his laundry because of illness or any other unforeseen emergency. Even if one did laundry on Erev Yom Tov and does not have enough clothes [e.g., shirts, pants, suits and other garments] for the remainder of the festival. The following rules apply: Enough clothing to last for the entire festival should be prepared in advance. If enough garments were cleaned but proved to be insufficient, one should purchase additional clothes on Chol ha-Moed if it does not entail great expense(22). If one ran out of clean clothes and cannot [for any reason] purchase others, and he is embarrassed to be seen in public wearing dirty clothes, he should consult a rav(23).

**DOING LAUNDRY ON CHOL HA-MOED IS PERMITTED...** For all clothing that may be required(24) by infants, babies or small children(25) who constantly get their clothes dirty(26). There is no requirement to buy additional clothing for a child in order to avoid washing his clothes. When traveling, one is not required to pack all of the children's clothes in order to avoid doing laundry, if doing so will be very bothersome(27). According to some contemporary poskim, socks, undergarments and other items which are changed daily may be washed once the supply that was prepared on Erev Yom Tov has run out. In their opinion, these clothes are similar to children's clothing, since these, too, need to be changed frequently(28). Many other poskim reject this comparison and prohibit washing such items on Chol ha-Moed(29). When only spot cleaning(30). For health reasons, e.g., lice removal, disinfecting, or to clean a rug that got soiled in the bathroom, etc. If otherwise the garment will get ruined(31).

**ADDITIONAL NOTES:** Creased clothes, which are needed for the festival, may be ironed(32). Professional pressing, however, is prohibited(33). Brushing clothes is permitted. Most poskim allow shoes to be polished, while others are stringent. Shining the shoes [without polish] is permitted. All feminine grooming is permitted. Thus it is permitted for a woman to apply all types of cosmetics and professionally set and perm [but not cut] her hair(34). One should not cut or file his nails unless he previously cut them on Erev Yom Tov [and would now like to cut them again](35).

**FOOTNOTES:** 1 The Rishonim debate if the prohibition is Biblical or Rabbinical; see Beur Halachah 530:1. 2 "Carrying" and "making a fire" are two Labors which are completely permitted on Chol ha-Moed, since even on Yom Tov they are permitted whenever the need arises. Muktzeh, too, does not apply on Chol ha-Moed. 3 As a general rule, needs which are tzorech ha-moed but not tzorech ha-guf may be done only as a ma'aseh hedyot, in non-professional manner, not as a ma'aseh uman, in a skilled, professional manner. 4 Harav M. Feinstein (Zichron Shelomo, pg. 33). 5 Igros Moshe O.C. 3:78. 6 Minchas Yom Tov 104:2. Polishing and waxing a floor, however, is prohibited. 7 Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 66:47. 8 Moed Katan 14a. 9 See Haghos Chasam Sofer to O.C. 531 who explains why the Rabbis were not concerned about being properly groomed before the onset of the last days of Yom Tov. 10 The Sages feared that were they to lift the prohibition for any valid excuse or emergency, people would falsely assume that laundry and haircutting are permitted without restriction on Chol ha-Moed. 11 Mishnah Berurah 546:16. 12 Beur Halachah 531:1. 13 O.C. 531:2. 14 Teshuvos Chasam Sofer O.C. 154, followed by most of the later authorities, see Sdei Chemed (Chol ha-Moed 1). Igros Moshe O.C. 1:163, however, relies on the Noda b'Yehuda's lenient ruling for someone who shaves daily and has a "great need" to do so on Chol ha-Moed [or will suffer "much distress" if he did not shave]. A rav must be consulted. 15 O.C. 531:3. 16 Mishnah Berurah 531:15. If possible, it should be done discreetly. 17 See Be'er Heitev O.C. 531:8 and Sha'arei Teshuvah 2. 18 O.C. 531:8. 19 See Sha'ar ha-Tziyun 531:15. 20 Beur Halachah 531:8. 21 It is also prohibited to add an adult's laundry to a washload of children's laundry - Harav M. Feinstein (Zichron Shelomo, pg. 34). 22 Harav S.Z. Auerbach (Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 66, note 240, and Tikunim u'Miluim); 23 In such a situation, a case for allowing one to do laundry could be made on grounds of kavod ha-beriyos and davar ha-aveid. In addition, clothing made out of linen (Mishnah Berurah 534:9) or synthetic fibers (Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 66:66) may be washed when there are no other clean clothes available. 24 L'chatchilah, all of the baby's available clothing should be cleaned and available before Yom Tov arrives. 25 Generally, children till the age of seven are not responsible enough to keep their clothes clean. Obviously, though, this will depend on each child. 26 Rama O.C. 534:1. [Even though the Rama allows small children's clothing to be washed only one by one, contemporary poskim agree that this does not apply when doing laundry in a washing machine.] 27 Harav M. Feinstein (Zichron Shelomo, pg. 34). 28 Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 66:66; Sheraga ha-Meir 7:43. This also may be the opinion of Harav S.Z. Auerbach, see Tikunim u'Miluim 66, note 263. 29 Debreciner Rav (Zichron Shlomo, pg. 49); Harav S.Y. Elyashiv and Harav Y.Y. Fisher (quoted in Pischei Moed, pg. 206); The same debate applies to changing linen when a house guest comes unexpectedly. 30 Harav M. Feinstein (Zichron Shelomo, pg. 34); Harav S.Y. Elyashiv (Pischei Moed, pg. 199). 31 Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 66:72. 32 Mishnah Berurah 541:9. 33 Harav M. Feinstein (Zichron Shelomo, pg. 34). 34 O.C. 546:5. 35 Mishnah Berurah 532:2.

If you would like to sponsor an issue of Weekly Halacha, please respond by e-mail to jgross@torah.org or call 216-321-6381 for more information. Weekly-Halacha, Copyright (c) 1998 by Rabbi Neustadt, Dr. Jeffrey Gross and Project Genesis, Inc. The author, Rabbi Neustadt, is the principal of Yavne Teachers' College in Cleveland, Ohio. He is also the Magid Shiur of a daily Mishna Berurah class at Congregation Shomre Shabbos. The Weekly-Halacha Series is distributed

L'zchus Doniel Meir ben Hinda. Weekly sponsorships are available - please mail to jgross@torah.org . The series is distributed by the Harbotzas Torah Division of Congregation Shomre Shabbos, 1801 South Taylor Road, Cleveland Heights, Ohio 44118 HaRav Yisroel Grumer, Marah D'Asra. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave. http://www.torah.org/ Baltimore, MD 21215

Daf-insights@shemaisrael.com Insights to the Daf: Pesachim 45 INSIGHTS INTO THE DAILY DAF brought to you by Kollel Iyud Hadaf of Yerushalayim Rosh Kollel: Rabbi Mordecai Kornfeld daf@shemaisrael.co.il

**Pesachim 45b 1) LESS THAN A K'ZAYIS OF CHAMETZ QUESTION:** The Mishnah discusses the amount of Chametz which one is obligated to destroy. If there is a k'Zayis of Chametz in the crevices of a kneading basin ("Areivah"), one is Chayav to get rid of that Chametz. If there is \*less\* than a k'Zayis in the basin's crevices, one is not obligated to get rid of that Chametz because it is Batel. The Gemara explains that half of a k'Zayis of dough is Batel if it is either on the \*bottom\* of the basin or on the \*middle part of the inside of its walls\*. If, however, the Chametz is on the rim or on the \*top of the inside of its walls\* or on the \*outside of the walls\*, then even a half of a k'Zayis must be destroyed and is not Batel to the basin (see RASHI, DH Ela). The Gemara continues and says that if there are two half k'Zaysim on the inside walls of the basin and they are not connected at all (by a thread of dough), then they are both Batel. Ula adds that this leniency applies only with regard to Chametz in the crevices of a basin. In a \*house\*, though, two half k'Zaysim must be disposed of even if they are not connected. The reason is because perhaps while sweeping the house, one will sweep the two separate half k'Zaysim into one pile, combining them together to form a full k'Zayis in one place. Why does the Gemara need to add this reason to explain why two half k'Zaysim of Chametz in a house must be disposed of? The Gemara just taught that even if the two half k'Zaysim would be on the outside of the walls of the \*basin\*, they would not be Batel to the basin and one would be Chayav to get rid of them! Certainly, then, when they are on the floor of the house, they are not Batel to anything, and thus each half of a k'Zayis by itself must be destroyed!

**ANSWERS:** (a) The MAHARAM CHALAVAH says that in a house, we might have thought that small pieces of Chametz that are less than a k'Zayis do not have to be disposed of, because of the Halachah of "Pirurin" (6b) which says that small crumbs of Chametz are insignificant and Batel. In the kneading basin, though, such small pieces of dough are still in good, usable condition, and thus they are still significant and are not Batel. The Gemara concludes that even in a house, small pieces of dough are not Batel because they might combine together to make a k'Zayis when one sweeps the house. Since they might get joined together and become significant, they are not Batel even when they are separate. When the Gemara earlier (6b) said that small crumbs are Batel, it was referring to dried crumbs that will never become fit, or -- as the PISKEI RIFAZ explains -- it is referring to very small crumbs which we do not fear will join together to become a k'Zayis. The MAGEN AVRAHAM (OC 442:2) gives the same explanation. Similarly, RABEINU DAVID answers that small pieces are normally Batel and it is only when they are on a kneading basin that we say they are not Batel because they might join together. That is, on the outside of the basin itself they must be disposed of because of the concern that they might come in contact with each other and form a k'Zayis amount of Chametz. The Gemara concludes that a house is the same as the outside of the basin (and we do not say that in the house they are Batel because they are so far apart from each other).

(b) The MAGID MISHNAH (Hilchos Chametz u'Matzah 2:16) infers from the Rambam that the Halachah that half of a k'Zayis on the floor of a house must be disposed of applies only when the Chametz is not within the floor boards. If the Chametz pieces are between the floor boards and serve to fill up cracks in the floor, then they are Batel, just like the pieces of dough on the inside of the kneading basin which serve a purpose for the basin and thus are Batel.

