

BS"D



To: Parsha@YahooGroups.com  
From: crshulman@aol.com

## INTERNET PARSHA SHEET ON SUCCOS - 5766

To receive this parsha sheet, go to <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/parsha/join> or send a blank e-mail to [parsha-subscribe@yahoo.com](mailto:parsha-subscribe@yahoo.com). Please also copy me at [crshulman@aol.com](mailto:crshulman@aol.com). A complete archive of previous issues is now available at <http://www.teaneckshuls.org/parsha> (hosted by [onlysimchas.com](http://www.onlysimchas.com)). It is also fully searchable. See also torah links at [www.teaneckshuls.org/parsha](http://www.teaneckshuls.org/parsha)



From: <mailto:usa-weekly-owner@yatednews.com> Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2005 5:41 PM To: [usa-weekly@yatednews.com](mailto:usa-weekly@yatednews.com) Subject: YATED USA WEEKLY 10-17-05

### Enjoying the Ziv of the Shechinah by Rav Chaim Pinchas Sheinberg

In the prayer said upon entering the sukkah we say: "May it be Your will, Hashem... that you rest Your Shechinah among us and spread Your sukkah of peace over us... and surround us from the luster (ziv) of Your holy and pure glory, spread over our heads from above, like an eagle arousing its nest."

We must understand. What does it mean for Hashem to surround us from the ziv of His glory? What is the ziv spoken of here? The Messilas Yesharim (chapter 1) writes: "Now our sages z"l told us that man was not created except to delight with Hashem and to gain enjoyment from the ziv of His Shechinah. Because this is the true enjoyment and the greatest pleasure of all pleasures that can exist." Here too, what is the meaning of ziv?

The sages (Sotah 49a) say: "After Raban Yochanan ben Zakai died, the ziv of his wisdom was lost." And Rashi writes: "This, I do not know what it is." In other words, the nature of this ziv that was lost is unclear to Rashi.

Concerning ziv, we also daven a prayer derived from the Yerushalmi every Motza'ei Shabbos: "This week and every week, open for us, Father of mercy and atonements the gates of light, the gates of long days and years... gates of ziv, gates of zohar (illumination) of Torah, gates of zohar of wisdom... gates of Torah." We see here that there are two concepts in Torah, gates of Torah and also gates of zohar of Torah, and the zohar of Torah is greater than Torah by itself.

The explanation of all this is that the Midrash (Bereishis Raba parshah 68:6) writes: "Rabbi Azariah says in the name of Rabbi Yehudah bar Siman, and Rabbi Chanin in the name of Rabbi Shmuel bar Rabbi Yitzchak, when the tzaddik is in the town, he is its ziv, he is its glory. When he leaves, its ziv has gone, its glory has gone." The commentary Yefei To'ar explains: "Ziv refers to the light of Torah and wisdom, because a man's wisdom lights his face."

When someone has the ziv of Torah, it imparts him with a visual beauty and gives him special chen (favor). Thus Chazal say, "Every person who (people) find chen in him, one can know that he has fear of Heaven because it says, 'The chesed of Hashem is forever and ever on those who fear Him.' Thus fear of Hashem brings chen on a person's face and his face is filled with ziv."

This Torah which makes a visible mark on someone is Torah that was learnt sincerely and with truth as Chazal say, "Nikarim divrei emes," "Words of truth are discernable." As Rav Chaim of Brisk said, even a simple wagon driver can discern that the true Torah sevara (ideas) that someone says are truth, and not only a learned person. If someone who

learns Torah in its entirety and perfection, one can see a visible ziv of Torah on him. This is a special beauty, like a beautiful garment that becomes even more beautiful after its laundering. So it is with the Torah. If one learns it in completeness and perfection, one merits to receive beauty – the ziv of the Torah.

The holy Zohar writes: "And you friends, the Holy One is now delighting with those things that you said... and you have fulfilled (having) the form (tzurah) of man and the face of man on your holy forms... Meanwhile, (Rabbi Shimon bar Yochai) saw that Rabbi Yosi was thinking of worldly matters. He said to him, 'Yosi, stand up and complete your form, because a letter is missing from you. Rabbi Yosi stood up and rejoiced in words of Torah and stood before him. Rabbi Shimon looked at him. He said to him, 'Yosi, now you are whole before the Ancient One and your form is complete'" (Beck edition parshas Vayakhel page 217b).

We see from here that when we learn Torah, the Holy One rejoices and through that the tzurah of man becomes complete. Rabbi Shimon noticed that Torah was absent from Rabbi Yosi's face when he thought of worldly matters, because the verse says, "The wisdom of a man illuminates his face" (Kohelles 8:1). Then, when Rabbi Yosi rejoiced in Torah study, his tzurah changed and Rabbi Shimon said, "Now you are whole before the Ancient One."

Although Rabbi Yosi was on a very lofty level even when he dealt with worldly matters (certainly with good reason), the joy of Torah lessened to such a degree that it was discernable on his face. Because the external reveals what is going on inside and if someone has wisdom it is seen on his face. The Zohar emphasizes that after Rabbi Shimon spoke to Rabbi Yosi, Rabbi Yosi rejoiced in words of Torah and did not merely learn. What was lacking to perfect his tzurah was this high level of joy.

David HaMelech writes in Tehillim (119:11): "Nochalti eidvosecha, ki sason libi heimah, I inherited Your statutes, because they are the sason (joy) of my heart." This verse must be understood, because Chazal tell us in Avos (2:12), "Rabbi Yosi says... prepare yourself to learn Torah because it is not an inheritance for you." So how can David HaMelech write that it is an inheritance? The verse emphasizes, "Because they are the sason (joy) of my heart." What is the difference between sason and simchah? The Malbim explains that simchah is internal. The person is happy but relaxed. He feels good inside, but from outside nothing is discernable. Sason, however, is when one's joy is visible and shown by external signs that reveal what is going on inside. This is the meaning of our prayer, "Simchah le'artzecha vesason le'irecha," "Happiness for Your land and joy for Your city." In the whole land there will be an inner happiness, but in Yerushalayim it will be visible. As Chazal wrote: "They said, whoever did not see the simchas beis hasho'eivah, never saw simchah in his days" (Sukkah chapt. 5:1). When people dance and sing with joy, the spiritual happiness within is revealed and this is sason.

True, the Torah is not an automatic inheritance, but if it becomes the joy (sason) of one's heart, and so important to him that his joy becomes externally visible, then Torah becomes an inheritance. Because a son who sees that Torah is his father's whole pleasure will make it the drive of his life as well.

This is the reality of wisdom, that it puts chen and light on a person's face. With this perhaps we can have some understanding of Chazal's statement that, "When Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakai died, the ziv of wisdom was lost." Because the Gemara (Sukkah 28) tells us that there was absolutely no aspect of Torah that he did not learn. His Torah was complete and perfect and therefore his face shone with the greatest ziv. This too is why Moshe's face shone so brightly that no one could look at him. How does one merit to receive this ziv? The Chovos Halevavos (Yichud Hama'aseh 5) writes: "Therefore the Torah is compared to fire as it says, 'Are My words not like fire'... because they light the eyes with its light as it says, 'The mitzvos of Hashem are pure, lighting the eyes.'"

The Torah is fire. When a person learns with fire and excitement and bren, it has its powerful effect and produces ziv on a person's face as we saw in the Zohar.

Why do we daven for the ziv of Torah when we enter the sukkah? Because just as a hut protects people from the blazing sun, so the sukkah protects from the external forces of the world. Thus when we sit in the sukkah it is an appropriate time to pray that instead of the forces of this world, we should merit to receive the inner warmth of the sukkah instead, the spiritual influx of ziv. In the merit of sitting in the sukkah purely for Hashem's sake, (as the Tur points out, this is why we do this mitzvah at the beginning of the cool season), may we truly merit that this mitzvah brings us the ziv of Torah and wisdom.



From: Halacha  
[mailto:halacha@yutorah.org]  
Sent: Sunday,

October 16, 2005 5:35 PM Subject:

### **Weekly Halacha Overview**

**by Rabbi Josh Flug**

#### **Eating in the Sukkah on the First Night of Sukkot**

The Torah (Vayikra 23:42) states "basukkot teishvu shivat yamim," one must dwell in a sukkah for the seven days of Sukkot. This mitzvah includes eating, drinking and sleeping in the sukkah. Additionally, the Gemara, Sukkah 27a, derives from a gezeirah shava (a method of biblical interpretation) that the first night of Sukkot is equated to the first night of Pesach. Just as there is an obligation to eat (matzah) on the first night of Pesach, so too there is a specific obligation to eat bread in the sukkah on the first night of Sukkot. This article will explore the unique aspects of the mitzvah to eat bread in the sukkah on the first night of Sukkot and how it differs from the obligation to dwell in the sukkah throughout Sukkot.

#### **The Question of the Rishonim**

Many Rishonim ask the following question regarding the obligation of eating in the sukkah on the first night of Sukkot: At every Yom Tov meal there is an obligation to eat bread. Accordingly, there is an obligation to eat bread on the first night of Sukkot. The mitzvah of dwelling in the sukkah requires that one eat that Yom Tov meal in the sukkah. If so, why is there a need for a separate obligation to eat in the sukkah on the first night of Sukkot; every Yom Tov meal on Sukkot must be eaten in the sukkah?

Tosafot, Berachot 49b s.v. Ee Ba'i, answer that this special obligation is necessary for a situation where it rains for part of the first night of Sukkot. If it is raining when one is ready to start one's Yom Tov meal, there is no obligation to eat the Yom Tov meal in the sukkah. If however, it stops raining, the obligation to eat in the sukkah on the first night of Sukkot would require one to eat bread in the sukkah after the rain stops.

It is clear from the comments of Tosafot that there is no obligation to eat in the rain even on the first night of Sukkot. According to Tosafot, if it rains the entire first night of Sukkot, one is exempt from this obligation. However, Rabbeinu Asher, Berachot 7:23, is of the opinion that the obligation to eat in the sukkah is necessary for a situation where it rains the entire night. Although one would normally not be obligated to eat the Yom Tov meal in the rain, on the first night of Sukkot one must eat a k'zayit (the size of an olive) of bread in the sukkah, even if it must be done in the rain.

Ran Sukkah 12b, s.v. Matnitin, offers a different explanation to this problem. The Mishna, Sukkah 26b, states that one is permitted to eat less than a k'beitza (the size of an egg) outside of the sukkah. A k'beitza is much larger than the k'zayit that is normally required for the Yom Tov meal. Ran suggests that in theory, one is not obligated to eat the Yom Tov meal in the sukkah provided that he only eats a k'zayit of bread.

Therefore, there is a necessity for a special obligation to eat bread in the sukkah on the first night of Sukkot. Furthermore, Ran suggests that one is required to eat a k'beitza in the sukkah on the first night. However, he does admit that one can argue that eating a k'zayit in the sukkah is sufficient in order to fulfill this special obligation.

#### **An Analysis of the Opinions**

Ostensibly, the question of whether one must eat in the sukkah on the first night of Sukkot while it is raining is contingent on the nature of the obligation of the mitzvah of the first night. Tosafot and Ran are of the opinion that the mitzvah of the first night is reflective of the obligation to eat in the sukkah throughout Sukkot. Therefore, when it is raining, the exemption from eating in the sukkah that exists throughout Sukkot will exempt one on the first night as well. Rabbeinu Asher - who holds that one should eat in the sukkah on the first night even if it is raining - is of the opinion that the mitzvah of the first night is independent of the obligation to eat in the sukkah throughout Sukkot.

Nevertheless, the Vilna Gaon, Biur HaGra, Orach Chaim 639:5, offers a different explanation for the opinion of Tosafot. He explains that Tosafot are of the opinion that while it is raining, the sukkah is considered an invalid sukkah and there can be no fulfillment of the mitzvah while it is raining. The implication is that Tosafot are of the opinion that one is obligated to eat in the sukkah on the first night of Sukkot regardless of whether the situation would exempt one from eating in the sukkah throughout Sukkot. The only reason why one does not eat in the rain on the first night of Sukkot is a technical one; a sukkah in the rain is an invalid sukkah and it is impossible to fulfill the mitzvah in such a situation.

Perhaps what motivated the Vilna Gaon to provide a novel explanation of the opinion of Tosafot is a ruling of the Tosefta. The Tosefta, Sukkah 2:5, states that if one starts a meal indoors due to the rain and then the rain stops, one is not required to conclude the meal in the sukkah. This ruling is codified by Shulchan Aruch, Orach Chaim 639:6. The reason why one is not required to conclude the meal in the sukkah is based on the principle of taishvu k'ein taduru, the principle mentioned by the Gemara (see for example Sukkah 27a) that the obligation to dwell in the sukkah is reflective of the normal way to live in a home. Just as one who starts a meal outside of his home (due to the inability to eat in his home) will not return to his home mid-meal (when it becomes available), so too one who cannot eat in the sukkah is not required to return to the sukkah mid-meal when it becomes available. If one assumes that according to Tosafot, the principle of taishvu k'ein taduru applies on the first night, one would not be obligated to eat in the sukkah on the first night even after the rain stops. However, Tosafot state explicitly that a special mitzvah of eating in the sukkah on the first night of Sukkot is only necessitated in a case where it rains for part of the night. Clearly Tosafot are of the opinion that one is obligated to move mid-meal from the house to the sukkah. How can there be such an obligation if throughout Sukkot one is actually exempt from eating in the sukkah in such a situation? This question may be what compels the Vilna Gaon to understand that the opinion of Tosafot is not based on taishvu k'ein taduru. Rather, Tosafot are of the opinion that while it is raining, the sukkah is considered an invalid sukkah and there can be no fulfillment of the mitzvah.

Nevertheless, Ran - who holds that one must eat a k'beitza in the sukkah on the first night - is clearly of the opinion that the mitzvah of the first night is based on the obligation to eat in the sukkah throughout Sukkot. According to Ran, the mitzvah of the first night requires that one put himself in a situation where he would be obligated to eat in the sukkah throughout Sukkot. If it raining there is no way to obligate oneself to eat in the sukkah and therefore, one is exempt even on the first night. [See addendum for an analysis of Rambam's opinion.]

The Ruling of Rama

Rama, Orach Chaim 639:5, rules in accordance with the opinion of Rabbeinu Asher that if it is raining on the first night of Sukkot, one should eat a k'zayit of bread in the sukkah. Mishna Berurah 639:35, notes that although Rama does seem to rule conclusively on the matter, one should be concerned for the many Rishonim who maintain that one cannot fulfill the mitzvah of the first night while it is raining. Therefore, one should not recite the beracha of leishev basukkah if it is raining because according to these Rishonim there is absolutely no fulfillment of any mitzvah. Furthermore, it is preferable to wait until midnight (and if that is not possible, at least one or two hours) for the rain to stop in order to fulfill the mitzvah according to all opinions. [Mishna Berurah, Sha'ar HaTziyun 639:67, rules that if there are those who are too hungry or tired to wait, one is not required to wait.] Mishna Berurah also notes that if one follows the ruling of Rama by eating a k'zayit of bread in the rain and then it stops raining, one should return to the sukkah and eat a k'beitza of bread in the sukkah in order to satisfy the opinions of Tosafot and Ran. Upon returning to the sukkah one may recite the beracha of leishev basukkah.

One can question the requirement to eat a k'beitza upon returning to the sukkah. A k'beitza is only required according to Ran. Yet, according to Ran, there should be no obligation to eat in the sukkah after the rain stops based on the principle of taishvu k'ein taduru? Perhaps Mishna Berurah is of the opinion that once one is obligated to return to the sukkah in order to satisfy the opinion of Tosafot, the taishvu k'ein taduru principle is no longer applicable and there is a fulfillment of the mitzvah even according to Ran.

---

From: Halacha [mailto:halacha@yutorah.org] Sent: Sunday, October 16

## **Weekly Halacha Overview**

**by Rabbi Josh Flug**

### **The Broken Pittam**

Many etrogim are harvested with their pistil still attached. This pistil is known as the pittam. If the etrog is not handled properly, the pittam can break off of the etrog. This article will discuss the status of an etrog with a broken pittam.

The Torah (Vayikra 23:40) refers to the etrog as a p'ri eitz hadar, a beautiful fruit. The Gemara, Sukkah 29b, derives from the word hadar that certain flaws invalidate the four species. Regarding the etrog, the Mishna, Sukkah 34b, lists various imperfections of an etrog that would render it invalid. These imperfections include an etrog that is dried, cracked, perforated, incomplete, or missing the pittam.

