



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

### Succah Daf Lamed Daled

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says "arvei nachal", which refers to aravos that grow by the river. This excludes the "tzaftzafa", which are aravos that grow in the mountains.
  - **R' Zeira** said, a pasuk teaches that the tzaftzafa is inferior and is not considered to be an aravah. The pasuk says, "He took that which grows by the waters (i.e. the aravah) and made it as a tzaftzafa". We see that the tzaftzafa is different and inferior to the aravah.
    - **Q: Abaye** asked, maybe the pasuk is explaining that the thing that grows by the water is the tzaftzafa!? **A:** If that was true, the pasuk wouldn't have said "and made it".
    - **R' Avahu** explains the pasuk to mean: Hashem says, I said that the Yidden should be like an aravah before me, but they made themselves as the tzaftzafa.
- A Braisa says, the aravah has a red stem, long leaves, and a smooth edge. The tzaftzafa has a white stem, round leaves, and edges that are jagged like a sickle.
  - **Q:** A Braisa said that an aravah like a sickle is valid!? **A:** The Braisa is discussing the "chilfa gila", which is a true aravah which happens to be jagged like a sickle.
    - **Abaye** said, we can learn from here that the chilfa gila is valid as an aravah.
      - **Q:** That is obvious!? **A:** We would think that it is passul because it has an accompanying name. Therefore, the pasuk says "arvei", which teaches to include an aravah of any name.
- **R' Chisda** said, there are 3 things whose names changed when the Churban occurred: what used to be called a tzaftzafa is now called an aravah and visa-versa. The significance is regarding the mitzvah of arbah minim, because what *used* to be called an aravah is what must be used; what was a shofar is now called chatzotzros, what was chatzotzros is now called a shofar. The difference is, that we must use what used to be called a shofar, for Rosh Hashana; what was a "pesorah" (big table) is now called a "pesorta" (what used to refer to a small table), and visa-versa. Difference is, for the standard use of the term in commerce.
  - **Abaye** added, the "huvlila" is now called the "bei kasi" (2 different parts of a kosher animal's stomach) and visa-versa. Difference is, one of these makes the animal a treifah only if it is punctured through and through. The other makes an animal a treifah even if it is only punctured on one side. Therefore, one must know which is which.
  - **Rava bar Yosef** added, the place originally called "Bavel" is today called "Bursif" and visa-versa. The difference is for divorces – either because the people of Bavel were considered experts in gittin, so we must know where the original Bavel truly is, or to make sure that we write the proper, current city name on the "get".

### MISHNA

- **R' Yishmael** says, one must take 3 hadassim, 2 aravos, one lulav, and one esrog. The hadassim are valid even if two have their tops chopped off and one is not chopped off. **R' Tarfon** says, even if all 3 have chopped off tops, they are valid. **R' Akiva** says, just like one only needs to take one lulav and one esrog, he also only needs to take one hadas and one aravah.

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, regarding esrog the pasuk says "pri", which teaches that only one is needed, regarding lulav the pasuk says "kapas" which teaches that only one is needed, regarding hadassim the pasuk says "anaf eitz avos" each word teaching that a hadas is needed, for a total

of 3 hadassim, and regarding aravos the pasuk says “arvei nachal”, written in the plural, which teaches that 2 aravos are needed. As long as one of the 3 hadassim are not chopped off at the top, that is sufficient. **R’ Tarfon** says, all 3 hadassim may be chopped off at the top. **R’ Akiva** says, just like one only needs to take one lulav and one esrog, he also only needs to take one hadas and one aravah. **R’ Eliezer** said, one would think that the esrog should be bound with the other species. To prevent this thought, the Torah does not connect the mention of esrog to the mention of lulav with the conjunctive “and”. The pasuk also teaches us that each of the minim are essential, because the pasuk says “u’likachtem” – which we darshen to mean, you should take a complete taking.

- **Q:** According to **R’ Yishmael**, if he requires the hadassim to be complete, then all 3 should need to be complete. If he does not require that, then none of them should need to be complete!? **A: Bira’a in the name of R’ Ami** said, **R’ Yishmael** retracted his opinion and held that only one hadas is necessary. It was regarding that one hadas that he said it must be complete.
- **R’ Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, the halacha follows **R’ Tarfon**.
  - **Shmuel** follows his opinion elsewhere, because he threatened the hadassim merchants that if they raise their prices unjustifiably, he will let all know that the halacha follows **R’ Tarfon**, which will have the result of driving prices down.

#### MISHNA

- An esrog that is stolen or dried out is passul. An esrog of an asheirah tree or of an ihr hanidachas is also passul. An esrog of orlah is passul. An esrog that is tamei terumah is passul. If an esrog is of tahor terumah, it should not be used, but is valid b’dieved. Regarding an esrog of demai, **B”S** say it is passul and **B”H** say it is valid. An esrog of ma’aser sheini in Yerushalayim should not be used, but is valid b’dieved.
- If there are boils on the majority of the esrog, if its pitam was removed, if its peel was removed, if it was split, or if it has a hole with even a tiny piece missing, the esrog is passul. If there are boils on a minority of the esrog, if the “ukatz” (the bottom stem) was removed, or if it has a hole but nothing at all is missing, it is valid.
- An esrog that comes from Kush (and is very dark) is passul. Regarding an esrog that is green like a leek, **R’ Meir** says it is valid, but **R’ Yehuda** says it is passul.
- **R’ Meir** says an esrog must at least be the size of a walnut. **R’ Yehuda** says it must at least be the size of an egg.
- **R’ Yehuda** says the maximum size of an esrog is that one must be able to hold two of them in one hand. **R’ Yose** says, the maximum size of an esrog is such that one must be able to hold one esrog in both of his hands.