(c) The RAMBAN (Milchamos) and RABEINU DAVID say that according to the RIF, this Gemara holds like Rav Huna who, earlier, did not reconcile the two conflicting Beraisos by saying that one is referring to places in the kneading basin which are "Makom Lishah" and the other is referring to places which are not "Makom Lishah." Rather, Rav Huna explained that the two Beraisos are arguing; one holds that a half k'Zayis on the inside of the wall of the basin is Batel, while the other holds that it is not Batel and must be destroyed. This Gemara (Rav Nachman) -- which discusses a half k'Zayis on the floor of a house -- is in accordance with the Beraisas that says that half of a k'Zayis is Batel even when it is not serving any other purpose. Therefore, the Gemara has to teach that this is not so in a house, and a half k'Zayis in a house is \*not\* Batel because it might be swept together with another half k'Zayis to form a whole k'Zayis.

(d) TOSFOS (45a, DH Kan) has a different explanation of "Makom Lishah." Tosfos says that when pieces of dough are \*not\* in "Makom Lishah," we are more lenient, and not more stringent, and we say that it is Batel, because the dough that one is kneading in the basin will not come into contact with it and there is no concern that it will get mixed in with the Matzah and be eaten. Therefore, a half k'Zayis on the floor of a house will certainly be Batel (if not for the reason that they might be swept into one pile to form a k'Zayis).

(e) RABEINI YECHIEL cited by TOSFOS RABEINU PERETZ suggests that small pieces of Chametz are Batel not because of the Halachah of Pirurin (6b), but because they are a half of a Shi'ur ("Chatzi Shi'ur"), and the Isur of Bal Yera'eh does not apply to Chametz less than the minimum Shi'ur (a k'Zayis). The TESHUVOS P'NEI YEHOSHUA (#15) also gives this answer. However, if so, why should a half k'Zayis not be Batel when it is on the rim or on the outside of the kneading basin? The Pnei Yehoshua concludes that it must be that the basin being discussed has a lot of pieces of Chametz around its outside, which all add up to a k'Zayis. Therefore, they must be disposed of because the basin joins them all together. However, if there were multiple pieces of a half k'Zayis of Chametz on the floor of a house, it is not necessary to dispose of them because there is nothing to join them together to be a k'Zayis. Therefore, it is necessary to give the reason that one might sweep them together. This is also the way the KORBAN NESANEL (3:2:100) learns the Gemara.

According to this explanation, we need to understand why one does not transgress the Isur of Bal Yera'eh with half of a Shi'ur. We know that Chatzi Shi'ur is Asur mid'Oraisa (as the Gemara (Yoma 74a) teaches with regard to eating on Yom Kippur). Why is our Gemara assuming that Chatzi Shi'ur is not Asur? The CHACHAM TZVI (#86) explains that Chatzi Shi'ur is only Asur when it comes to

Isurei Achilah -- forbidden food items. By eating the item, no matter how small it is, one gives it importance and therefore it is Asur.

Alternatively, the SHA'AGAS ARYEH (#81) explains, the Isur of Chatzi Shi'ur does not apply to Bal Yera'eh for the following reason. Why is it Asur to eat Chatzi Shi'ur of an Isur? The Gemara in Yoma says it is Asur because the small amounts of food are "Chazi l'Itzterufi," they join together to become a proper Shi'ur. This may mean that it is Asur to eat one half-Shi'ur because if the person eats another half-Shi'ur, he will have eaten an entire Shi'ur and will have transgressed the Isur d'Oraisa \*retroactively\* by eating the first half-Shi'ur. Anything which can turn into an Isur retroactively, is Asur. When it comes to Bal Yera'eh and Bal Yimatzei, though, even if one had at the beginning of Pesach one half k'Zayis in his possession, and then later during Pesach another half k'Zayis came into his possession, he will only be in violation of Bal Yera'eh and Bal Yimatzei at the point in time at which he has a full Shi'ur in his house at once. The act of having the first half-Shi'ur alone can \*never\* be Asur, because no matter what one buys afterwards, he has not transgressed anything \*until\* he buys another half-Shi'ur (since at that point he has an entire Shi'ur in his possession).

Many Acharonim reject the logic of this assertion, because Bal Yera'eh should be Asur even with Chatzi Shi'ur for several reasons. (1) The MINCHAS CHINUCH (11:12) says that even though that logic works to explain why there is no Isur d'Oraisa of Chatzi Shi'ur for Bal Yera'eh, but mid'Rabanan, at least, there should be an Isur of Chatzi Shi'ur. (2) The MAHARAM CHALAVAH writes that we know that the prohibition of Bal Yera'eh, of not having Chametz in one's possession, is in order to prevent one from eating Chametz on Pesach. Consequently, even if the Isur of Chatzi Shi'ur applies only to Achilah, the Shi'ur of Bal Yera'eh is based on the Shi'ur of Achilah, and therefore Chatzi Shi'ur should be Asur mid'Oraisa for Bal Yera'eh just like it is for Achilah (see also TAZ OC 442:5).

2)HALACHAH: HOW INTENSIVE DOES ONE'S SEARCH FOR CHAMETZ HAVE TO BE  
The Gemara explains that one is obligated to dispose of crumbs of Chametz that are in one's home even when they are less than the size of a k'Zayis. How intensive does a person's Bedikas Chametz have to be? The ROSH here, instead of writing the Halachos discussed in the Gemara about the small amounts of Chametz that are in the kneading basin, writes that it is not important to discuss all of the intricacies of the Halachah, because "Yisrael Kedoshim Hem" -- the Jews are a holy nation, and their practice is to be stringent and to rub off any possible traces of Chametz from the walls of their homes and from the chairs and the like. The Rosh cites support to this practice from the Yerushalmi that states that even Chametz that was made as part of the floor must be destroyed unless it is not fit for animal consumption. In practice, many Jewish homes follow this custom to clean and dispose of any possible traces of Chametz in their houses. However, the Torah sages have emphasized that during the weeks and days leading up to Pesach, one should make sure that the members of his family, especially his wife, do not ruin their enjoyment of the Yom Tov due to working excessively hard.

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET  
SUCCOS - 5758

I now have capability to send this formatted document via e-mail. So please send your e-mail addresses to crshulman@aol.com. For instructions and listing of Torah e-mail lists and web sites see <http://members.aol.com/crshulman/torah.html>

[weekly-halacha@torah.org](mailto:weekly-halacha@torah.org)

SELECTED HALACHOS RELATING TO SUCCOS By Rabbi Doniel Neustadt

A discussion of Halachic topics related to the Parsha of the week. For final rulings, consult your Rav.

THE YOM TOV OF SUKKOS You should dwell in a Succah (Emor 23:42)

EATING IN THE SUCCA ON THE FIRST NIGHT

Every adult male is Biblically obligated to eat a k'zayis of bread in a succah on the first night of Succos. The Talmud(1) derives this obligation from the similar obligation of eating a k'zayis of matzah on the first night of Pesach. Since these two obligations are closely related, their halachos are similar in many respects. Like all mitzvos, this mitzvah, too, can only be properly fulfilled if there is prior planning and clear knowledge of all the requirements. Let us review the pertinent halachos:

WHEN IS IT EATEN

In the late afternoon of Erev Succos, one should not fill himself with food or wine so that he will be able to eat the k'zayis of bread with a good appetite(2). The k'zayis of bread [and the Kiddush that precedes it(3)] may not be eaten until it is definitely night(4), no earlier than 50 minutes after sundown(5). If one ate before that time, he must eat another k'zayis of bread in order to fulfill the mitzvah(6); The k'zayis of bread may not be eaten after midnight(7). B'dieved, though, one who did not eat before midnight should do so after midnight and recite the proper blessing(8); Preferably, one should sit down to eat the k'zayis of bread immediately after coming home from Ma'ariv. Unnecessary delays should be avoided(9).

HOW MUCH MUST BE EATEN There are various views in the poskim about the exact measurement of a k'zayis. Since this is a Biblical obligation, it is proper to be stringent and eat at least 1.75 fl. oz. of bread, though one who eats 1 oz. of bread fulfills his obligation. There is a view in the Rishonim(10) that holds that the minimum amount of bread one is obligated to eat in the succah on the first night is a k'beitzah, not merely a k'zayis. Although the basic halachah does not require the larger amount(11), still it is proper to satisfy that view as well(12). The amount to be eaten [to satisfy all views], therefore, is 3.5 oz. of bread(13). The bread which is eaten [whether it is a k'zayis or a k'beitzah(14)] must be eaten within a time-span of 3-4 minutes(15). No talking may take place until the full amount is chewed and swallowed(16). L'chatchilah, it is proper to chew and then swallow the bread in its entirety(17).

THE BASIC PROCEDURE -

One is obligated to eat the minimum amount of bread even if he does not enjoy it and even if it causes him distress(18). Even a person who is classified as a choleh sh'ein bo sakanah is obligated to eat a k'zayis of bread(19). Before eating the bread, one must have in mind that he is about to fulfill the Biblical mitzvah of eating bread on the first night of Succos(20). If one fails to have this intent and eats the piece of bread as he normally does every Shabbos or Yom Tov, it is questionable if he has fulfilled the mitzvah(21). In any case, he should eat another portion of bread with the proper intent(22). One does not fulfill his obligation by eating cake, etc.(23). Only bread made out of one of the five species of grain is valid. Women are exempt from this mitzvah, but if they do eat the required amount of bread in the succah, it is considered a mitzvah and they may recite the blessing(24). There are some who maintain that the bread should be eaten without being dipped in honey(25), etc. Most poskim are not particular about this stringency(26).

B'S'D'

ARE WE REQUIRED TO FULFILL THIS MITZVAH WHEN IT IS RAINING?

There are many discussions in the poskim concerning the obligation to eat in the succah on the first night of Succos if it is raining. The following points are raised: If rain is falling, is one obligated to eat in the succah or not? If it is raining, is one obligated to wait and see if the rain will stop so that he can eat in a rain-free succah? If one does eat in the succah while it is raining, can a blessing be recited? If a person ate in the succah while it was raining and then the rain stopped, is he required to eat in the succah again? If a person ate in the succah while it was raining and then went to sleep, is he obligated to get out of bed to eat again once the rain has stopped? Since there are different rulings on all of these issues, the following, then, is a summary of the majority opinion(27): If it is raining steadily and there is a reliable weather forecast for rain all night, one should make Kiddush [with shehecheyanu] and eat a k'zayis [or a k'beitzah(28)] in the succah. No blessing over the succah is recited. The rest of the meal is eaten inside the house(29). If there is no reliable weather forecast and there is a possibility that the rain will stop [e.g., it is drizzling or it is raining on and off], it is proper to wait an hour or two for the rain to subside(30). The poskim agree, however, that if the delay will disturb the dignity and pleasure of the Yom Tov, or if the family is hungry and/or tired, there is no obligation to wait.

If the rain stops while the meal is being eaten inside the house or even after the meal has finished, one is obligated to eat at least a beitzah(31) of bread in the succah. Even if the rain stops after midnight, a beitzah of bread must be eaten in the succah. If one has already gone to bed and then the rain stops, there is no obligation to get out of bed in order to eat in the succah(32).

FOOTNOTES: 1 Succah 27a. 2 Mishnah Berurah 639:27.

3 Beur Halachah 639:3. 4 Rama O.C. 639:3. 5 This is the generally accepted time for "night". Under extenuating circumstances, there are those who permit eating the bread a few minutes earlier. Since this is a Biblical mitzvah, it is proper - weather permitting - to wait for 72 minutes after sundown, to satisfy the views of the Rishonim who hold that before that time it is not definitely night. 6 Mishnah Berurah 639:25. If, mistakenly, one ate the bread even earlier than sundown, not only must he eat another k'zayis but he must also repeat the blessing of leishav basukah.

7 Rama 639:3. 8 Mishnah Berurah 639:26. In that case, though, at least a k'beitzah of bread should be eaten. 9 Mateh Efrayim 625:42, 44. 10 Quoted by the Ritva and Ran in Succah 27b. 11 O.C. 639:3. 12 Mateh Efrayim 625:51; Mishnah Berurah 639:22. 13 The amount of a beitzah according to the Chazon Ish. 14 Mateh Efrayim 625:52 and Elef le-Mateh 87. 15 Mishnah Berurah 639:22. Children under bar mitzvah may take up to 9 minutes for the amount to be eaten - Harav S.Z. Auerbach (Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasa 54 note 130).

16 Kaf ha-Chayim 639:50. 17 Mateh Efrayim 625:52. Mishnah Berurah, though, does not mention this. 18 Beur Halachah 639:3. 19 Bikurei Yaakov 639:6,24; Aruch ha-Shulchan 639:17. 20 Mateh Efrayim 625:51; Mishnah Berurah 625:1. In addition to this, one should bear in mind the reasons behind the mitzvah of succah. According to some poskim (Bikurei Yaakov 625:3 based on Bach), failure to have this intent invalidates the mitzvah. Mishnah Berurah, however, rules, that b'dieved one fulfills his obligation even if he does not have in mind the reasons for the mitzvah.

21 See Chidah (Simchas ha-Regel, quoted in Mo'adim U'zmanim 6:69) who questions if one has fulfilled his obligation in this case. See, however, Mishnah Berurah 60:10, quoting the Chayei Adam. 22 Mateh Efrayim 625:53. 23 Mishnah Berurah 639:21. 24

Sefaradic women, though should not recite the blessing on this mitzvah or on any mitzvah which they are not obligated to perform, such as lulav, shofar, etc. 25 See Yechaveh Da'as 4:37 for the various views. 26

Harav S.Z. Auerbach (quoted in Nishmas Avraham O.C. pg. 320 and Harav O. Yosef (ibid. pg. 337). Tzitz Eliezer (15:32-14) maintains that one should be stringent. See also Mo'adim U'zmanim 1:86. 27 Based on rulings of Mateh Efrayim and Mishnah Berurah. 28 Mateh Efrayim 625:51,

62 and Elef le-Mateh 84. See, however, Ktzei ha-Mateh who holds that when raining all agree that a k'zayis is sufficient. 29 When reciting Hamotzi, one should have in mind that he will recite Birkas ha-Mazon inside the house.

30 Some poskim are more stringent and recommend waiting until midnight. 31 In this case, a k'zayis is not enough. 32

There is a minority opinion (Mo'adim U'zmanim 1:86, based on his understanding of the Gr"a; Harav M. Soloveitchik, quoted in Reshimos Shiurim (Succah, pg. 92) and in Mesorah Torah Journal, vol. 14, pg. 57) which maintains that even after going to sleep one is obligated to get out of bed in order to eat in the succah.

\*\*\*\*\*

We would like to announce that the first volume of Rabbi Neustadt's shiurim based the Weekly-Halacha column has just come off the press. Genesis Judaica, the Project Genesis on-line bookstore, is carrying it at a special discount - Visit <http://books.torah.org/> for details!

Weekly-Halacha, Copyright (c) 1997 by Rabbi Neustadt, Dr. Jeffrey Gross and Project Genesis, Inc. The author, Rabbi Neustadt, is the principal of Yavne Teachers' College in Cleveland, Ohio. He is also the Magid Shiur of a daily Mishna Berurah class at Congregation Shomre Shabbos. The Weekly-Halacha Series is distributed L'zchus Hayaed Doniel Meir ben Hinda. Weekly sponsorships are available - please mail to [jgross@torah.org](mailto:jgross@torah.org).

The series is distributed by the Harbotzas Torah Division of Congregation Shomre Shabbos, 1801 South Taylor Road, Cleveland Heights, Ohio 44118 HaRav Yisroel Grumer, Marah D'Asra This list is part of Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway. [learn@torah.org](mailto:learn@torah.org) 6810 Park Heights Ave. <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21215 (410) 358-9800 FAX: 358-9801

---

## SUKKOT [by Nechama Lebowitz MTV]

### I. WHY RASHI DOES NOT USE PESHAT IN DEFINING SUKKAH

The verse (Leviticus 23:43) states: "That your generations may know that I made the people of Israel to dwell in (SUKKOT) booths, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt; I am the Lord your God." The Midrash Sifra (Emor 207), in describing the Sukkot mentioned in the verse (upon which the historical event on which the holiday of Sukkot is based), cites a famous argument: "Rabbi Eliezer says that actual booths (Sukkot) were meant. Rabbi Akiva says that the Clouds of Glory constituted the Sukkot." In explaining the word Sukkot, Rashi, however, simply states "Clouds of Glory."

QUESTION: We know that one of Rashi's principles is to explain the plain sense of the text (PESHUTO SHEL MIKRA) (see Rashi on Genesis 3:8). Why, then does Rashi here, in Leviticus, choose the miraculous explanation of Sukkot (Clouds of Glory), rather than the plain sense of actual booths?

ANSWER: The verse says that I (God) made the people of Israel to dwell in (SUKKOT) booths. If the PESHAT-plain sense were to mean actual Sukkot, then these would have been Sukkot-booths made by the people, without the aid of the Almighty. Since, however, the verse implies that God was involved in making these Sukkot, then, in this case, the Clouds of Glory explanation is closer to the text, and becomes the PESHAT-plain sense. Rashi only favors the less miraculous PESHAT explanation when the Torah words themselves give no indication one way or the other.

II. WHERE RASHI EXPLAINS A TERM IN THE TORAH On the verse describing the holiday of Sukkot, the Torah tells us "On the first day shall be a (MIKRA KODESH) holy gathering; you shall do no labor in it" (Leviticus 23:35). This verse, describing the prohibition of Melacha, is not unique to Sukkot, and has been described before in the chapter (verses 3,4,7,8, 21 and 24). Yet, it is on this verse, however, that Rashi chooses to define MIKRA KODESH - A holy gathering: Sanctify it with fine clothing and with prayer, and in regard to festivals (sanctify them) with food, drink, fine clothing and prayer. On this explanation, Rabbi Abraham Berliner in

his Z'achor Avrahamö says that these words of Rashi were originally written as an explanation for verse 27 that contain the words MIKRA KODESH - A holy gathering, and not verse 35, where this Rashi is located in our Chumashim. This errorö may have been due to a mix-up by a printer who lived long after Rashi.

QUESTION 1: How did Rabbi Berliner know this to be true?

QUESTION 2: Since this term, words MIKRA KODESH - A holy gathering, occurred so many times earlier in the chapter, why did Rashi wait until now, (the seventh time) to explain this term?

ANSWER: There is only one holiday that is sanctified only with fine clothing and prayer and not with eating and drinking -- Yom Kippur (see Shabbat 119a). Therefore, Rashi must have been defining the words MIKRA KODESH - A holy gathering of verse 27, referring to Yom Kippur, and not verse 35, referring to Sukkot. Regarding the second question, Rashi's general rule is to define a term the first time it appears in the Torah, unless there is a specific reason to wait until later (such as Exodus 7:19 and Deuteronomy 16:18). In our particular case, Rashi already defined the term MIKRA KODESH - A holy gathering the first time it does appear in the Torah, in Exodus 12:16. There he explains the term as "...you must proclaim its holiness by means of eating, drinking and (special) clothing." Therefore, in all the previous references in our Parsha (Emor), there is no need for Rashi to define this term again, as it continues to signify special drink, food and clothing. However, the same term, MIKRA KODESH does NOT have the identical meaning by Yom Kippur, since drinking and eating are forbidden. Thus, Rashi is forced to redefine MIKRA KODESH - A holy gathering by Yom Kippur (verse 27) as referring to "Sanctify it with fine clothing and with prayer, and in regard to festivals (sanctify them) with food, drink, fine clothing and prayer."

### III. HOW SUKOT DIFFERS FROM THE OTHER FESTIVALS

(ARAMA) In order to explain how Sukkot differs from the other Festivals, Rabbi Yitzchak Arama, in his Akaidat Yitzchak (Emor 67), writes the following: "The Pesach Festival commemorates our serfdom and hard labor in Egypt. We therefore deserved a festive day of rest celebrating the liberation and freedom. Hence, the scriptural reference in Pesach: "And thou shalt roast and eat it, in the place which the Lord thy God shall choose, and thou shalt turn in the morning, and go to thy tents" (Deuteronomy 16:7). As from the morning, they were thus free to celebrate their deliverance from poverty and slavery in their homes. Likewise, after the Revelation on Sinai, the people were told "Return to your tents" (Deuteronomy 5:27). Contrasting with this is Sukkot, which follows the joyous harvest season, whereupon God commanded us to observe seven days, so as to remember God and not fail to acknowledge His bounty. Accordingly, we leave our comfortable homes and seek shelter under the wings of the Almighty.... This is the time to disregard the ephemeral rewards, to praise and exalt the Source of all our prosperity, whereby Sukkot becomes truly a Feast of the Lord. We are to consider material bounty as a boon received by the servant from his master, in order that he may serve him."

QUESTION: What textual nuance or hint prompts Arama to differentiate between the goals of Pesach and the goals of Sukkot? (Compare Exodus 12:14-15, 13:6, 23:15, 34:18, Leviticus 23:6, Numbers 28:16-17 and Deuteronomy 16:1 -- all referring to Pesach, with Leviticus 23:34, 23:39, and Deuteronomy 16:15 -- all referring to Sukkot)

ANSWER: In all the verses referring to Pesach, not one speaks of a CHAG LASHEM--a holiday to the Lord of seven days. Each reference of CHAG LASHEM--a holiday to the Lord by Pesach (and there are many) indicates one day only. For Sukkot, however, the connotation of CHAG LASHEM--a holiday to the Lord in each instance is for a seven day holiday. This is what prompted Rabbi Arama to make his distinction in defining the different themes of each holiday. An Intournet Web Site Production.

---

[torah@lubavitch.chabad.org](mailto:torah@lubavitch.chabad.org) Torah Studies - Sukkos

Adaptation of Likutei Sichos by Rabbi Sholom Ber Wineberg Based on the teachings and talks of the Lubavitcher Rebbe Rabbi Menachem M.

Schneerson on the weekly Torah Portion

Sukkos

Sukkah and the Four Kinds

Two Torah commandments of the festival of Sukkos are to dwell seven days in a Sukkah, and to take the "four kinds," the esrog, lulav, haddasim and aravos (the citron, palm-branch, myrtle and willow).

The latter commandment is in reality not to be considered a distinct act to be performed during the seven days of Sukkos. Rather, the taking of the "four kinds" is related to the mitzvah of Sukkah itself; this also being the reason for the law that the best way of performing the mitzvah of the "four kinds" is within the Sukkah.

The Sukkah encompasses a Jew and all his possessions with holiness. The taking of the "four kinds" has the additional benefit of drawing down this degree of G-dliness within the Jew -- "You shall take unto yourselves a citron."

Indeed, this is why the four kinds are to be placed near the heart, so that the effect will be felt within the seat of human emotions. From there it infuses all the other bodily organs, including the intellect.

In terms of man's spiritual service, the encompassing quality of the Sukkah is indicative of the transcendental quality of mesirus nefesh, total self-sacrifice for the sake of G-d -- a level that surpasses all human powers, while taking the "four kinds" points to the individual's finite powers of intellect, emotion, etc.

This being so, it would seem that drawing down the infinite encompassing level of the Sukkah into the finite sense of self via the "four kinds" would be a step backward. Why then are we commanded to take the "four kinds" in order to draw down -- and seemingly limit -- this infinite level?

The reason is that complete mesirus nefesh only results when the attendant state of self-nullification permeates a person's intellect and emotions, so that they too desire this exalted state.

There are two reasons why this is so:

- a) Only when mesirus nefesh permeates the entire individual can it become a permanent part of his self;
- b) the permeation of all aspects of a person demonstrates the true power and scope of mesirus nefesh; every place within the individual has become permeated by its power.

The above helps clarify yet another matter: The festival of Sukkos is to be celebrated with joy, for it is one of the three pilgrim festivals -- Pesach, Shavuos and Sukkos -- concerning which G-d commands us: "You shall rejoice in your festival...." Particularly so since Sukkos is referred to in the holiday prayers as the "Season of our Joy."

The particular mitzvah of Sukkos which the Torah associates with joy is the taking of the "four kinds," concerning which the verse states: "On the first day you shall take unto yourselves a citron... and you shall rejoice before the L-rd your G-d for seven days."

Why is the taking of the "four kinds" singled out for its connection to rejoicing, and not the commandment to dwell in a Sukkah?

In light of the explanation given above, the reason becomes obvious:

If the full state of mesirus nefesh is realized specifically when it permeates a person's inner powers, then this is surely so with regard to joy. For joy must of course be actually felt, and true joy is not subject to limitations -- the true joy of something transcends intellect, and can only be realized when it is assimilated in an inward manner.

True joy results when the encompassing level of the Sukkah is drawn down by the taking of the "four kinds" -- "you shall take unto yourselves ... and you shall rejoice."

Based on Likkutei Sichos, Vol. XXIV, pp. 246-250

-----  
The Sukkah and the "Four Kinds"

There is a quality to the mitzvah of dwelling in a Sukkah that is not found in most other mitzvos, in that the physical objects with which the mitzvah is performed -- the schach (the Sukkah covering) as well as the walls -- become holy.

In other words, not only are the schach (and Rabbinically, the walls as well) used for the purpose of a mitzvah, but they themselves become sacred during the festival of Sukkos.

With regard to the mitzvah of the "Four Kinds," we find that there is a more striking relationship with the physical objects with which the mitzvah is performed than is to be found regarding other mitzvos.

The physical objects with which all the various mitzvos are performed are more suited than other matter to being receptacles for G-dliness. Thus, for example, the fact that wool is to be used for the commandment of tzitzis demonstrates that wool is intrinsically loftier than those other objects with which the mitzvah cannot be performed.

The physical objects involved in the "Four Kinds," however, not only possess this innate capacity to be used for a mitzvah, but clearly demonstrate this capacity.

Our Sages explain that the esrog, lulav, haddasim and aravos were specifically included in the "Four Kinds" because they each reflect unity. The branches of the lulav are all attached; the hadas has three leaves growing out of the same stem; aravos grow together in clusters. And surely this quality applies to the esrog, which is found on the tree for an entire year -- thereby uniting the climates of Spring, Summer, Winter and Fall.

Most other worldly objects exist as separate entities unto themselves.

The fact, then, that these "four kinds" share a connection to unity points to the fact that within them is to be found a lessening of corporeality -- a byproduct of their abnegation to holiness and G-dliness.

Herein lies both the similarity and the disparity between the mitzvos of Sukkah and the "Four Kinds": Both mitzvos are alike in that they -- more than other mitzvos -- reveal the innate capacity of physical objects to be used in the performance of a mitzvah.

The difference, however, lies in the fact that the sanctity inherent within the Sukkah is directly related to the performance of the mitzvah, while the relationship of the "Four Kinds" to its commandment is to be seen in the inherent nature of these plants, which makes them uniquely suited for the performance of the mitzvah.

There is yet another similarity and difference regarding these two mitzvos:

A Sukkah envelopes an entire person (indeed, many people), thus pointing to a degree of sanctity that transcends differences.

The "Four Kinds" also reflect unity; not merely by their very nature, as explained above, but also by the fact that they all join to bring about the actualization of one mitzvah.

But here too, a difference exists between these two mitzvos:

With regard to Sukkah there is no disparity even at the outset, while the "Four Kinds" are indeed separate to begin with, albeit uniting for the sake of the mitzvah.

Thus, the unity of the "four kinds" -- a unity such that even after the kinds unite they remain distinct from each other -- emphasizes how the world itself, whose very nature is divergence, becomes united with G-dliness.

The transcendent unity of the Sukkah, however, points to a level of G-dliness at which divergence and separation simply do not exist.

Based on Likkutei Sichos, Vol. XIX, pp. 356-359

---

\* PARSHA Q&A \* In-Depth Questions on the Parsha and Rashi's commentary. Parshas Vzos HaBracha For 24 October 1997/22 Tishrei 5758 in Israel 25 October 1997/23 Tishrei 5758 Outside Israel

Parsha Questions

1. Before giving the Torah, Hashem went to 'Seir' and 'Mount Paran.' Why?
2. How was the Torah written before it was given at Mt. Sinai?
3. Why is Yehuda blessed immediately after Reuven?
4. Where is Shimon's blessing found in the Parsha?
5. In Levi's blessing, which relatives are referred to as A) father, B) brother and C) son?
6. What covenant (bris) did Levi keep?
7. Why was Binyamin blessed before Yosef?
8. Which Tribe received the 'best' portion of Eretz Yisrael?
9. Besides the sun, which celestial body helps fruit to ripen?
10. If there were only 7 Canaanite nations,

why did Yehoshua need to conquer 31 kings? 11. Who are the "Rivavos Ephraim?" 12. What was the partnership between Zevulun and Yissachar? 13. What three things did the land of Zevulun possess? 14. What did visiting merchants see that inspired them to convert to Judaism? 15. The tribe of Gad saw "the beginning -- reishis." The beginning of what? 16. The source of the Jordan River was in the territory of which tribe? 17. Which tribe possessed the Kinneret? 18. The daughters of which tribe married High Priests and Kings? 19. Who wrote the last eight verses in the Torah, starting with the verse, "and Moshe died...." 20. Who buried Moshe?

**Bonus QUESTION:** Keeping in mind the concept of "mida kneged mida (measure for measure)," what mitzva did Moshe do to deserve the honor of being buried by Hashem Himself?

**I Did Not Know That!** The Torah's last verses describe Moshe's death. According to Rabbi Meir, Moshe wrote these verses 'B'dima -- in tears.' But this word can also be read 'B'dema -- jumbled.' This implies that Moshe wrote these verses in a disorderly fashion so their meaning could not be discerned. Based on The Vilna Gaon

**Recommended Reading List** Ramban 33:6 Why not Shimon? 33:12 The Shelter of Binyamin Sforno 33:6 Reuven's Blessing 33:7 Shimon's Blessing 33:17 The Kingship of Yosef 33:25-6 The Collective Blessing

**Answers to this Week's Questions** All references are to the verses and Rashi's commentary, unless otherwise stated

1. 33:2 - In order to offer the Torah to the people of Seir (Eisav's descendants) and the people of Paran (Yishmael's descendants). 2. 33:2 - Black fire on white fire. 3. 33:7 - Because both of them admitted their sin. 4. 33:7 - It is hinted at in Yehuda's blessing. 5. 33:9 - A) Maternal grandfather, B) Maternal half-brother, and C) Grandson through the daughter. 6. 33:9 - Bris Mila (circumcision). 7. 33:12 - Because the Beis HaMikdash, built in Binyamin's portion, was 'more beloved' than the Mishkan built in Yosef's portion. 8. 33:13 - Yosef. 9. 33:14 - The Moon. 10. 33:17 - Since the Land was so desirable, all foreign kings and governments acquired palaces and property there. 11. 33:17 - Those slain by Yehoshua, a descendant of Ephraim. 12. 33:18 - Zevulun engaged in commerce and provided for Yissachar, thus enabling Yissachar to study Torah full-time. 13. 33:19 - Tiris, a type of fish; Chilazon, a mollusk whose blood was needed for the techeles (a dye needed for tzitzis); and a type of sand needed for white glass. 14. 33:19 - They saw that the Jews serve one G-d and follow a unified Kashrus code. 15. 33:21 - They saw the beginning of the conquest of the land, and chose that as its portion. 16. 33:22 - Dan. 17. 33:23 - Naftali. 18. 33:24 - Asher. 19. 34:5 - According to one opinion, Yehoshua wrote it. Rabbi Meir says Moshe himself wrote it with tears. 20. 34:6 - According to one opinion, Hashem buried Moshe. According to Rabbi Yishmael, Moshe buried himself.

**Bonus ANSWER:** While the Jewish People were busy collecting gold and silver from the Egyptians, Moshe concerned himself with locating and transporting Yosef's remains. Moshe wanted to honor the oath made to Yosef, that his remains would be taken out of Egypt and buried in Israel. Since he honored Yosef in burial, he himself was honored in burial. Medrash Rabba

Written and Compiled by Rabbi Reuven Subar General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Lev Seltzer (C) 1997 Ohr Somayach International

---

When a House is Not Your Home The Sukkos Experience by Rabbi Mendel Weinbach When is a house not your home?

On Sukkos, of course. The Torah commands us to move out of our houses on the fifteenth day of the Month of Tishrei and to make sukkos (popularly translated as "booths" but better defined as shelters) our homes for seven days.

The revealed reason for this commandment is the Torah's explanation that dwelling in sukkos will remind us of the supernatural protection against the harsh climate of the desert which Hashem so graciously provided for our ancestors when He brought them out of Egyptian bondage. But, as is the case with all of the mitzvos there are many

lessons to be learned from analyzing and performing this mitzvah of making a sukkah our home for a week.

Perhaps the most elementary lesson of all is the sense of "temporariness." Although we are certainly expected to make every effort to dignify this mitzvah by making the sukkah as attractive as possible and to truly fulfill our Sages' guideline that "you shall dwell in them as you live in your own home," there is no escaping the feeling that this is only a "temporary dwelling." When dining room, living room and bedroom all become combined in an area equal in size to only one of these units, and when furniture is kept down to a bare minimum, the dwellers of the sukkah are keenly aware that this is not a permanent situation. The value of such an experience emerges from the classic tale of the Jew who came to visit the famous Torah giant, Rabbi Yisrael Meir Kagan, zatzal, (the Chafetz Chaim) in his humble abode in the Polish town of Radin. "Where is your furniture?" asked the astonished visitor of the saintly sage when he saw how barely furnished the room was. "And where is yours?" was the Chafetz Chaim's response. "I have no furniture with me because I am only passing through," explained the visitor. "I, too, am only passing through this world," said the Chafetz Chaim, "for our lives here are only a preparation for the real world, the World to Come. For merely passing through this corridor of time I have enough furniture."

In our pursuit of creature comforts and a higher standard of living we inevitably become ensnared in the illusion that we are here to stay forever and must therefore try make the most of it in terms of enjoyment. A week in a temporary home where there is only room for the bare essentials of survival restores our focus on the transient nature of our entire existence and provides us with at least a part of the transcendent perspective of the Chafetz Chaim.

Another vital lesson of the sukkah was colorfully summarized by a great Chassidic leader who said that "the mitzvah of sukkah is the only one you can immerse yourself in even with your boots." There are 248 positive commandments, but all of them require only a portion of our physiology for their performance: e.g., for tefillin we utilize the arm and head, for prayer, the Shema and Torah study our mouths and brains, for waving the four species on Sukkos our hands. Only when it comes to the mitzvah of dwelling in the sukkah do we totally immerse ourselves in the fulfillment of the command.

(Yishuv Eretz Yisrael is another mitzvah in which a Jew can totally immerse himself but it is limited by geography, sukkah provides this opportunity wherever a Jew lives.)

This is a crucial perspective for every Jew to develop. His religious life is not limited to the time he spends in the synagogue or when he is fulfilling one of those 248 commands. He is expected to serve Hashem when he eats, sleeps and is involved in the pursuit of his livelihood.

The key to this approach is the Biblical guideline of "know Him in all your ways" which our Sages have interpreted as a challenge to dedicate even our most mundane acts "leshaim Shamayim" - for Heaven's sake. If you eat, sleep and work in order to have the physical and economic well-being required for performing Hashem's mitzvos you are considered as serving Him all of the time. How effectively does the sukkah home, with its enveloping of all our daily functions in the sanctity of divine service, bring home this important message to our minds and hearts.

One more dimension of the Sukkos experience is based on our preference for the translation of "shelters" rather than "booths." The nuclear age in which we grew up fostered a certain sense of doomsday, with grim visions of someone on the other side of the world pressing a button and unleashing a deadly storm of missiles capable of destroying a significant portion of the human race. Even with the collapse of such a threat from a Cold War escalation into a hot one there still lurks the awful menace of suicidal terrorists blowing themselves up along with so many others and the access that such mass murderers have to nuclear weapons sold to the highest bidder.

The most depressing aspect of this doomsday feeling is that there is no salvation in any shelter designed by man. The sukkah reminds us that when



Jews in the desert faced the dangers of a blazing sun or merciless cold they were provided with the shelter of pillars of cloud miraculously placed above and around them by Divine Mercy. It is this concept that Heaven will provide shelter against every danger - natural or man-made - which gives us the confidence to joyfully go on living our lives and dedicating every moment of them to Hashem Who will envelop us in His love and protection just as we envelop ourselves in the sanctity of the sukkah.

Produced by Ohr Somayach Institutions, Jerusalem General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Lev Seltzer \_ 1997 Ohr Somayach International. Send comments to: ohr@virtual.co.il

---

TORAH WEEKLY \* Highlights of the Weekly Torah Portion Parshas Vzot HaBracha For 24 October 1997/22 Tishrei 5758 in Israel 25 October 1997/23 Tishrei 5758 Outside Israel

Insights What Goes Around "And this is the blessing that Moshe, the man of G-d, blessed the children of Yisrael." (33:1)

The perfect circle. Complete. The circle unites the beginning and the end. There is no beginning nor end to a circle. If you take one point and call it its beginning, when you get to the end you will find yourself back where you started.

On Simchas Torah, we finish reading the Torah and immediately start again from the beginning. In our joy at having completed the Torah, we dance with it in a circle. Specifically in a circle. The Torah is endless. When we reach its end, we are already back at its beginning.

The final words of the Torah are: "in the eyes of all Yisrael." And its first words: "In the beginning." The circle dance of Simchas Torah joins the end to the beginning, that "the eyes of all Yisrael" should be fixed on the "beginning." ...

At the end of Parshas Mishpatim, the Torah describes a brick of Sapphire. "Moshe, Aaron, Nadav and Avihu and seventy of the elders of Israel ascended. They saw the G-d of Israel, and under His feet was the likeness of a brick of sapphire, and its purity was like the essence of the heavens."

All the time that the Jewish People were slaves, this brick was before Hashem. This brick was a memorial to their suffering when they built the treasure cities of Egypt with bricks of mortar. The "essence of heavens" refers to the light and joy before Hashem when they were redeemed.

Whenever the Torah describes the attributes of Hashem, it is so we may strive to emulate them. Even when "the essence of the heavens" was revealed -- even in the light and joy of redemption -- "the brick of sapphire," of suffering, was still there too.

By reminding ourselves of our suffering at the height of our joy, we experience an entirely new dimension in our rejoicing. Through this, we can understand on a deeper level the good that the Almighty bestows upon us, and thank Him with a full heart that He has brought us again to the great simcha of completing the reading of His holy Torah.

Spending and Saving "The Torah that Moshe commanded us is the heritage of the Congregation of Yaakov." (33:4) There is a great difference between an inheritance and a heritage. An inheritance is the sole possession of the one who inherits it. It is his to do with as he pleases: To consume, to invest or to squander. However, a heritage must be cherished and preserved and passed on intact to the next generation.

The Torah is our heritage -- not our inheritance. We must pass it on to the next generation as we found it, and not abridged, altered or adulterated.

Seeing and Believing "...before the eyes of all Yisrael." (34:12)

These are the final words of the Torah. The entire Jewish People were witnesses to all the miracles that were wrought through Moshe Rabbeinu. With their own eyes they saw, and "seeing is believing."

In other words, their believing came from seeing; their faith in Moshe came from daily contact with miracles. These miracles were witnessed not by a small group who then convinced others through charisma or coercion. Rather, the entire nation -- the eyes of all Yisrael -- were witnesses to the miracles. They all saw the dividing of the Red Sea,

the Voice at Sinai, and the manna.

Manna was the miraculous food that the Jewish People ate every day for forty years. Forty years, day-in day-out. They saw it with enough regularity for it to have become mundane.

This was the seeing that founded the rock-like faithfulness of the Jewish People throughout the long night of exile. With their own eyes they saw that Moshe, the prophet of Hashem, was authentic, and his Torah, the Torah of the Living G-d, was Truth.

Sources: o What Goes Around - adapted from Rabbi Shlomo Yosef Zevin o A Brick of Sapphire - A Plank of Wood - Rashi; o Rabbi Yerucham Levovitz; Zale Newman; Moshe Averick o Spending And Saving - Rabbi Nachman Bulman o Seeing And Believing - Ohr HaChaim HaKadosh o Haftorah: Adapted from Dr. Mendel Hirsch, based on the words of his father, Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsch

Written and Compiled by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Lev Seltzer (C) 1997 Ohr Somayach International - All rights reserved.