There is a dispute among the Rishonim as to which part of the etrog is considered the pittam. An etrog grows with the pistil protruding from the top and the stem protruding from the bottom. The pistil consists of two parts. The stigma is the round portion on top known as the shoshanta. The style is the stalk-like portion that supports the stigma, known as the dad. Rabbeinu Tam, in Tosafot, Sukkah 35a, and Rambam, Hilchot Lulav 8:7, assert that as long as the dad is intact, the etrog is valid. Rif, Sukkah 17b (as understood by Ran, ad loc., s.v. Gemara) is of the opinion that if the shoshanta falls off, the etrog is no longer valid. Rashi, Sukkah 35b, s.v. Nitla, quotes one opinion that the pittam is the stem on the bottom of the etrog. According to this opinion if the entire stem is uprooted, the etrog is invalid.

Shulchan Aruch, Orach Chaim 648:7, rules in accordance with the opinion of Rambam that the etrog is valid as long as the dad remains intact. Rama, ad loc., rules that although Rambam's opinion is the accepted opinion, one should follow the stringent opinion that if the shoshanta falls off, the etrog is invalid. Mishna Berurah 648:31, notes that Rama's stringency only applies to one who has the choice of purchasing two equivalent etrogim, one of which has a broken shoshanta. However, if the etrog with the broken shoshanta is a nicer

etrog, one should purchase that etrog despite its broken shoshanta. It is clear from this ruling that if the shoshanta breaks subsequent to the purchase of the etrog, one is not required to purchase a new etrog (see Mishna Berurah, Biur Halacha, ad loc., s.v. Mihu).

There is a dispute among the Acharonim as to how much of the dad must remain intact in order for the etrog to be valid. Taz 648:11, maintains that the etrog is only invalidated if the entire dad is uprooted. Levush 648:8, contends that even if part of the dad falls off, the etrog is invalid. Magen Avraham 648:9, presents a middle position that if there remains a part of the dad protruding from the etrog, the etrog is valid. If the remaining part of the dad is below the surface of the etrog it is invalid. Mishna Berurah 648:30, quotes the opinions of Taz and Magen Avraham, but does not rule conclusively on the matter. [See Mishna Berurah, Sha'ar HaTziyun 648:32, who limits the difference between Magen Avraham and Taz by stating that even Taz will agree that the etrog is invalid if the only remnant of the dad is below the surface of the etrog, and there is an indentation in the etrog.]

### **A Broken Pittam After the First Day**

A broken pittam is not necessarily problematic throughout Sukkot. The Mishna, Sukkah 41a, states that the mitzvah of the four species applies throughout Sukkot for one who is in the Beit HaMikdash. For one who is outside of the Beit HaMikdash the biblical mitzvah of the four species only applies on the first day of Sukkot. The obligation throughout the rest of Sukkot is rabbinic in nature. [The Talmud Yerushalmi, Sukkah 3:13, provides the source in the Torah to distinguish between the Beit HaMikdash and other areas.] Therefore, there is room to draw a distinction between an etrog that is used for the first day of Sukkot, and an etrog that is used for the rest of Sukkot. The Gemara, Sukkah 36a, draws this distinction regarding an incomplete etrog in order to explain the practice of R. Chanina. R. Chanina would eat part of his etrog prior to using it for the mitzvah. The Gemara explains that he would only eat the etrog starting on the second day, and an incomplete etrog is valid from the second day and onward.

Tosafot, Sukkah 29b, s.v. Ba'inan, note that although an incomplete etrog is valid from the second day and onward, the Gemara, Sukkah 29b, implies that an etrog which lacks hadar (beauty) is invalid throughout Sukkot. Rambam, Hilchot Lulav 8:9, as well as Ramban, Lulav HaGadol, disagree and assume that an etrog that lacks hadar is valid on the second day. [Ramban explains that the Gemara that invalidates an etrog that lacks hadar on the second day refers to an etrog that is for use in the Beit HaMikdash. Since the mitzvah of the four species in the Beit HaMikdash is of biblical origin, all of the imperfections will invalidate the etrog throughout Sukkot.]

Shulchan Aruch, Orach Chaim 649:5, rules in accordance with the opinion of Rambam. Therefore, an etrog that is incomplete or lacks hadar is valid starting on the second day. However, Rama, ad loc., rules in accordance with the opinion of Tosafot that an etrog that lacks hadar is invalid throughout Sukkot. Accordingly, one must address whether the invalidity of an etrog whose pittam fell off is due to the lack of hadar or whether it is invalid because it is incomplete.

Rabbeinu Yerucham, Sefer Adam 8:3, states that an etrog whose pittam fell off is similar to an incomplete etrog and is valid starting on the second day. However, R. Avraham of Prague (cited in Darkei Moshe 649:5), is of the opinion that an etrog with a broken pittam lacks hadar and is therefore invalid throughout Sukkot. Rama, ibid, rules in accordance with the opinion of Rabbeinu Yerucham. However, Magen Avraham 649:17, notes that Maggid Mishneh, Hilchot Lulav 8:7, is also of the opinion that an etrog with a broken pittam is invalid due to a lack of hadar. Therefore, Magen Avraham rules that an etrog with a broken pittam should not be used throughout Sukkot.

Mishna Berurah 649:36, quotes Eliah Rabbah, 649:15, who contends that even if R. Avraham of Prague is correct, one can utilize the opinion of Rambam – who holds that even an etrog that lacks hadar is valid

starting on the second day - as a mitigating factor in a situation where there is no other etrog available. Mishna Berurah adds that one should not recite a beracha in such a situation unless there is an additional mitigating factor (i.e., the pittam is broken in a way that there is room to validate the etrog for the first day).

There is one limitation in validating an etrog with a broken pittam after the first day. Those who live in the Diaspora observe a second day of Yom Tov called Yom Tov Sheni Shel Galuyot. Ran, Sukkah 14a, quotes a dispute as to whether the leniencies of the etrog that apply the rest of Sukkot apply on Yom Tov Sheni Shel Galuyot. Ran concludes that one may rely on these leniencies but one may not recite a beracha when relying on these leniencies. Shulchan Aruch, Orach Chaim 649:6, rules in accordance with the opinion of Ran. Accordingly, there is more reluctance to rely on the leniencies mentioned previously regarding the broken pittam on Yom Tov Sheni Shel Galuyot.

**A Pittam that Fell Off During the Development of the Etrog**

Many etrogim are sold without a pittam. These etrogim lost their pittam during the development of the etrog. Rabbeinu Asher, Sukkah 3:16, states that if the etrog never had a pittam from the outset (i.e. the pistil detached prior to the formation of the fruit) the etrog is valid. This ruling is codified by Rama, Orach Chaim 648:7. Mishna Berurah 648:32, explains that since the natural growth of the etrog was without the pittam, it cannot be categorized as incomplete or lacking hadar. R. Shlomo Zalman Auerbach (cited in Halichot Shlomo Vol. II 10:18) adds that based on the logic of Mishna Berurah, the etrog is valid even if the pittam falls off at a later stage of its development.

The next issue is scheduled for October 31.

The Weekly Halacha Overview, by Rabbi Josh Flug, is a service of YUTorah, the online source of the Torah of Yeshiva University. Get more halacha shiurim and thousands of other shiurim, by visiting [www.yutorah.org](http://www.yutorah.org). To unsubscribe from this list, please click here.



<http://www.chaburas.org/hoshanot.html>

### **CIRCLE DANCING - HOSHANOT**

**[RABBI AARON ROSS]**

The mishna in Succah (45a) discusses the mitzva of "arava" (willow branches). It states that during the time of the Beit HaMikdash the priests would go down on Succot to a place called Motza that was below Yerushalayim and there they would cut large willow branches. They would then bring the branches to the Beit HaMikdash and lean them against the side of the altar, with the top part leaning over the top of the altar. They would then blow the shofar in the standard fashion, with one broken sound (teru'ah) preceded and followed by a solid sound (teki'ah).

The mishna then continues to say that every day they would circle the altar and would say "ana Hashem hoshi'a na, ana Hashem hatzlicha na" or "ani v'ho hoshi'a na" - please Hashem grant us salvation (Rashi works out how "ani v'ho" is equivalent to "ana Hashem"). Finally, on the seventh day they would circle the altar seven times and when leaving it for the last time they would praise the altar.

