

Daf 25a

Come and hear proof from another source: With regard to **one who established his Shabbat residence on a mound that is ten handbreadths high and its area is anywhere from four cubits to two *beit se'a***; and similarly, with regard to one who established his Shabbat residence **in a natural cavity of a rock that is ten handbreadths deep and its area is anywhere from four cubits to two *beit se'a***; and similarly, with regard to one who established his Shabbat residence in a field of **reaped grain, and rows of stalks ten handbreadths high that have not been reaped surround it**, serving as a partition enclosing the reaped area, **he may walk in the entire enclosed area and outside it an additional two thousand cubits**. Apparently, the stalks are a fit partition **although they sway back and forth** in the wind. The Gemara refutes this proof: **There, too**, it is a fit partition due to the fact **that he established** the partition by tying it **with hard palm leaves and laurel leaves**.

ת"ש שבת בתל שהוא גבוה עשרה והוא מארבע אמות עד בית סאתים וכן בנקע שהוא עמוק עשרה והוא מארבע אמות עד בית סאתים וכן קמה קצורה ושבולות מקיפות אותה מהלך את כולה וחוצה לה אלפים אמה אע"ג דקאזיל ואתי התם נמי דעביד ליה בהוצא ודפנא:

Comment/Chiddush

Any fenced area that is uninhabited can only be considered a private domain if it is less than to *beit seah*.

MISHNA: Those on the path to perform a mitzva are exempt from the mitzva of *sukka*. The ill and their caretakers are exempt from the mitzva of *sukka*. One may eat and drink in the framework of a casual meal outside the *sukka*.

שלוחי מצוה פטורין מן הסוכה חולין מתני' ומשמשיהן פטורין מן הסוכה אוכלין ושותין עראי חוץ לסוכה:

Comment/Chiddush

Rashi provides going to a reception for one's rebbe on Yomtov as an example of a mitzva-trip. Even though it is only rabbinical in its obligation, presumably, it yet frees one from being required to perform other – biblical – mitzvot!

GEMARA: The Gemara asks: **From where are these matters** derived that one who is performing a mitzva is exempt from the mitzva of *sukka*? **The Sages taught** in a *baraita* that it is written in the Torah that one recites *Shema* at the following times: "When you sit in your house, and when you walk by the way, and when you lie down, and when you rise up" ([Deuteronomy 6:7](#)). The Sages interpret: "**When you sit in your house,**" to the exclusion of one who is engaged in the performance of a mitzva, who is not sitting at home; "**and when you walk by the way,**" to the exclusion of a groom, who is preoccupied with his mitzva of consummating the marriage and is not walking along the way. The *baraita* adds that **from here** the Sages stated: **One who marries a virgin is exempt** from reciting *Shema* on his wedding night, **and one who marries a widow is obligated**.

גמ' מה"מ דת"ר (דברים ו, ז) בשבתך בביתך פרט לעוסק במצוה ובלכתך בדרך פרט לחתן מכאן אמרו הכונס את הבתולה פטור ואת האלמנה חייב

Comment/Chiddush

Rashi – although the groom is not physically engaged in any way, only his mind is taken up, that suffices.

The Gemara asks: **From where** may it be inferred in this verse that a groom is exempt from the mitzva of *Shema*? **Rav Huna said:** The circumstances when one is obligated to recite *Shema* are like the circumstances when one walks along **the way: Just as** the walking by the **way** described in the verse is **voluntary** and involves no mitzva, **so too**, all those obligated to recite *Shema* are similarly engaged in **voluntary** activities, **to the exclusion of this groom, who is engaged in** the performance of a mitzva.

מאי משמע אמר רב הונא כדרך מה דרך רשות אף כל רשות לאפוקי האי דבמצוה עסוק

Comment/Chiddush

How can the source of a groom, who merely refrains from performing a mitzva, compare with *sukka*, where one actively eats outside of one? It would seem that *sukka* too is passive, merely refraining to sit in a *sukka*. The eating is not an active violation. Rabbi Akiva Eiger.

Daf 25a

The Gemara asks: The verse does not specify the way along which one is walking. **Are we not dealing with one who is walking** along the way **for a matter of a mitzva, and nevertheless, the Merciful One says to recite Shema?** Apparently, one is obligated to do so even if he set out to perform a mitzva. The Gemara answers: **If it is so** that the intention was to obligate even those who are engaged in performance of a mitzva, **let the verse state: When sitting and when walking. What is the meaning of: "When you sit...and when you walk"?** It comes to underscore: **It is in your walking**, undertaken for personal reasons and of one's own volition, **that you are obligated** to recite *Shema*; **in walking** with the objective of performing a mitzva, **you are exempt** from reciting *Shema*.

מי לא עסקינן דקאזיל לדבר מצוה וקא אמר רחמנא ליקרי אם כן לימא קרא בשבת ובלכת מאי בשבתך ובלכתך בלכת דידך הוא דמיחייבת הא בלכת דמצוה פטירת

The Gemara asks: **If so, even one who marries a widow** should **also** be exempt, as he too is engaged in the performance of a mitzva. That, however, contradicts the *baraita*. The Gemara responds that there is a distinction between one marrying a virgin and one marrying a widow. **One who marries a virgin is preoccupied** by his concern lest he discover that his bride is not a virgin, while **one who marries a widow is not preoccupied**.

אי הכי אפילו כונס את האלמנה נמי כונס את הבתולה טריד כונס אלמנה לא טריד

Comment/Chiddush

Although he who marries a widow is also engaged in a mitzva, he may safely take the time to say shma without harming the mitzvah, which is not the case by someone who marries a virgin.

The Gemara asks: **And wherever one is preoccupied is he indeed exempt? But if that is so**, then one **whose ship sank at sea, who is preoccupied**, should **also** be exempt. The Gemara reinforces its question: **And if you say that indeed, that is so, didn't Rabbi Abba bar Zavda say that Rav said: A mourner is obligated in all the mitzvot mentioned in the Torah, including reciting Shema, except for the mitzva to don phylacteries, from which he is exempt, as the term splendor is stated with regard to phylacteries?** If a mourner, who is clearly pained and preoccupied, is obligated to recite *Shema*, then certainly all others who are preoccupied, even one whose ship sank at sea, whose loss was merely monetary (*Birkat Hashem*), should be obligated. Why, then, is a groom exempted due to his preoccupation and one who lost his property is not?

וכל היכא דטריד ה"נ דפטור אלא מעתה טבעה ספינתו בים דטריד הכי נמי דפטור וכי תימא ה"נ והאמר ר' אבא בר זבדא אמר רב אבל חייב בכל המצות האמורות בתורה חוץ מן התפילין שהרי נאמר בהן פאר

Comment/Chiddush

There are two reasons given by Rashi why a mourner is exempt from phylacteries; one is that it is disrespectful for a mourner, rolling in ashes, to wear them. And two is that these represent jewelry to us, inappropriate for a mourner.

The Gemara answers: Nevertheless, there is a distinction between the cases. **Here**, in the case of a groom, **he is preoccupied with the preoccupation of a mitzva** that he must perform; **there**, in the case of a ship lost at sea, **he is preoccupied with the preoccupation of a voluntary act** that he chooses to perform.

הכא טריד טירדא דמצוה התם טריד טירדא דרשות

Comment/Chiddush

There is certainly a definite obligation to mourn, but feeling pain in the heart is not an obligation. Rishonim.

§ The Gemara asks: **And is the halakhic principle that one who is engaged in a mitzva is exempt from performing another mitzva derived from here? It is derived from there, as it is taught** in a *baraita* that it is written: **"There were certain men who were impure by the corpse of a person** and they could not observe the *Pesah* on that day" ([Numbers 9:6](#)). Before proceeding with the discussion, the *baraita* seeks to clarify with regard to **those men** who became impure: **Who were they?** The *baraita* answers: **They were the bearers of**

והעוסק במצוה פטור מן המצוה מהכא נפקא מהתם נפקא דתניא (במדבר ט, ו) ויהי אנשים אשר היו טמאים לנפש אדם וגו' אותם אנשים מי

Daf 25a

Joseph's coffin, which the Jewish people brought with them in the desert. This is the statement of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili.

היו נושאי ארונו של יוסף
היו דברי ר' יוסי הגלילי

Comment/Chiddush

Why wasn't Moshe himself impure, for he was the one who first took the coffin? The answer is that he had purified himself in the interim. Alternatively, before the giving of the Torah Jews were not rendered impure from a corpse.