---

Drasha Succoth -- Just Desserts by Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky rmk@torah.org Drasha Succoth 5758

Just Desserts The Talmud in Tractate Avodah Zarah talks about the future. It details for us a scenario that will occur after the final redemption, when the G-d of the Jews and His Torah are known and accepted by all of mankind. The entire world will see the great reward meted to the small nation that endured an incessant exile while following the Torah scrupulously. Then the idol-worshippers from other nations will line up before G-d and complain, "what about us?" Had we been given the Torah we, too, would surely have kept it! Why are you only rewarding the Jewish people?" The Talmud tells us that G-d makes a deal. "All right," He tells them. "I'll give you one easy mitzvah. If you observe it correctly, fine. However, if you do not, then your complaints are meaningless. The Talmud tells us He will give them the mitzvah of Sukkah. G-d will then take out the sun in all its glory and the protection of the Sukkah will be no match for its rays. These idol-worshippers, predicts the Talmud, will kick the walls of the Sukkah and flee in disgust. There are many mitzvos in the Torah. 613 to be exact. And there are quite a number of difficult ones. Some are conducive to despair and disheartenment without a broiling sun. Why, then, was the mitzvah of Sukkah chosen to be the cause celebri that differentiates our commitment to that of an idolator? Rabbi Paysach Krohn, in his first book of the Magid Series tells the story of a Reb Avraham who was about to enter a restaurant one late spring afternoon. Upon entering, he noticed a familiar vagrant Jew, known to all as Berel the beggar, meandering outside. Reb Berel, rumor had it, was a formidable Torah scholar back in the old country, but had his life shattered physically and emotionally by Nazi atrocities. He was a recluse, no one knew exactly where or how he lived: but he bothered no one, and not too many people bothered with him. Reb Avraham asked the loner to join him for a meal. He was about to make a business trip up to Binghamton and figured that he might as well prepare for the trip with more than a hot meal - he would begin it with a good deed. Reb Berel gladly accepted the offer; however, when it came time to order, he asked for nothing more than two baked apples and a hot tea. Reb Avraham's prodding could do nothing to increase the poor man's order. "All I need are two baked apples and a steaming tea," he insisted. Reb Avraham's trip to Binghamton was uneventful until the rain and the darkness began to fall almost simultaneously. As if dancing in step, the darker it got, the heavier the deluge fell. All Reb Avraham remembered was the skidding that took him over the divider and into oncoming traffic on Route 17 in Harriman, New York. He came to shortly after two tow trucks had pulled his wrecked car from a ditch and lifted him to safety. Refusing hospitalization, he was driven to a nearby motel that was owned by the Friedmans, a Jewish couple who were readying the place for the summer migrations. Mr. Friedman saw the battered Reb Avraham and quickly prepared a comfortable room for him. His wife quickly prepared a little something for him to eat. She brought it out to a shocked and bewildered Reb Avraham. On her

... serving tray were two baked apples and a glass of steaming tea. When the Jews left Egypt, they had nothing to look at in the vast desert but faith. They built simple huts, almost in declaration: "Hashem we will do ours, we are sure You will do yours." And those simple huts, those Sukkos, protected them from the heat, the cold, the wind, and the unknown. Hashem tells the prophet Jeremiah to tell his folk, "I remember the kindness of your youth as you followed Me in an unsowed desert." (Jeremiah 2:2) Perhaps when the final redemption arrives, it will again be the simple Sukkah that will stand as the protectorate and advocate of the People who stood for 2,000 years in the face of idolators, who invited the Jews to join them... or die. So, when we enter the Sukkah this year, let us remember that it is only a small Sukkah stop on a long journey home. And when we arrive there, the Sukkah will be there once again to greet us as it was more than 3,300 years ago in the Sinai Desert. After all, it's nice to be served at the end of a 2,000-year-long journey with just desserts. Gut Yom Tov! Dedicated by Dr. and Mrs. Blair Skolnick

... Drasha, Copyright (c) 1997 by Rabbi M. Kamenetzky and Project Genesis, Inc. Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky is the Rosh Mesivta at Mesivta Ateres Yaakov, the High School Division of Yeshiva of South Shore, <http://www.yoss.org/> This list is part of Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway. Permission is granted to redistribute electronically or on paper, provided that this notice is included intact. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave. Baltimore, MD 21215 (410) 358-9800 FAX: 358-9801

---

Rabbi Frand at the Tenth Siyum HaShas of Daf Yomi ryfrand@torah.org (Rabbi Yissocher Frand) This special edition of "RavFrand" is dedicated in loving memory of Mrs. Anne K. Goldberg - l'zaycher nishmas Chana Tie'bul bas Yisroel

An extraordinary, historic event in the annals of the American Jewish community occurred a few days before the arrival of Rosh HaShana 5758. Over 70,000 Jews, - men, women and children - gathered and participated in a unified celebration of the "Tenth Siyum HaShas of Daf Yomi" - the culmination of a seven and one half year cycle of study in which thousands of Jews throughout the world, as individuals and in groups, participated in learning the same folio of the Talmud each day. The Daf Yomi study program was conceived in 1923 by one of the great talmudic scholars and leaders of pre-war European Jewry, Rabbi Meir Shapiro of Lublin.

The celebration was transmitted live via satellite from Manhattan's Madison Square Garden and the Nassau Veterans Memorial Coliseum in Long Island, N.Y., to more than thirty communities throughout the world. The program included a united afternoon Mincha prayer and evening Ma'ariv prayer. Tehillim - Psalms - were recited on behalf of the sick and on behalf of the safety and welfare of Jews in Israel. There was singing and dancing. The Tenth cycle of Talmud study was completed, and the eleventh cycle begun. One of the original students of Rav Meir Shapiro, who survived the Holocaust, chanted a Kaddish in memory of the six million holy martyrs.

The evening included many interesting talks from Rabbinic leaders. One particularly powerful address was that given by our very own Rabbi Yissocher Frand, speaking from Nassau Coliseum. We are delighted to offer you this edited text version of Rabbi Frand's message.

-----  
Rav Meir Shapiro, Lubliner Rav, you were right. All that you envisioned about Daf Yomi has come to fruition, and even more. My only question is, could you have dreamed that it would become as successful as it has? Could you have dreamed of Madison Square Garden, and the Nassau Coliseum, and all the thousands of Jews who are tuned in? Could you have envisioned Dial-A-Daf and cassettes and the Daf on the Long Island Railroad and on the El AL flights? But history has certainly proven you correct in your initial goals. You viewed Daf Yomi, perhaps first and foremost, as a vehicle to promote achdus - unity - to bind together Jews from disparate communities

and backgrounds and so many different walks of life, all unified by THE DAF.

And if such an innovation was necessary almost 75 years ago, when the Daf Yomi was begun, how much more so today. Today, when there seems to be so much strife and argument and disunity and so much of it for no reason, we certainly need something like the Daf that brings us together.

When Balak took Bilaam to curse Klal Yisrael [The Jewish People], Balak showed him part of the nation and told him "V'efes Kotsayhu Sireh V'kulo Lo Sirreh" - see a part of the nation, but do not see the entire people. Isn't that strange? If Bilaam wanted to curse Klal Yisrael, would it have not made more sense for Balak to show him the entire Klal Yisrael, for the curse to fall upon everyone, G-d forbid?

The Skulener Rebbe [zt"l, of blessed memory] explained that one can only have a negative effect on "Kotsayhu" - on the kitzvos of Klal Yisrael - at the points of divisiveness and disunity, but "V'kulo Lo Sirreh." Balak did not show Bilaam all of Klal Yisroel, because in a united state, we cannot be touched. When there is Achdus and there is unity, we are invulnerable.

When one looks out at this mass of Jews, and is aware of the thousands more in Madison Square Garden, and the thousands and thousands more Jews tuned in all over the world, united, \_for\_ Torah, \_by\_ Torah, one senses that this is such a moment. As a unified Tzibur, a unified congregation, we are invulnerable.

\_Savor\_ this moment. \_Cherish\_ this moment. \_Remember\_ this moment. \_Use\_ this moment for a prayer, for thought of repentance. Never forget this mass of Jews that has come together to give honor to Torah.

But the koach ham'agaid [uniting power] of the Daf Yomi was not limited to uniting different people. It is that which unites and gives unity and structure to each of our own personal lives, as well.

The Talmud tells us in Mesechtas P'sachim, that Rav Yosef declared, "If not for the day of Kabalas HaTorah [the receiving of the Torah at Mt. Sinai], I would just be another one of the many Yosefs wandering the streets."

My Rosh Yeshiva, Rav Yaakov Yitzchok HaLevi Ruderman [zt"l] used to say, al pi drush [in homiletic fashion], that this is not referring to many different people - to many different Yosefs. This is referring to the same person, for there are often so many aspects to a person. Especially today, a person can be in the business and professional world for part of the day, and indeed part of his life. And he can also be a Jew who goes to pray and goes to learn and he can be a father and a husband for another part of the day. We all long for something that binds the different parts together. We long for something that unifies the different Yosefs of our existence. And such is the Daf. Such is the power of the Torah, the great unifier of individual souls and lives.

But the uniting power of Torah, that which binds all of us together as a people, and sometimes binds us together as individuals, was not the only factor that motivated Rav Meir Shapiro zt"l to create the Daf Yomi. Ironically, it was something that he heard and learned from his mother.

The tradition in the family is that when Rav Meir Shapiro was seven years old, on Issru Chag HaPesach [the day after Passover] of 1894, he noticed his mother crying. When he asked his mother why she was crying, she explained to him that the melamed [teacher] who was supposed to come that day, the day after Pesach, did not come and little Meir went an entire day without learning. And for that she cried. And when he asked his mother, when he asked his Mamme, Mrs. Shapiro, "Why are you crying?" She told him, "Meir, do you not understand what a day of learning is? You don't understand what a day of learning is all about. A day of learning can never be replaced."

And that, my masters and teachers, is the foundation of Daf Yomi. Daf Yomi is all about the benefit of YOMI, daily learning, about the constancy of learning, the consistency of doing something day in and day out.

This is extolled by the following Medrash - a medrash that discusses which pasuk [verse] in the Torah, embodies, encapsulates and exemplifies the entire essence of Torah. There are three opinions in the Medrash. Ben Zoma says that we can find a pasuk that "includes everything," and it is "Shema Yisroel HaShem Elokeynu HaShem Echod." You want a pasuk that

embodies Torah? It is Shema Yisroel - accepting the yoke of the Kingdom of Heaven. Ben Nanis says, we find a pasuk that includes everything, and it is "V'ahavtah L'rayacha Kamocha" - love your brother as you love yourself. Ben Pahzi says, we find a pasuk that includes everything, and it is "Es hakeves echad taseh bahboker, v'es hakeves hashayni taseh bain ha'arbayim" - the first lamb shall be brought in the morning, and the second lamb shall be brought in the afternoon." This is the verse of Parshas Tamid - the Torah portion describing the daily sacrifice, which must be brought every single day.

We can readily understand why Shema Yisroel should embody the Torah - it is all about the relationship between man and G-d. We can also understand that "love your brother as yourself" should be the essence of Torah - it is all about the relationship between man and his fellow man. But "the first lamb shall be brought in the morning, and the second in the afternoon" - that is the essence of Torah?

