



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

Succah Daf Lamed Gimmel

NIKTAM ROSHO

- **Ulla bar Chinina** said, if the top of the hadas was chopped off, but a berry grew in its place, it is valid.
 - **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked, what is the halacha if the top was chopped off before Yom Tov and the berry grew on Yom Tov? Does the concept of "dichuy" (rejection) apply to mitzvos, and since this was passul at the start of Yom Tov it remains passul, or not?
 - **Q:** He should have been able to answer that from a Mishna which says that if the wind covered the blood of a chaya or a bird (whose blood must be covered for the mitzvah of kisuy hadam), and it then became uncovered, one must cover the blood again. The Gemara there asked, the blood should not have to be covered again, because when the blood was covered it had the status of "rejecting" the mitzvah, and therefore should not need to be covered if it later became uncovered? **R' Pappa** answered, that we don't apply this concept of dichuy to mitzvos. **R' Yirmiya** should have learned his answer from **R' Pappa**!? **A:** He was unsure whether **R' Pappa** actually held this way (and would say so for a leniency as well) or only held this way out of doubt (and would only hold this way when it resulted in a chumra). This question remains a **TEIKU**.
 - **Q:** Maybe the idea of whether we apply dichuy to mitzvos is a machlokes among Tanna'im. A Braisa says that if one pulled off the berries from the hadassim on Yom Tov, **R' Elazar ben Tzadok** says the hadassim are passul, and the **Rabanan** say they are valid. Now, presumably all say that we learn the halachos of the 4 minim (lulav, esrog, haddasim and aravos) from succah, that they too must be "ta'aseh v'lo min he'asuy" (that the 4 minim must be valid at the time they are bound together, not first after they are bound together). Based on this, the **Rabanan** must hold that we don't apply the concept of dichuy to mitzvos and **R' Elazar ben Tzadok** must hold that we do!? **A1:** It may be that all hold that we do not apply dichuy to mitzvos. The machlokes may be whether we learn the 4 minim from succah, that the 4 minim must also be "ta'aseh v'lo min he'asuy". **A2:** The machlokes may be whether or not the lulav, haddasim and aravos need to be bound together to be valid. **R' Elazar ben Tzadok** holds that they must be bound, and also learns from succah that they must be "ta'aseh v'lo min he'asuy". The **Rabanan** say that they need not be.
 - The Gemara learns from a Braisa, that even according to the **Rabanan**, who argue on **R' Yehuda**, and hold that one need not bind the arba minim, they would still say there is a mitzvah to bind them under the concept of "zeh Keili v'anveihu" (to beautify the mitzvah).

OY SHEHAYU ANAVAV MIRUBIN

- **R' Chisda** said in the name of **Rav**, the berries are only problematic when they are all in one place. However, if they are spread out in a few different places, the hadas will be valid.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, if it is spread out in 2 or 3 places it will make the hadas look like it has black dots, and should surely be passul!? **A: R' Chisda** must have said that it is only passul if the berries are black. However, if the berries are green it will not be passul, because they are the same color as the hadas and are less noticeable.
 - **R' Pappa** added, red berries have the status of black berries.

IHM MI'ATAN KASHER

- **Q:** When did he remove the berries? If he did it before the hadas was bound to the lulav, it is obvious that it will be valid! If he did it after it was bound, the hadas was passul as it was bound. If it is still valid, we should learn from here that we don't apply dichuy to mitzvos!? **A:** He removed the berries after the hadas was bound to the lulav, but before Yom Tov. The binding before the onset of Yom Tov is only a preparatory act (the mitzvah begins when Yom Tov begins). Therefore, we would not say dichuy here, because that is only said when it was passul at the time that the mitzvah had begun.

V'EIN MIMA'ATAN B'YOM TOV

- **Q:** The Mishna suggests that if one went ahead and removed the berries on Yom Tov, it will be valid. Now, when did the berries become black (and thereby make the hadas passul)? If it happened before Yom Tov, that would mean that the hadas was passul at the onset of Yom Tov, and we should learn that we do not apply dichuy to mitzvos!? If the berries became black after the onset of Yom Tov, we should learn that if something is fit, and then became unfit, and then became fit again, that it remains valid and that we don't say dichuy at least in that case!? **A:** It became black before Yom Tov. Therefore, we can learn that something that is passul at the onset of the mitzvah does not become dachuy forever. However, we cannot answer for the situation where something is fit, then unfit, and then fit again.
- A Braisa says, one may not pick off the berries on Yom Tov. **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** says it may be done.
 - **Q:** He is "fixing" something on Yom Tov, so how can **R' Elazar** allow that to be done!? **A:** He picks off the berries to eat them, and **R' Elazar** holds like his father, that something done without intent is mutar (he is fixing the hadas without intent to do so).
 - **Q: Abaye and Rava** both say that **R' Shimon** would agree that when the unintended result is certain to happen, it is assur!? **A:** The person has other hadassim to use. Therefore, it is not considered as if he is fixing the hadas, because he has another one to use and therefore doesn't need this one.
- A Braisa says, if the binding became undone on Yom Tov, he should retie them by simply wrapping them together (no knot).
 - **Q:** Why can't he make a bow? **A:** The Braisa follows **R' Yehuda** who says that for purposes of Shabbos, tying a bow has the same status as tying a knot.
 - **Q: R' Yehuda** says that the lulav must be tied with a knot in order to be yotzeh!? **A:** The Tanna of the Braisa holds like **R' Yehuda** regarding the status of a bow, but does not hold like him regarding the binding of a lulav.

MISHNA

- An arava that is stolen or is dried out is passul. An arava from an asheirah tree or from an ihr hanidachas is also passul. An arava whose top has been chopped off, whose leaves have been torn off, or from a "tzaftzafa" (an arava with round leaves), is passul. If its leaves are somewhat dried out, or if some of its leaves have fallen off, or an arava that grew in a field (not near a river), are valid.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says "arvei nachal". This teaches that that the arava should come from one that is grown near a river. Another interpretation is, that the arava should have long leaves, like a river.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk says "arvei nachal". How do we know that even an arava that grew in a field or in the mountains is valid? The pasuk says "arvei" in the plural form, to teach that all types are valid. **Abba Shaul** says, the plural form teaches that aravos are needed for the lulav, and aravos are needed for another mitzvah of using them to walk around the Mizbe'ach as well.
 - **Q:** How does the T"K learn this second mitzvah of **Abba Shaul**? **A:** He says it is a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai.