



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Succah Daf Lamed Aleph

- A Braisa says, **R' Eliezer** says, a stolen succah, and a succah that is built on public property are passul. The **Chachomim** say it is valid.
 - **R' Nachman** said, the machlokes is only where one forces an owner out of a succah and then uses that succah as his own. In that case **R' Eliezer** says he is not yotzeh, because he holds that one is only yotzeh in a succah of his own. Therefore, whether he holds that land can be "stolen" (in which case it is a stolen succah) or whether he holds that land cannot be stolen (in which case it would be as if he is borrowing the succah), he will not be yotzeh the mitzvah of succah. The **Rabanan** say it is valid, because they say that land cannot be stolen. Therefore, it is as if this "thief" is sitting in a borrowed succah, which they hold is valid. However, **R' Eliezer** and the **Rabanan** would agree, that in a case where one stole wood and built a succah with it, he is yotzeh his mitzvah, and he only needs to pay for the value of the wood that he stole.
 - This must be the machlokes, because the Braisa compares the case of a stolen succah to the case of one built on public property. Just like in this second case the case under discussion is where the land does not belong to him, the first case must be discussing the same set of circumstances.
 - A woman complained to **R' Nachman** that the Reish Galusa's succah was built with wood that was stolen from her, and she wanted it returned. **R' Nachman** told her, she could only get the value of the wood returned, but could not force the return of the actual wood.
 - **Ravina** said, the **Rabanan** said that a stolen beam that is used in a succah need not be removed and returned, rather, the thief can simply pay the money for the beam (this was instituted to help one do teshuva, by not requiring him to dismantle his succah and make it more difficult to do teshuva).
 - **Q:** We already said he need not return the actual wood of the succah, so why would we think a beam is different? **A:** We may have said that a good beam is more difficult to find and purchase and he should therefore be required to return the actual beam. **Ravina** teaches that he need not do so.
 - This leniency only applies during Succos. Once Succos is over, he must dismantle the succah and return the beam. However, if he permanently installed the beam (e.g. with cement), even after Succos he need not return the actual beam.
- A Braisa says, a dried out lulav is passul, but **R' Yehuda** says it is valid.
 - **Rava** said, the machlokes is only regarding a dried out lulav. The **Rabanan** (the **T"K**) say that we compare lulav to esrog (regarding which the Torah says it must be "hadar"), and a lulav must also be hadar, and is therefore passul if it is dried out. **R' Yehuda** says that we do not compare lulav to esrog, and therefore a dried out lulav is valid. However, all agree that an esrog must be hadar.
 - **Q:** In Our Mishna **R' Yehuda** says that one must bind the lulav. Presumably this is so that it should be nice, and proves that **R' Yehuda** requires hadar by lulav as well!? **A:** A Braisa explains that **R' Yehuda** requires it because the Torah refers to the lulav as "kapos temarim", from which he learns that the lulav must be closed, and if it is not, it must be tied together.

- **Q:** A Mishna says that **R' Yehuda** says the lulav may only be bound with a ring made of the lulav itself. Presumably this is to make it nice, and we see that he requires hadar for the lulav as well!? **A: Rava** explained that **R' Yehuda** holds that the binding of the lulav is part of the mitzvah. The reason it must be made of the lulav itself is so that the mitzvah of binding not be done with a new species (that is not part of the 4 needed for the mitzvah). It has nothing to do with hadar.
- **Q:** A Braisa says that a dried out lulav and esrog may not be used, and **R' Yehuda** says that it may be used. We see that he doesn't even require hadar for the esrog!? **A: R' Yehuda** was only referring to the lulav, not the esrog.
 - **Q:** The Braisa said that just as one may not use less than the 4 species, one may also not use more than the four. That seems obvious!? **A:** We would think that since **R' Yehuda** says that binding is necessary, if one brings a fifth species and doesn't bind it to the other four it should not be a problem. The Braisa teaches that that case is still a problem.
 - **Q:** The Braisa says, if one doesn't have an esrog, he should not use another fruit in its place. That seems obvious!? **A:** We would think that one should use another fruit so that people should not forget that a fruit is needed. The Braisa teaches that this should not be done, because people may come to think that any fruit may be used.
- **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** says that an old, dried out esrog is valid!? **A: TEYUFTA of Rava.**
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that **R' Yehuda** says that a green esrog is passul. Presumably this is because he requires an esrog to be hadar!? **A:** He says it is passul because a green esrog is not fully ripe yet, not because he holds that it needs to be hadar.
 - **Q: R' Yehuda** says that an esrog must be the larger size of an egg. Presumably this is because he requires an esrog to be hadar!? **A:** He says it is passul if it is smaller, because it is not fully ripe yet, not because he holds that it needs to be hadar.
 - **Q: R' Yehuda** says that an esrog must not be too large (one must be able to hold two of them in one hand). Presumably this is because he requires an esrog to be hadar!? **A:** He says it must not be larger than that, so that if one needs to maneuver the esrog into his left hand and the lulav into his right hand, he will not drop the esrog and cause it to become passul.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Yehuda**, why does the pasuk say "hadar" altogether? **A:** It teaches that the esrog is a fruit that stays on its tree from year to year.

SHEL ASHEIRAH V'SHEL IHR HANIDACHAS

- **Q: Rava** said that a lulav used for avodah zarah is valid b'dieved!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing an asheirah from the times of Moshe Rabbeinu, which must be burned. Therefore, it is as if it is burned and it lacks the minimum size necessary for a lulav.

NIKTAM ROSHO

- **R' Huna** said, it is only passul if the top is cut off. However, if the top is only split, it remains valid.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that a lulav that is split is passul!? **A: R' Pappa** said, the Braisa is discussing where the lulav is split so severely that it is shaped like the letter "Y".
 - The Braisa said that if a lulav is bent like a sickle, it is passul. **Rava** said, that is only if it is bent to the front (away from the spine). However, if it is bent towards the spine it remains valid, because that is its normal way of growing. **R' Nachman** said, if it is bent to one of the sides it is passul. Others say that it is valid.
 - **Rava** said, a lulav that has leaves on only one side of the spine, is passul.