And not only that, but the Medrash continues: Rebbi stood on his feet, and declared that the halacha [law] is like Ben Pahzi. The halacha is that that which encapsulates and embodies all of Torah is the pasuk of Tomid - the bringing of the Korban Tomid, the daily sacrifice, every single day.

The Maharal in the Nissiv Ahavas Rayach explains that the foundation of Torah, of being a servant of G-d, is consistency. It is day in, day out, every single day. This is the Torah. The Torah is t'medeous - constancy - and that's what the Daf is. And the lesson from that must be, that if not Daf Yomi, then let it be Amud Yomi [one side of each page, per day], let it be Mishna Yomis, let it be seder Yomis [a regular daily time for learning]. But whatever it is, it must be Yomi. It must be done daily. A day without learning can never be replaced.

[Note to the reader: the following paragraph, in which Rabbi Frand credits women with the merit of Daf Yomi, was the one portion of the entire evening where the speaker was repeatedly interrupted by applause.]

But we gain another insight from Rav Meir Shapiro's mother, and that is that the founding of Daf Yomi was originally inspired by a woman, by a "Yiddische Mamma" [Jewish mother]. [Interrupted by applause] And today as well, Daf Yomi is made possible by righteous women [Interrupted by applause] - by women who realize that it falls to their lot to see to it that their husbands learn and continue to grow. And there can be no greater contribution to the spiritual wellbeing of a Jewish home, other than that the husband should learn. [Interrupted by applause] And if that requires sacrifice - a tremendous sacrifice on your part - like, not seeing your husband an entire day, and then having your husband home at the end of the day for a few minutes of supper, and some time with the children, and then out the door again to the Daf Yomi. Or, in those hectic hours of the morning, when it is so difficult to get the children off to school, when another set of hands and another person can be so helpful, but no, your husband goes to the Daf at 5:30 or 6:00 in the morning. You, righteous women, must be proud of your portion. [More applause]

And remember something else that Mrs. Shapiro said. When it came time to hire that melamed [teacher], who eventually came the next day, they paid him 300 Rubel, which was a tremendous amount of money. Her reaction to that was that it is but a mere small sacrifice for such a big and important Torah. And that must be your mantra as well - that it is a small sacrifice to make for the sake of Torah.

Finally, Lubliner Rav [zt"l, of blessed memory], there is another lesson, that I don't think you meant to teach us. Not about Daf Yomi, and not about Achdus [unity] and not about the benefit of consistency. We learn from you a lesson that one person and one deed can make a tremendous difference in this world. You taught us what one idea and what one story can accomplish. Look at all the thousands and thousands and thousands - millions of hours and Dafim that have been learned because of one man and one idea. A man who lived in our century, and who has changed the face of learning throughout the world. One man, one idea can change so much.

And you don't have to be a Gadol B'Yisroel [one of the great leaders of Jewry] to have an unbelievable effect on people. Let me share with you a true story:

A Jew comes in to a Rav in Dallas, Texas, and says, "Here is ten thousand dollars." The Rabbi asks the Jew, "What is this all about?" So the Jew said, "I was at the Kotel [The Western Wall], and I saw a Jew - a Yerushalmi [pious old-time resident of Jerusalem] - praying with such fervor, with such devotion, with such kavana [concentration], and I thought to myself, 'I want to be part of that. I want to be part of that world.'"

And therefore, he told the Rabbi, "I want to give you ten thousand dollars because I want to support Torah causes. And I am going to give you ten thousand dollars each year, for as long as a live." And so the man did until he died, and then his mother continued the tradition of giving ten thousand dollars.

Imagine... That Yerushalmi - the Yerushalmi at the Kotel, who prayed just one plain prayer at the Kotel, one prayer with kavana [concentration], will go, after 120 years, to the Yeshiva Shel Mayla [Heavenly Yeshiva], and G-d will show him all of the merits that he earned in this world. G-d will say to him, "And this is the merits of the Jew in Dallas."

The man will look at G-d, and say, "What's Dallas? I've never been to Dallas. What's this about?"

So G-d will replay for him that moment at the Kotel, when he happened to offer a prayer with intense concentration, a prayer that made a difference to another Jew, who lived thousands of miles away. For that he will have eternal reward - for one prayer, for one story.

That is what you taught us, Rav Meir Shapiro, Lubliner Rav. You taught us that one man with one idea can accomplish so much.

[Kesiva V'chasima Tova] Have a good Yom Tov!  
Transcribed by Dovid Hoffman <dhoffman@torah.org> Edited by Rabbi Yaakov Menken <menken@torah.org> Project Genesis

---

The Weekly Daf - #192 From: ohr@virtual.co.il (Ohr Somayach) Dafyomi@virtual.co.il ( Insights into Daf Yomi from Ohr Somayach ) Berachos 16-22 Week of 12-18 Tishrei 5758 / 13 - 19 Oct. 1997 By Rabbi Mendel Weinbach, Dean, Ohr Somayach Institutions  
Training for the Shema Even though the Torah does not obligate one to fulfill mitzvos before he reaches the age of Bar Mitzvah, there is a requirement by rabbinical law for a parent to train his young child in the performance of those mitzvos even at an early age, once he reaches a level of intelligence where chinuch training is practical. Does this rabbinical requirement of chinuch also apply to the mitzvah of reciting the Shema in the morning and evening? It all depends on how we understand what the Mishnah means when it says that minors are exempt from the mitzvah of reciting the Shema. Rashi explains that this refers even to a minor who has reached the level where he is capable of being trained in other mitzvos. The mitzvah of Shema is different, he points out, because it is confined to a set period of time and it is too much to expect of the father to always be available at that time to train his son. Tosefos cites the differing opinion of Rabbeinu Tam who contends that the Shema is no different from any other mitzvah in which a minor must be trained, and the Mishnah's exemption relates only to a minor who has not yet reached the age of chinuch. Even according to Rashi's view, a father is required to teach his son the first passage of Shema as soon as he learns to speak, but not necessarily within the time framework to which the recital of Shema is limited. This is so because the father must train his child in the study of Torah. Similarly, he must train him in prayer, which is not as limited in its time framework as the Shema. The Shulchan Aruch (Orach Chaim 70:2) cites both opinions and declares that it is proper to follow the ruling of Rabbeinu Tam and train children in the recital of the entire Shema. Berachos 20a

Prayers and their Sayers What are the sources for the texts of the prayers that we say? The blessings we say upon rising, the ones we say in our Shmoneh Esrei, those before and after the Shema, and before and after our "Passages of Song" are all the creation of the prophets and sages who were the Members of the Great Assembly. Many of our prayers are also taken from the Psalms of King David and other parts of Tanach. In this week's

section of the Talmud we discover another source for some of our prayers - the personal prayers which some of our sages were accustomed to say at the conclusion of their Shmone Esrei. The prayer which Rabbi Yehuda Hanassi (Rebbie) used to say for Divine protection against all sorts of arrogant and dangerous people became part of our morning prayers, immediately following the blessings upon rising. At the other end of our morning service is the prayer we say at the conclusion of our Shmone Esrei for Divine assistance in guarding our tongue. This was initiated by the Sage Mar, the son of Ravina. On the Shabbos before Rosh Chodesh when we pray before the Mussaf service for a good new month we repeat the words which the Sage Rav would say each day after his prayers. Finally, the appeal to Hashem for acceptance of our confessions on Yom Kippur is the prayer which was said daily by the Sage Rava. Berachos 16b-17a

---

yhe-halak@jer1.co.il

HALAKHA58 - 02: Eating in the Sukka on Shemini Atzeret

by Rav Elyakim Krumbein

Translated by Moti Novick

The gemara (Sukka 47a) determines that outside Israel, one must eat in the sukka on Shemini Atzeret, but without reciting the berakha of "leishev ba-sukka." Various explanations have been given for this. The Rambam sees this as an example of a general rule, namely that no berakha is made when a mitzva is performed based on a safek (doubt) in this case, the safek that perhaps the day celebrated as Shemini Atzeret outside Israel is in fact the seventh day of Sukkot. Tosafot (Sukka 47a) imply that making a berakha would be tantamount to treating the chag like an ordinary workday (since during chol ha-mo'ed we also make a berakha and work is permitted), though sitting in the sukka alone is not as problematic, since "a person often finds it pleasant to eat in the sukka even on days of Yom Tov [when it is not necessary to do so]."

We will focus on the explanation given by the Rif: "Since it is Shemini Atzeret, making a berakha would lead to a contradiction: If it is a day of [sitting in the] sukka, then it is not Shemini Atzeret, and if it is Shemini Atzeret, then it is not a day of [sitting in the] sukka! Since we are in doubt, we act stringently on both counts. We eat in the sukka but make no berakha and treat the day as chag (i.e., Shemini Atzeret)." The Rif is somewhat difficult to understand. He claims that making a berakha would imply that one MUST sit in the sukka on that day, and this is inconsistent with the character of Shemini Atzeret. Yet it would seem that SITTING in the sukka without a berakha implies the same thing! It is difficult to explain that the Rif is relying on the explanation of Tosafot quoted in the last paragraph, since he does not mention this at all.

The explanation of the Rif is adopted by the Sefer Ha-chinukh (chapter 323), who explains it in greater detail. According to the Chinukh, the reason we make no berakha on sitting in the sukka on Shemini Atzeret relates to the essence of Shemini Atzeret itself. While the gemara (Sukka 47a) lists various ways in which Shemini Atzeret is considered a holiday in and of itself, it nonetheless refers to the day as "the closing yom tov of Sukkot" (Sukka 48a). The question which naturally arises is, should Shemini Atzeret be viewed fundamentally as an independent chag, or rather as the end of Sukkot? This question could lie at the heart of the debate among poskim regarding the proper reference to Shemini Atzeret in Ya'aleh Ve-yavo: should one say "chag ha-atzeret" festival of closing or "atzeret ha-chag" closing of the festival (the latter suggesting that the day is the conclusion of the "chag," namely Sukkot)? The Chinukh opts for the first formulation, thus emphasizing the independent character of the day: "There is no reference made to Sukkot in this formulation at all." Why, then, do we sit in the sukka on Shemini Atzeret? "Chazal commanded us to sit in the sukka to fulfill the obligation [of Jews outside Israel] to add one day to every holiday; hence, we add a day to Sukkot and make it eight days, but we don't make a berakha on the sukka on that day because it is really a different

holiday altogether [namely, Shemini Atzeret]. Since nowadays we know the calculation of the calendar and hence the true date, it is more appropriate to make berakhot relating to the true character of the day rather than to the aspect of the day instituted by Chazal. Although one may ask: Why do we not mention both Sukkot and Shemini Atzeret in our blessings, as we do with regard to Shabbat and Yom Tov when they coincide? [The answer is] we find that it is possible for Shabbat and Yom Tov to occur on the same day, but TWO DIFFERENT HOLIDAYS CANNOT OCCUR AT THE SAME TIME, and hence we should not recite such a berakha. But it is perfectly appropriate to sit in the sukka on Shemini Atzeret, SINCE THIS DOES NOT DETRACT FROM THE HOLIDAY OF SHEMINI ATZERET AT ALL."