This practice in the Beit HaMikdash serves as the basis for our modern custom of Hoshanot. As reported by the Tur (O.C. 660), we circle the bima once a day with a Torah being taken to the bima (a practice based on the Yalkut Tehillim) and thus serving as the focal point and in place of the altar. We also bring a Torah to the middle since during the time of the Beit HaMikdash the marchers would recite the name of Hashem while walking, and we have a tradition that the entire Torah is made up of various names of Hashem. According to the Yerushalmi, our current practice reflects not only what was done during the time of the Beit HaMikdash, but also is meant to mimic the siege and conquering of Yericho (Jericho) in the time of Yehoshua, when they circled the city

once a day for six days and seven times on the final day, causing the walls to come tumbling down (Yehoshua 6).

There are several issues to explore concerning the practice of Hoshanot. First, only those people who have a set of the four species participate in the actual parade around the Torah. This is based on statements of Rashi, the Hagahot Ashri, and the Or Zarua. The Tur notes that the proof for this idea is that on Shabbat, when we do not take the four species, we also do not walk around the Torah, and thus he infers that being part of the march is intrinsically connected to doing so with the four species. However, the Beit Yoseif notes that on Hoshana Rabba (day seven), even a person who does not have the four species should take part in the seven laps around the Torah. His rationale is that since there is a special "zeicher l'Mikdash" (remembrance of what was done in the Beit HaMikdash - see Succah 41a for more on this concept) for Hoshana Rabba in particular, then the fact that a person cannot do the mitzva of the four species should not mean that he should also be excluded for the mitzva of circling the bima. However, the Darchei Moshe opposes this view, and the common practice is that a person who does not have the four species never takes part in the walking around the bima.

In terms of Shabbat, the Tur cites Rav Sherira Gaon, who claims that Hoshanot should not even be said on Shabbat, since the children will get confused and assume that since we say Hoshanot on Shabbat, we must also be allowed to use the four species (which are muktzeh on Shabbat lest one come to carry them in a public domain). However, the Ba'al HaTtur and the Bach both rule that even though there is no walking around the bima on Shabbat, we nevertheless do say one of the hoshana-piyutim (liturgical poems) on Shabbat.

The other main exception to Hoshanot is a person who is a mourner. The Kol-Bo writes that the custom in Narbonne was that a mourner did not take part in the Hoshanot, although the Beit Yoseif does not understand why he should lose out on this mitzva as a result of his status. The Bach offers two possible explanations of the custom for a mourner to not take part in the Hoshanot. The first possibility is that during the time of the Beit HaMikdash, those priests who were in any way blemished (ba'alei mumim) or whose hair was uncut (peru'ei rosh) would not take part in the march around the altar. Nowadays, since our Hoshanot are done as a remembrance of the practices in the Beit HaMikdash, we exclude mourners, who may not cut their hair. Even though we do not exclude other people who may have been excluded in the Beit HaMikdash (such as anyone who is not a priest - see Taz), the Bach reasons that while other people may have some disqualifying feature that is unknown to most people, the uncut hair of a mourner is public knowledge and thus the exclusion is feasible without causing too much commotion. The Bach's second rationale is far smoother. He claims that a mourner should sit out the Hoshanot since they are a fulfillment of the commandment to be happy before Hashem on Succot (Vayikra 23:40 and Tosafot Succah 45a), and a mourner does not participate in things specifically oriented towards happiness. The general practice in Ashkenazic circles today is for mourners to not take part in the Hoshanot (although they are thus often used to hold the Torah), while Sephardim follow the Beit Yoseif and allow mourners into the circle. The Taz offers a third view, stating that just as we do not ask mourners to serve as the chazzan on days when Tachanun is not said (i.e. happy days on the calendar), so too do they not take part in the Hoshanot, which he deems to be comparable.

There is also a question as to when during the prayers Hoshanot should be said. Rav Sa'adiah Gaon rules that they should be said after the reading of the haftarah, since the Torah is still out and thus there will be no need to remove it a second time (when it will not even be read from). Bach also claims that Rav Sa'adiah Gaon may feel that just as the blessing on the four species should be done earlier in the day, so too should the Hoshanot with the four species be done earlier in the day. Rav Moshe Feinstein (Igrot Moshe O.C. 3:99) claims that there is a practice to do the Hoshanot after Hallel, before the Torah reading, since one is

already holding the four species and thus if he puts them down before completing all of the things that he has to do with them it will look as if he is "passing over the mitzvot," (ma'avirin al ha-mitzvot) which is expressly forbidden by the gemara in Pesachim 64b.

[We should point out that the concept of "ein ma'avirin al ha-mitzvot" is one that finds its roots in laws relating to sacrifices. See previous years' Chaburot on Succot for more on the inherent connection between the four species and the worship in the Beit HaMikdash.]

Rav Feinstein also notes that there is a custom to recite the Hoshanot after Musaf. He gives a simple reason for this order - since one is obligated to read from the Torah and say Musaf, but the Hoshanot are simply a custom, it is logical that obligations should precede customs. Bach offers a second reason, based on the mishna in Succah cited above. The Mishna concludes that after the Hoshanot on Hoshana Rabba everyone would leave for home while praising the altar. The implication is that the Hoshanot were the last thing done in the Beit HaMikdash before people departed, and thus we also make them the end of our services every day before departing for home.

Finally, we should note the reasoning behind the various orders of the piyyutim recited. Depending on the day on which Succot begins, the various Hoshana-piyyutim are recited in different orders. The reason, as given by the Levushei S'rad and recorded by the Machatzit HaShekel and others, is that there are four factors which influence which piyyutim are said on which days. The piyyut "I'ma'an amitach" is about the glory of Hashem and that piyyut of "even sh'tiyah" is about the Beit HaMikdash. As such, we try to say them on the first two days of Succot (as long as neither day is Shabbat), since we want these themes to come at the beginning of the holiday, to emphasize two of the main themes of the entire festival. The piyyut "e'eroch shu'i" refers to the fast day on which our sins are revealed, meaning Yom HaKippurim, and thus it is said as early as possible after the other two, so that it can be close to Yom HaKippurim. The third factor is that "adon ha-moshi'a" is always said on the day before Hoshana Rabba since it speaks about rain, and rain on Succot itself is not considered to be a blessing (see Succah 28b). Finally, the piyyut of "om netzora" is about Shabbat, and thus is always said on that day.

---

<http://www.chaburas.org/shmini.html>

### **THE MITZVA OF SUCCAH ON SHMINI ATZERET [RABBI AARON ROSS]**

The gemara in Rosh HaShana 4b (and other places) states that Shmini Atzeret is a "regel bifnei atzmo" - a festival unto itself. It then lists six ways in which this is true, one of which is simply referred to as "regel." Rashi comments that this means that there is no mitzva of succah or of taking the four species on Shmini Atzeret. While it may be connected to Succot, it does not have anything to do with Succot in a halachic sense.

This is all fine and well in Israel. But what about in Chutz La'Aretz, where every day of a festival is a safek (doubt) that it may really be off by a day? Perhaps the day that Americans refer to as Shmini Atzeret is really only the seventh day of Succot, and thus there is still a mitzva of succah and the four species? Shouldn't everything still be done, seeing as with regards to doubt in Torah laws we are generally stringent? The gemara in Succah 46b deals with this, and distinguishes between the two laws. It claims that the four species should not be taken on Shmini Atzeret since they are muktzeh and thus may not be handled. However, succah is a different issue. The key point is that with regard to laws of muktzeh in general, we say that anything that is being designated for use during bein hashemashot (loosely translated as twilight - the period between sunset and the appearance of three medium sized stars), may be used on Shabbat or Yom Tov. Since a succah is still fit to be used during twilight at the end of the seventh day of Succot, thus it becomes fit to be

used, and not muktzeh, on Shmini Atzeret. This being the case, what is the law?

The gemara continues on 47a to say that one should in fact sit in the succah on Shmini Atzeret, although the bracha of "leishev ba-succah" is not made. Why is this the case - If there is a mitzva, why don't we make a blessing on it, and if there is no mitzva, why even bother sitting there?

Ritva states that the argument brought in the gemara about whether or not a bracha should be made is focused around the idea of "ziluta d'yom tov" - denigrating the holiday. What does this mean? Originally, the idea of keeping a second day of Yom Tov outside of Israel came from the fact that the new months were proclaimed in the Sanhedrin in Yerushalayim, who would then send messengers out to all Jewish settlement. Since travel resulted in delays, people would often not be completely sure about when the month had begun, and thus they were often in doubt as to when the festivals were. However, since that time Hillel (not of Beit Hillel fame, but rather Hillel who lived a few generations after Rabi Yehuda HaNasi, the compiler of the Mishna) fixed the calendar, and it became known to everyone when the holidays were. Nevertheless, people outside of Israel continued to keep two days of Yom Tov because of "minhag avoteinu b'yadeinu" - it was the custom of their fathers. Returning to the view of Ritva, he claims that even though by other "second days" of holidays we do everything the same as the first day, in this case there is a particular problem. The seventh day of Succot is Chol HaMoed, a day when work is permitted. If one were to make a bracha on the succah on that day, it would seem that Shmini Atzeret, a day when work is prohibited according to the Torah, also has aspects of a weekday, and one might come to confuse the two. Since our "doubt" nowadays is only a result of the practices of our forefathers before the fixing of the calendar, we can be lenient in the face of denigrating the holiday and thus not make a bracha.

Meiri cites the reason of Ritva, and adds on a second one, based on the view of Rif. He states that since the kiddush that is made mentions Shmini Atzeret, and not Succot, to follow that with a bracha on the succah would be a claim that the day is both Succot and Shmini Atzeret, an impossibility and a contradiction. Thus, the bracha on the succah is omitted (Rav Yoseif Dov Soloveitchik z"l claims that the kiddush and prayers on Shmini Atzeret mention Shmini Atzeret and not Succot because the prayers flow from the prohibition of labor on the day. Since labor is prohibited because of Shmini Atzeret, and not because of the possibility of it being Succot, thus the prayers follow suit). The Otzar Dinim U'Minhagim states similarly that since we say the bracha of "shehecheyanu" at night, thus proclaiming a new holiday, it would be contradictory to also proclaim that it is still Succot. However, in all cases, we still sit there due to the doubt, seeing as there is "no harm done" by doing so. The Minchat Chinuch claims that even though we generally have a concept of "tosefet," of adding on to the holidays from the weekdays, that only applies to extending the time when there is a prohibition of labor, and not to extending the time for the mitzva of succah.

Rambam (Hil. Succah 6:13) and other halachic works all agree that one must sit in the succah on Shmini Atzeret, and the only disagreements seem to be about the reason for this practice. The Magid Mishne adds a new reason, claiming that no bracha is made since the bracha itself is only a d'rabbanan (Rabbinic ordinance), and in such cases we are lenient. The Lechem Mishne and the Tur (O.C. 668) both state that no bracha is made because of the issue of ziluta. The Beit Yoseif quotes Ra'avayah who says that one should not make a bracha so as to make it clear that he is not adding onto the mitzva of succah, which really only extend for seven day (the prohibition of "bal tosef" - loosely defined as not adding onto a mitzva, with the classic examples being taking five species on Succot and having five parshiyot in tefillin. The issue is more complex, and may be a topic in the future).

Despite the fact that it seems that one must continue to be in the succah on Shmini Atzeret, the obligation is not as absolute as it is for the first seven days. While the GR"A (Vilna Gaon) and Rav Soloveitchik z"l both slept in the succah on the night of Shmini Atzeret, most Acharonim did not do so, and both Ra'avayak and the Magen Avraham give the reason as being that one should make it clear that the mitzva of succah does not really extend for eight days. A second point to bear in mind is that if a person davens Ma'ariv while it is still light outside, he should wait until it is dark (three medium stars) to begin eating in the succah. Otherwise, he would have to say a bracha, and thus would encounter the various problems cited above (Machatzit HaShekel and Maharshal quoted by the Taz in Orach Chayim (668).

What about all of the various customs that people have to only make kiddush in the succah, or to only eat there at night, or perhaps only during the day? Rav Herschel Schechter, in Nefesh HaRav, cites Rav Soloveitchik z"l as believing that there was no reason not to fully utilize the succah on Shmini Atzeret, and that people began to reason that since there was no bracha, therefore the obligation must not be serious, or perhaps may even be non-existent. However, there are several reasons given for the various customs.

The Tur and the Magen Avraham state that one should leave the succah after eating during the day, and is thus not obligated to spend the rest of the day there, although if Shmini Atzeret fell on Shabbat one would have to eat the third meal in the succah. Why is this done? The Medrash Tanchuma on Parashat Pinchas notes that since on Shmini Atzeret we pray for rain, people will not pray with their full hearts if they know that they still have to eat outside. Thus, the practice developed to either eat part of a meal in the succah during the day and then to leave, or to leave right after the meal. With regard to the practice of not eating in the succah at night but returning to eat there during the day, that is derived from the desire to distinguish between the mitzva of succah from the first seven days and the sitting in the succah on Shmini Atzeret, which is done only as a result of a doubt (Magen Avraham). With regard to other various combinations of making kiddush and/or eating in the succah, I have yet to find a source, although it is possible that they all derive from these two main ideas, and that variations developed along the way.



From: Avi Lieberman  
<[AteresHaShavua@aol.com](mailto:AteresHaShavua@aol.com)>  
Subject: ATERES HASHAVUA  
Mesivta Ateres Yaakov 1170A William Street  
Hewlett NY, 11557 (516)-374-6465  
[AteresHaShavua@aol.com](mailto:AteresHaShavua@aol.com)  
EMES LIYAAKOV

### **Weekly Insights from MOREINU HORAV YAAKOV KAMENETZKY zt"l**

[Translated by Ephraim Weiss <[Easykgh@aol.com](mailto:Easykgh@aol.com)>]

"For seven days you shall dwell in Succos; every citizen of Bnei Yisroel shall dwell in a Succah."

The Gemara in Maseches Succah (28b) writes that the word BiYisrael teaches us that even Geirim are obligated in the mitzva of Succah.

There is an obvious question asked on this Gemara. Why do I need an extra drasha to teach me that Geirim are chayav in the mitzva of Succah? A ger is a full fledged member of Klal Yisroel, and is obligated to keep all the mitzvos of the Torah. Why should Succah be any different?

HaRav Yaakov Kamenetzky, zt"l offers two ways to understand this Gemara. The Gemara in Maseches Bava Basra (15a) explains that when the Torah mentions Eysan HaEzrachi, it refers to Avraham Avinu. As such, the word Ezrach, means someone that is a direct descendant of Avraham Avinu, through one of the twelve shevatim. Therefore, when

the Torah used the word Ezrach, in our pasuk, one might have thought that geirim, who do not descend from Avraham Avinu are not included in the mitzva of Succah. In order to clarify this possible misconception, the Torah specified that Geirim, like Ezrachim, are obligated to live in Succos.

The second answer is based on the Torah's explanation for the mitzva of Succah. The Torah writes that the mitzva of Succah commemorates the fact that Hashem built Succos for Klal Yisroel when they were traveling through the Midbar after yetzias Mitzrayim. There is a machlokes earlier in Maseches Succah (11b) as to whether the Succos that the Torah mentions refer to the clouds that surrounded Bnei Yisroel, and protected them from the harsh elements of the desert, or to actual huts that Hashem built for Bnei Yisroel to live in while they traveled. In any event, Geirim were not beneficiaries of the miracle of the Succos, and as such, one might mistakenly presume that they should be exempted from the mitzva of Succah. Therefore, the Torah added the word BiYisrael to teach us that all members of Klal Yisroel are obligated in the mitzva.

Succos is a Yom Tov that unites every member of Klal Yisroel, regardless of their background and origin, as illustrated by the mitzvos of Succah, and the daled minim. This Succos, let us strive to recognize the value and significance of every Jew, so that we may be zocheh to greet Moshiach as one united nation, bi'mihayra bi'yameinu, amen.

---

<http://www.aish.com/sukkotthemes/>

#### **Your Money or Your Life**

**By Rabbi Benjamin Blech**

As a generation blessed with abundant wealth, Sukkot ensures that we keep our priorities straight.

Trivia experts recognize it immediately as the line that resulted in the longest recorded laugh in radio history. Jews understand it as the underlying theme of Sukkot, the ancient festival of the harvest.

"Your money or your life" was the choice given to Jack Benny, famous for playing the role of a miserly character on his then nationally famous show, by a mugger who accosted him. When Benny didn't respond, the mugger repeated his question. After a long silence followed by a third demand for an answer, Benny replied, "I'm thinking, I'm thinking" -- and the studio audience exploded with lengthy laughter that has not had a parallel since.

How humorous to imagine that anyone can actually require time to consider which one -- money or life -- is the more appropriate response.

And how tragic to realize that all too many people, when confronted with the very same decision, make the wrong choice and pick money over everything else that gives real meaning to their lives.

On the simplest level, the irony of life is that in our youth we give up our health for the sake of wealth so that in our old age we can use our wealth to try to recapture our health.

But the reality is even more heartbreaking. G-d, in His infinite goodness, grants us days in which we can grow spiritually, help to perfect the world, make our lives filled with meaning and purpose so that we gain a measure of immortality from our limited stay on earth. And how do we opt to spend our time? By chasing after the illusion of success that we mistakenly confuse with the accumulation of material goods, as if the slogan of the Seventies that "He who dies with the most toys wins" was sacred truth instead of sarcasm.

In Biblical times, there was one season that permitted farmers to feel themselves wealthy. Harvest time was when the granaries were full, tables were laden, food was abundant. Perhaps precisely then, Jews might mistake their money for their life. So that is when G-d decreed that we observe the holiday of Sukkot, to leave the comfort of our homes, the luxury of our dwellings, the attachment to our "stuff" and our "things" in order to exchange them for the closeness with our family and the nearness to the Almighty under whose heavens we find the ultimate security and meaning for our lives.

That is why Sukkot is the holiday that speaks most powerfully to our generation. We, as perhaps never before in history, are blessed with an abundant harvest of material advantage. And we need to reflect on how we have skewed our priorities.

Just a few weeks ago Fortune Magazine came out with their annual listing of the world's wealthiest people. Although Microsoft's Bill Gates still heads the list, the Waltons comprise the richest family on earth. How instructive, then, to learn what

the last words of the founder of Walmart, the legendary Sam Walton, were as he knew he was approaching his end. As he was lying on his deathbed, he struggled to get out his last three words on earth. He had given his life for his business. In that area, he succeeded beyond anyone's wildest dreams. Yet, it was at a price. He hardly spent any time with his wife, his children, and his grandchildren. He didn't allow himself the moments of loving interaction, of cuddling a grandchild on his lap, of playing and laughing and rejoicing with his loved ones. His final three words? "I blew it!" He had the billions, but by his own admission he failed. Of course Einstein was smarter. "Try not," he said, "to become a man of success. Try rather to become a person of values." And that, even for Einstein, wasn't relative -- but an absolute truth that in all probability he absorbed from his Judaic heritage.

The Mexican Fisherman and Us

Sukkot wants us to understand the message that is so powerfully summed up in the story of the Mexican fisherman. Listen to this story and see if it relates at all to you. An American investment banker was at the pier of a small coastal Mexican village when a small boat with just one fisherman docked. Inside the small boat were several large yellow-finned tuna. The banker complimented the Mexican on the quality of his fish and asked how long it took to catch them.

The Mexican replied, "Only a little while."

The banker then asked why he didn't stay out longer and catch more fish. The Mexican said he had enough to support his family's immediate needs.

The banker was puzzled and then asked, "But what do you do with the rest of your time?"

The Mexican fisherman said, "I sleep late, swim a little, play with my children, take a siesta with my wife Maria, stroll into the village each evening where I sip wine and play guitar with my amigos. I have a full and busy life, Señor."

The banker scoffed, "I am a Harvard MBA and could help you. You should spend more time fishing and with the proceeds buy a bigger boat. With the proceeds from the bigger boat you could buy several boats. Eventually you'll have a fleet of fishing boats. Instead of selling your catch to a middle man, you would sell directly to the processor, eventually opening your own cannery. You would control the product, processing and distribution. You would need to leave this small coastal fishing village and move to Mexico City, then Los Angeles, and eventually to New York City where you will run your expanding enterprise."

The Mexican fisherman asked, "But, Señor, how long will this all take?"

To which the banker replied, "Five to ten years."

"But what then, Señor?"

The banker laughed and said, "That's the best part. When the time is right, you would announce an IPO and sell your company's stock to the public and become very rich. You would be worth millions!"

"Millions, Señor? Then what?"

The banker said, "Then you would retire, move to a small coastal fishing village, take siesta with your wife, play with your kids, stroll to the village in the evenings where you would sip wine and play your guitar with your amigos."

Yes, then, after wasting your years in the pursuit of money you might finally realize those very dreams that could have been yours without it!

So on this Sukkot, the Festival of the Harvest, perhaps we can gain the wisdom of Solomon who said it all in his book Ecclesiastes that we read on this holiday: Vanity of vanities, all is vanity... The end of the matter, when all is heard: Fear the Lord and His commandments observe.

It's no wonder that the holiday when we leave our homes and our attachment to the material to sit with our loved ones under the heavens is called "Zman Simchateinu - the Season of our Rejoicing." #22 of 24 in the Aish.com Sukkot Themes and Insights Series

---

From: **Rabbi Shlomo Riskin's Shabbat Shalom Parsha Column**

[Shabbat\_Shalom@ohrtorahstone.org.il] on behalf of Rabbi Shlomo Riskin's Shabbat Shalom Parsha Column [parshat\_hashavua@ohrtorahstone.org.il] Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2005 4:50 AM To: Rabbi Shlomo Riskin's Shabbat Shalom Parsha Column Subject: Shabbat Shalom: Parshat Haazinu - Sukkot by Rabbi Shlomo Riskin

Shabbat Shalom: Parshat Haazinu - Sukkot (Deuteronomy 32:1-32:52)

Efrat, Israel - One of the most colorful and engaging Festivals of the Hebrew calendar is Sukkot, the Festival of Huts (Booths) or Tabernacles – and in the difference between these two translations lies the major issue of this commentary. There is a great deal of pageantry in actually building and living in a miniature kind of new habitation for seven days (or eight, in the Diaspora); the earthy greens and yellows of the vegetative ceiling (sekhakh) from whose openings we must be able to see the sky, the magnificently decorated make-shift walls emblazoned with fruits

and vegetables, colorful depictions of Holy Temple celebrations bringing together past glories and future expectations, and the benign portraits and/or Biblical quotations about our special Sukkah guests, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, Joseph and David (and nowadays many add the matriarchs, Miriam, Zipporah and Deborah). Especially the children in my family looked forward to Sukkot more than to any other holiday – despite the interrupting rains we had to suffer in Manhattan during the Israeli harvest season.

But what is the real symbolism of the sukkah, what is it that we are attempting to recreate? The Sages of Talmud engage in a very fundamental dispute, with R. Akiba maintaining that the sukkah represents the actual temporary huts or booths our ancestors had to set up in the desert, and R. Yishmael arguing that the sukkah expresses the clouds of Divine glory, the rays of Divine Splendor, which encompassed the Israelites during their sojourn (B.T. Sukkah 11b); R. Akiba would call it the Festival of Huts (or Booths) and R. Yishmael the Festival of Tabernacles (Divine Sanctuary).

And this dispute is not merely a theoretical one: Rav Haym Soloveitchik maintains that the commandment of sukkah must be performed with specific intention and understanding, since the bible enjoins us "to dwell in the sukkah for seven days... in order that your future generations shall know (and understand in a precise manner) that I (the Lord) enabled the Israelites to dwell in sukkot when I took them out of the land of Egypt" (Lev. 23:42,43). So what are we experiencing in our sukkah? Is it the makeshift huts of our wanderings through the various deserts of our exiles – despite which we nevertheless managed to survive – or is it the majestic and impregnable Divine fortress of protection and spirituality which encircled us throughout the desert experience? Is the sukkah a hut or a tabernacle?

Fascinatingly enough, the official Codes of Jewish Law, the 16th century Shulhan Arukh, compiled by Rav Yosef Karo, decodes the issue: " 'You shall dwell in sukkot for seven days... because I enabled the Israelites to dwell in sukkot': these are the clouds of glory which encompassed them so that they would not be smitten by the dry heat and sun..." (Orah Haim 425,1). There is certainly a logic to this decision. Jewish Law likewise maintains that "one who is uncomfortable is freed from the obligation of dwelling in a sukkah", which is defined as the wind or the flies making it impossible to sleep in the sukkah or rain spoiling the soup you are about to eat in the sukkah (Orah Haim 640, 4).

Now generally speaking, discomfort is not a valid reason for exempting an individual from a mitzvah obligation. I have never heard it said that a person whose ear drums are discomforted by the loud music at weddings need not perform the commandment of helping the bride and groom rejoice! Apparently, therefore, there must be something intrinsic to the sukkah which makes it incompatible with discomfort. If the sukkah symbolizes the desert booth, there must certainly have been uncomfortable invasions by desert creatures and a pounding hot sun which would make sitting in such a sukkah intolerable; nevertheless, so did the Israelites live for forty years. Only if we maintain that the sukkah expresses Divine clouds of glory, impervious to any foreign element of annoyance, would it make sense to rule that one who is uncomfortable need not sit in our sukkot today.

I would argue, however, that perhaps the Talmud is teaching us another lesson entirely. The sukkot in the desert were actual make-shift huts, temporary dwelling whose occupants were vulnerable prey to all the hazards of difficult desert living conditions. But since they felt that they were living under Divine protection, that the G-d who had freed them from Egyptian slavery was still watching over them, they experienced themselves encompassed by rays of Divine splendor and they, the Israelites, became impervious to discomfort. I believe that this is the message of the Holy Zohar: "It was taught to the people of the world that anyone who has a share in the our holy nation and our holy land will dwell in the shadow of Divine faith and receive the sacred guests who will bring joy in this world and in the world to come" (Emor, 278). Whether your sukkah is a silo or a sanctuary depends on whether or not you feel that Your nation and your lands is under the loving protective covering of the Divine, come what may.

It is told that Rav Levi Yitzchak of Berditchev would sit in the sukkah and continue to eat, sing and study Torah during the worst rain storms. One of his disciples cited the Shulchan Arukh: "If rains fall, one must (leave the sukkah) and go into the house... Anyone who is freed from the commandment of sukkah (because he is uncomfortable) and still does not leave it, will not receive any reward; he is considered a commoner (Greek, idiot)" (Orah Haim 639). Responded Rav Levi Yitzchak: Indeed, anyone who can be dwelling within the Divine Rays of Splendor and still feel uncomfortable is truly a commoner!"

Perhaps the deepest message of the sukkah is that true joy and comfort stems not from a fancy palatial residence replete with expensive oak furnishings and chandeliers, but rather from familial love and togetherness within the backdrop of our Biblical guests and under the protection of a loving G-d. As the Talmud teaches, "When our love was strong, we could lie on the edge of metal implement

and there was sufficient room; now that our love is no longer strong, a bed of sixty cubits is not large enough." (B.T. Sanhedrin 7a).  
Shabbat Shalom and Chag Sameach!

---

From: Heritage House [innernet@gmail.com] Sent: Saturday, October 15, 2005 5:57 PM To: innernet@innernet.org.il Subject: InnerNet - "The 4 Species of Sukkot" INNERNET MAGAZINE OCTOBER 2005  
<http://www.innernet.org.il/categories.php?pid=17>

#### "THE 4 SPECIES OF SUKKOT"

by Rabbi Nosson Scherman

Aside from the mitzvah to sit in a Sukkah, 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 Sukkot. 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 G-d 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 G-d 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 Sukkot 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 G-dly 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 Sukkot 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 Sukkot holiday!

Excerpted from the book, "Sukkot - It's Significance, Laws and Prayers." Reprinted with permission. Published by ArtScroll/Mesorah, Brooklyn, NY. Web: [www.artscroll.com](http://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. Archives of past articles are accessible on-line at <http://www.innernet.org.il> (C) 2005 InnerNet Magazine To subscribe, send a blank e-mail to: [innernet-subscribe@innernet.org.il](mailto:innernet-subscribe@innernet.org.il)

---

From: Yeshivat Har Etzion Office [office@etzion.org.il] Sent: Sunday, October 16, 2005 2:44 PM To: yhe-holiday@etzion.org.il Subject: Special Sukkot Package  
Yeshivat Har Etzion Israel Koschitzky Virtual Beit Midrash (Vbm) Yhe-Holiday: Special Sukkot 5766 Package  
<http://vbm-torah.org/archive/chag66/suk66.htm>

It is with Hodaya la-Kadosh Barukh Hu that we dedicate this package of shiurim to Shani Berkowitz, born leil Shabbat to Kalman and Dikla. May her parents, and the entire Berkowitz-Boublil family, be zocheh to raise her le-Torah, le-chuppa u-le-maasim tovim!

#### The Beauty of the Arava

By Rav Elyakim Krumbein

On the seventh day of Sukkot, the celebrators in the Temple turned to the altar which they had been circling, and said as they were leaving: "Yofi lekha mizbeach!" -- "Beauty unto you, altar!" (Sukka 45a). Ostensibly, this refers to the altar's special decoration in honor of Hoshana Rabba -- long branches of arava (willow) were laid all around it. Yet this exclamation gives us pause. The arava is the simplest and most lacking in visual distinction of all the four species used on Sukkot. How did it, more than any of the others, come to be used, and noticed, for its aesthetic properties?

In order to understand this, we may have to sharpen our focus as to the aesthetic quality featured on Sukkot. We of course are familiar with the idea of "hadar" (beauty) required in the etrog and the other minim. But, interestingly, the innate beauty of each element, in and of itself, is not sufficient. We require (lekhatchila) that there be an eged -- the species need to be combined in a single unit. This the ultimate hadar -- the majesty inherent in harmony, the way in which one element offsets another in order to create a pleasing, striking, overall effect.

Now, the arava is the one branch which would never have been chosen for its inherent beauty. By itself it is not eye-catching in the least. Its entire significance is in its association with the others. Together with them, it creates the harmonious whole, to which it adds its own contribution. The simple green leaves create their aesthetic effect in combination with the lulav and hadasim.

Likewise, when decorating the altar, the aim is not to adorn it with a beautiful object, but to create an overall pleasing appearance. The arava will not detract by drawing undue attention to itself, but will fulfill the function of setting off the altar with refreshing greenery.

From this point of view, the lowly arava may be seen as embodying a central message of Sukkot. For this unassuming characteristic of the arava extends beyond the realm of outward appearance. Of all the species, the arava is the most water-dependent. It is called arvei nachal in the Torah, and is in constant need of water in order to grow. Its lack of self-sufficiency is evidenced, therefore, in its biology as well as in its appearance. It therefore stands to reason that the arava is a major presence when we beseech the Almighty for our own sustenance, and for rain in particular.

Turning to the word "arava" itself, we notice that the name's linguistic root means "mixture." Clearly, this tree has nothing to commend it on its own, and is constantly aware of its need to "mix" with others. All of its beauty and value come from its context. Halakhically, one of the things invalidating an arava is jagged edges on the leaves. The term for this blemish is "ke-masor" -- like the teeth of a saw. The saw-edge goes against the essence of the arava, which is combination and unity, not division.

In fact, there is a discussion among later authorities whether the arava has any clear identity at all. The Gemara, of course, gives various signs to identify the tree; but unlike the other minim, there are those who theorize that in the case of the arava, it may be possible to use any branch that has those specified physical qualities, such as eucalyptus. This view is not accepted halakha le-ma'aseh, but the very possibility does indicate something about the nature of

the arava – a branch whose essence is not to be found in its own identity, but in its ability to blend in and contribute to its surroundings.

The term arava also has a geographic connotation. It is usually a forbidding plateau, whose usefulness is not as a habitat, but as an artery for passage. Yeshayahu says (chapter 40): "Make way for the Lord! Straighten a path in the arava for our G-d!" Here again, the word is being used for an entity whose importance lies in its contextual function - connecting different places.

On a deeper level, the Gemara in Chagiga (12b) tells us that there are seven reki'im (firmaments), and that the seventh, uppermost one – the one closest to G-d Himself - is called aravot. For this reason G-d is referred to as rokhev aravot – the rider of aravot. The self-effacing nature of the arava, the feeling of lack of sufficiency and of yearning, is a prerequisite for one who wishes to be close to the Creator.

But at this point it may be possible to observe a transformation in the nature of the arava. We spoke of the inherent feeling of lack, which generates yearning. Yearning - for what? The self-evident answer is, for life itself. This connects with the prayer for rain, as we mentioned. But if we pay attention to the content of the hakafot on Hoshana Rabba, we notice a major change in the seventh hakafa, the one associated most clearly with the arava and with the seventh firmament. Whereas until then the emphasis had been on the motif of water, now the dominant idea is fire.

It appears that yearning for life has metamorphosed into yearning for that which is beyond life, which indeed can only be attained if life is forfeited. This is also a feeling that is sometimes uniquely associated with the personal characteristic of simplicity and straightforwardness, symbolized by the arava. The author of the Tanya speaks of the capacity of the simplest Jew to give up his life for G-d. A well-known story comes to mind of the simple Jew, Reb Mann, who came to the Shakh in Vilna and offered to give up his life to save the community from a blood libel. While the Shakh, the learned halakhic authority, needed time to weigh the pros and cons, Reb Mann simply went ahead and did the deed. During the Crusades, as well, Jews gave up their own and their families' lives instinctively, and left subsequent rabbis the task of sorting out their actions from the halakhic point of view.