The Chinukh's explanation of the Rif may be summarized as follows: with regard to the berakha, the seventh and eighth days are mutually exclusive, and for that same reason we can't mention both Sukkot and Shemini Atzeret in our blessings, since "two different holidays cannot occur at the same time:" however, sitting in the sukka itself on the eighth day is fine because "this does not detract from the holiday of Shemini Atzeret at all." While the Rif's language is terse, the Chinukh provides an explanation. According to the Chinukh, the entire problem would not have arisen had Shemini Atzeret not been an independent holiday. Had the eighth day been part of Sukkot, we would have been able to sit in the sukka and even make a berakha, and there would have been no conflict between Sukkot and Shemini Atzeret. The problem lies not in the fact that there is no OBLIGATION to sit in the sukka on the Shemini Atzeret, but in the fact that Shemini Atzeret IN ITS ESSENCE is a holiday separate and different from Sukkot. Thus, for instance, we have no problem making a berakha of "al akhilat matza" on the second night of Pesach outside Israel, despite the fact that there is no obligation from the Torah to eat matza then; this is because the second night of Pesach is part of the holiday of Pesach, while Shemini Atzeret itself is detached from and independent of Sukkot. The Chinukh believes that we need be concerned about the problem of mutual exclusion only with regard to two entirely different and conflicting characteristics which we attempt to impose on the same one day.

As explained, according to the Rif and the Chinukh, sitting in the sukka alone does not represent such a problem of mutual exclusion, while making a berakha over the sukka would be problematic and is comparable to mentioning both Sukkot and Shemini Atzeret in the same berakha. The novelty of this approach is that it considers the berakha of "leishev ba-sukka" not simply as a berakha made on a mitzva but as a berakha which serves to impart to the day itself the character of the holiday of Sukkot. Thus, this berakha stands in contradiction to the tefillot recited throughout the eighth day, in which we refer to the day as "this holiday of Atzeret" and impart to the day the character of Shemini Atzeret. In addition, since we have to mention "chag ha-atzeret" we have to leave out any mention of Sukkot. This approach, while fully explained by the Chinukh, can also be inferred from the words of the Rif quoted earlier: "If it is a DAY OF [eating in the] SUKKA, then it is not Shemini Atzeret, and if it is Shemini Atzeret, then it is not a DAY OF [eating in the] SUKKA." The contradiction lies not in the act of making a berakha but in the character ascribed to the day by the berakha.

A Berakha on a Mitzva Establishes the Character of the Day

This explanation assumes, as noted, the novel assumption that the berakha on the mitzva of sitting in the sukka establishes the character of the day as a "day of sukka" and therefore the berakha, not the sitting itself, undermines the independent status of Shemini Atzeret. The Rambam, too, seems to accept this assumption. We have already noted that in his opinion, the reason we make no berakha on the mitzva of sukka on Shemini Atzeret is that we do not make berakhot on mitzvot performed due to a safek. But this is somewhat difficult, because we recite such berakhot on every added day of Yom Tov outside Israel (the berakha made over matza on the second night of Pesach, alluded to earlier, is but one example), and these days are only safek Yom Tov. The Rambam himself referred to this in a response to the elders of Lunel (quoted in the Kesef Mishneh, Hilkhos Mila 3:6): "[The

second day of Yom Tov] was itself created out of a safek, and Chazal established on that day all the berakhot associated with it, just like the first day of Yom Tov." That is to say, were it true that we eat matza on the second night of Pesach solely due to the safek regarding the fulfillment on the previous night of the mitzva to eat matza, we would not make a berakha.

But since Chazal IMBUED THE ENTIRE SECOND DAY with the sanctity of the first day of Yom Tov due to a safek, we may recite all the berakhot associated with the mitzvot of the day. The reason is as we explained in the Rif and the Chinukh: reciting berakhot on the mitzvot of the day helps also to fulfill and establish the sanctity of the day itself.

Thus, it turns out that the Rambam and the Rif do not disagree in the reasons they give for not making the berakha over sukka on Shemini Atzeret. The Rambam establishes that we cannot recite the berakha due merely to the safek of whether we are fulfilling the mitzva of sukka, since berakhot are not made over mitzvot in such situations. However, we would still believe that the berakha should be recited as an integral part of the rabbinically ordained sanctity of the day, just as we recite the berakha over matza on the second night of Pesach. To reject this reasoning, we need the explanation of the Rif regarding the mutual exclusion of the character of Sukkot and the character of Shemini Atzeret.

Is Shemini Atzeret a "Second Day of Yom Tov" At All?

We have seen that (in the opinion of the Rif) no berakha is made on the mitzva of sukka on Shemini Atzeret because this berakha undermines the sanctity of Shemini Atzeret inherent in the day. But the question arises: doesn't the undermining of the sanctity of the day still exist simply by virtue of the institution of the second day of Yom Tov? Just as the second day of Sukkot is imbued by Chazal with the sanctity of the first day, so too the eighth day - Shemini Atzeret - is imbued with the sanctity of the seventh day of Sukkot and hence represents a rabbinic "day of sukka" undermining the sanctity of Shemini Atzeret! When we refrain from reciting the berakha over the mitzva of sukka on the eighth day, it seems that we are simply closing our eyes to the fundamental contradiction inherent in the day. Is it conceivable that Chazal recognized this contradiction and commanded us to HIDE it to the greatest possible extent by not alluding to it in our prayers or in our berakhot?!

But we can deal with this difficulty in a much more direct manner by suggesting that the "sefeika de-yoma" (doubt relating to the identity of the day) with regard to Shemini Atzeret is different from that of the usual second day of Yom Tov. With regard to every other Yom Tov, Chazal instituted that nowadays (when we know the true date with certainty) the second day is a "rabbinic Yom Tov," imbued with the sanctity of the first day, as explained earlier. But Shemini Atzeret was not instituted as a "rabbinic seventh day of Sukkot;" rather, we are simply commanded to perform all the mitzvot of Sukkot on Shemini Atzeret out of doubt, as if we were really concerned that the day might truly be the seventh day of Sukkot. With regard to the essential nature and sanctity of the day, Shemini Atzeret is not a "day of sukka" at all.

Evidence for this suggestion is provided by the discussion of Rishonim regarding why we do not perform the mitzva of lulav on Shemini Atzeret but nevertheless still sit in the sukka. One suggested answer is that lulav is only a rabbinic mitzva on the seventh day of Sukkot. Rav Soloveitchik pointed out a major difficulty with this answer: maror is only a rabbinic mitzva nowadays, yet we perform this mitzva (and with a berakha) on the second night of Pesach! It would seem that this answer relies on a fundamental distinction between Shemini Atzeret and other days of safek Yom Tov such as the second day of Pesach. Other days of safek Yom Tov have (on a rabbinic level) the sanctity and character of the previous day, and hence all obligations associated with the previous day are in force. Shemini Atzeret, in contrast, has no character of Sukkot at all; rather, we are commanded by Chazal to perform the mitzvot of Sukkot on that day out of concern that the calendar is one day off. This stringency was instituted only with regard to biblical mitzvot, and hence we sit in the sukka but do not perform the mitzva of lulav which is a rabbinic mitzva on this day.

The Sitting in the Sukka of Shemini Atzeret Differs from That of the

Rest of Sukkot

Finally, one additional point must be examined. The Rif applies his explanation to the berakha of "leisheiv ba-sukka" but not to the sitting in the sukka itself, since, as the Chinukh explained, "this does not detract from the holiday of Shemini Atzeret at all." But we could conceivably claim that the sitting too should be problematic if we assume that it too, like the berakha, defines the character of the day. This would obviously prevent us from making any distinction between the berakha on sitting in the sukka and the sitting itself; both serve to define the character of the day and hence both should be prohibited on Shemini Atzeret according to the Rif. But we could still suggest that there are two aspects to the mitzva of sitting in the sukka; it is on the one hand a mere act ("ma'aseh mitzva") we are commanded to perform on certain days of the year, and on the other hand it defines and fulfills the sanctity and character of those days. Perhaps different activities representing different levels of dwelling in the sukka can be associated with each of these aspects: the bare essentials of eating and sleeping in the sukka are part of the "ma'aseh mitzva" of sitting in the sukka, while additional acts such as strolling in the sukka and bringing fine utensils into the sukka, which transform the sukka into a person's natural environment for the duration of the holiday, serve to define the character of the day as a "day of sukka." If we apply the idea of the Rif to this framework, we may suggest that the requirement of sukka on Shemini Atzeret is to perform the "ma'aseh mitzva" of SITTING IN THE SUKKA, but NOT to transform the sukka into a PERSON'S NATURAL DWELLING - since this would define the day as a "day of sukka."

This seems to be the opinion of the Bach (OC, 666). The mishna (Sukka 48a) states that on the afternoon of the seventh day of Sukkot, a person must bring his utensils from the sukka back into the house, out of respect for the upcoming Yom Tov. Presumably, this requirement exists only in Israel, where people eat in the house on Shemini Atzeret and hence require their utensils to be in the house. The Bach, however, suggests that this halakha applies even outside Israel; though we eat in the sukka, we must still remove beforehand from the sukka all the fine utensils and leave only the utensils required for eating. The opinion of the Bach must be that we can fulfill on Shemini Atzeret only the "ma'aseh mitzva" of sitting in the sukka and must not perform the higher level of transforming the sukka into a natural dwelling, since this would define the day as a "day of sukka" and thereby undermine the independent character of Shemini Atzeret.

For direct questions or comments to Rav Mordechai Friedman, the list coordinator, please send email to MF@ETZION.ORG.IL .  
HTTP://WWW.VIRTUAL.CO.IL/EDUCATION/YHE Copyright (c) 1997 Yeshivat Har Etzion. All rights reserved.