By the time we have reached the seventh raki'a, our prayers have almost pierced their ultimate destination. In the seventh hakafa, we need the merit of the arava-like figures of Jewish history in order to overcome the final hurdle. The fire of self-sacrifice is needed to bring down the waters of life.

May the Almighty hear all our prayers.

### **The Nature of the Seven-Day Mitzva of Lulav Rav Moshe Taragin**

**By**

Although the Mishna provides an extensive list of characteristics that disqualify a lulav for use on Sukkot, it did not address the scope of these conditions. Do these situations invalidate a lulav for all seven days, or only for the first day?

The Gemara is quite clear that the ownership requirement applies only to the first day. During the remainder of Sukkot, a borrowed lulav may be used, since the Torah employed the term "lakhem" ("for you" - suggesting that one must own his lulav) specifically in the context of the first day - "U-lekachtem lakhem ba-yom ha-rishon." Undoubtedly, however, there are criteria of mitzvat lulav which apply all seven days. For example, each person must perform the mitzva and cannot rely on one public performance - "lekicha le-kol echad ve-echad." In addition, each and every one of the four species must be taken - "daled minim me'akvin." Presumably, these halakhot apply throughout yom tov (even though they, too, are derived from the word "U-lekachtem," which appears only in the context of the first day). Ultimately, a lulav gazul (stolen lulav) is disqualified based upon the issue of mitzva ha-ba'a ba-aveira (a mitzva arising from a transgression), which clearly spans the entire yom tov. What is unclear from the Mishna is whether the rules governing the quality of the lulav apply to all seven days of the yom tov.

The Gemara (Sukka 29b) seems to address this question immediately when it exclaims, "The Mishna stated these disqualifications categorically - as applying to both the first yom tov and the second yom tov." However, a second Gemara (Sukka 36b) raises serious questions about this issue. It suggests that Rabbi Chanina was allowed to use a "deficient" etrog (etrog chasser) during the final six days of Sukkot, since the requirement of taking a whole etrog applies only on the first day. This statement stands in direct contradiction to the earlier Gemara (29b), which explicitly disqualifies a dry lulav for all seven days.

The manner of resolving this issue is debated among the Rishonim. Tosafot (29b s.v. ka-pasik) claim that the two sugyot disagree. A similar position is adopted by the Ra'avad (in his Chibbur Hilkhos Lulav), who explains that the two gemarot

debate the issue of whether the term "rishon" (which designates the first day as separate from the rest) qualifies the beginning of the verse ("U-lekachtem lakhem") or even the end of the verse ("peri etz hadar," etc.). By extending the term "rishon" to the end of the verse, we limit almost all disqualifications to the first day – the position of the Gemara on 36b. Presumably, according to the Gemara on 29b, all disqualifications would apply for the entirety of Sukkot, whereas according to the Gemara on 36b, none or very few of them would. Elsewhere (29b s.v. be-nayan), Tosafot distinguish between different types of criteria. Fundamental conditions, such as the need to take all four species and the requirement that everyone take a lulav, apply throughout the holiday. The hadar concept (which is lacking in the case of a dry lulav) also is necessary during the entire holiday. Secondary issues – such as the need to take a complete etrog - do not apply during the remainder of Sukkot, since after the first day the entire mitzva is only de-rabbanan in origin. The Rabbis who enacted this law did not require or were not concerned with secondary issues, and only incorporated primary ones as part of their mitzva. Namely, the yom tov sheni leniency cited in the Gemara on 36b applies to the latter days of Yom Tov OUTSIDE THE BEIT HAMIKDASH - where the mitzva only applies mi-derabbanan. Rashi (36b s.v. Le-Rabbi Chanina) explains the contradiction in a similar manner. The position of Tosafot – distinguishing between fundamental issues and secondary ones - is quite logical. It is clear that the amount of minim (four and no less) is crucial and should apply equally to all seven days. What is less clear is Tosafot's view of "chasser" (an incomplete etrog). Why did the Rabbanan not require a complete etrog all seven days? Presumably, the integrity of the etrog is elementary, and we would thus expect Chazal to require a complete etrog throughout the seven days. The Ran (13b in the pages of the Rif) suggests one approach when he claims that an etrog chasser is invalid because it lacks the quality of hadar. Since the remainder of the etrog can provide the hadar component, the deficiency is not so severe and can be overlooked during the days in which the mitzva only applies mi-derabbanan. By contrast, the complete absence of hadar – namely, yavesh (dried out) - is insurmountable even during the final days of the mitzva.

The Rav zt"l proposed a different approach, by which an etrog chasser is invalid because the execution of the mitzva suffers. Instead of viewing the incompleteness as an inherent problem with the item itself, Tosafot might have viewed the deficiency as ruining the completeness of the lekicha - the act of taking the four species. (See, for instance, the Gemara on 34b which disqualifies the taking of fewer than four minim because it undermines the integrity of "lekicha tama" - a "complete taking.") Flaws in the item itself cannot be ignored during the final "de-rabbanan" days of the mitzva, but factors which prevent a complete execution of the act of the mitzva (a pesul in the ma'aseh mitzva) can be overlooked during these final days.

The Ramban, too, in his Chibbur Lulav, believes that leniencies may only apply during the final six days, during which the mitzva is only de-rabbanan. He, however, believes that the Gemara which did not tolerate leniencies even after the first day referred to the Temple, where the mitzva is of biblical authority all seven days. In this context, absolutely no leniencies are allowed. The Gemara (36b) which tolerated leniencies refers to everywhere outside the Temple, where the mitzva applies only mi-derabbanan after the first day, and hence leniencies are allowed. As opposed to Tosafot, who distinguished between different types of leniencies, the Ramban differentiated between different locations during the final six days of Sukkot.

We have examined several positions regarding lulav requirements which may be relaxed as the mitzva de-rabbanan replaces the mitzva de-oraita. According to all positions, however, all the lulav requirements apply during the duration of the mitzva de-oraita. Namely, within the Temple – where the mitzva de-oraita extends all seven days – no leniencies are tolerated. When the Gemara (36b) allowed leniencies on yom tov sheni, it referred to the final days outside the Temple, where the mitzva is only de-rabbanan.

The Rambam, however, adopts a novel position. In Hilkhos Lulav (8:9), he claims that MOST disqualifications are suspended during the final six days - presumably even within the Mikdash (Temple), where the mitzva remains de-oraita throughout Sukkot. Evidently, the Rambam distinguished between different levels within the mitzva de-oraita. Rav Moshe Soloveitchik explained that the mitzva in the Mikdash is of a very different sort than the basic/universal mitzva. When describing the basic mitzva, the Torah employs the term "lekicha," taking, while it presents the concept of simcha (joy) when describing the extended mitzva of the Mikdash. According to the Rambam, the seven-day requirement in the Mikdash is really a mitzva to create joy; the four species are merely the media to generate this experience. Indeed, the Yerushalmi (Sukka 3:11) actually suggests that the concept of "simchat lulav" constitutes the primary fulfillment of simchat Yom Tov. It should also be noted that in addition to the standard mitzva of simchat Yom Tov, Sukkot enjoys a special and heightened mitzva of simcha (see especially

Rambam, Hilkhot Lulav 8:12-13). Independent support for this explanation of the Rambam can be drawn from his own formulation in his Sefer Ha-mitzvot (mitzvat asef #169), where he describes the mitzva as "taking the lulav and CELEBRATING." This perspective - according to Rav Moshe - accounts for the Rambam's relaxing the standards of lulav even during the period of the mitzva de-oraita.

An interesting question might be posed within the structure suggested by Rav Moshe in the Rambam. What relationship, if any, exists between the original mitzva of lekicha and the Mikdash-based mitzva of simcha? Presumably, within the Mikdash itself the two mitzvot can overlap or coincide. By picking up the four species in the Mikdash, one has fulfilled both lekicha as well as simcha. What would happen, however, if someone took the four species at home and subsequently traveled to the Mikdash? Would he have to take the four species a second time in order to fulfill his mitzva of simcha? This question is posed by the Chatam Sofer, who addresses the dynamic BETWEEN these two proposed types of the mitzva. NOTE: This shiur is based on an article in Kovetz Chiddushei Torah, a compendium of articles by Rav Moshe Soloveitchik and the Rav.