



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

### Succah Daf Lamed Hey

#### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says "pri eitz hadar", which teaches that what is meant is the fruit of a tree whose branches taste like its fruit. From here we learn that it is an esrog that must be used.
  - **Q:** Maybe it refers to pepper (the spice), as **R' Meir** says in a Braisa that its tree tastes like the pepper itself? **A:** The mitzvah can't be done with pepper, because taking one kernel will not even be noticeable. Taking more than one kernel would not work because the pasuk says "pri", meaning that only one should be taken.

The Braisa continues, that **Rebbi** says, the pasuk should be read as saying "pri eitz *hadir*" – the fruit of a corral. This means to teach that just as in a corral there are animals of all sizes and qualities, this fruit must come from a tree that contains many sizes and qualities of the fruit.

- **Q:** All fruit trees have different sized fruits on it!? **A:** The pasuk is referring to a tree that has the fruits of the old crop still on it when the new crop arrives, which is the esrog tree.

The Braisa continues, **R' Avahu** says, the pasuk should be read as saying "pri eitz *hador*", which refers to a tree on which the fruit "remain" from one year to the next, which is the esrog tree.

**Ben Azzai** says, the pasuk should be understood as if it said "idur", meaning water, referring to a tree that needs more than just rainwater to survive, which is the esrog tree.

#### SHEL ASHEIRAH V'SHEL IHR HANIDACHAS PASSUL

- The reason it is passul is because since it must be burned, it is considered as if it even currently does not have the necessary shiur required for an esrog.

#### SHEL ORLAH PASSUL

- **R' Chiya bar Avin** and **R' Assi** argue as to the reason why the esrog is passul: one says it is passul because it is assur to be eaten (and therefore is not properly considered to be "lachem"), and the other says it is because it is not considered to be your money (and is therefore not "lachem").
  - **Q:** Our Mishna said, an esrog of tamei terumah is passul. Now tamei terumah may not be eaten, but is mutar to have hana'ah from and is therefore considered to be his money. This is a proof to the view that the reason for the pessul is the issur to eat it!? **A:** All agree that the esrog used for the mitzvah must be mutar to eat. The machlokes is whether there is an additional requirement necessitating that it be mutar to benefit from as well.
    - The difference between the shitos will be whether one can use an esrog of ma'aser sheini in Yerushalayim (which may be eaten) according to **R' Meir** (who says that ma'aser sheini is considered to not belong to the one who made it ma'aser).
    - We can prove that **R' Assi** is the one who says that one must be allowed to benefit from an esrog in order for it to be valid for the mitzvah, because **R' Assi** says that an esrog of ma'aser sheini in Yerushalayim may not be used according to **R' Meir**, but may be used according to **Rabanan** (who say that the esrog is considered to be belonging to the one who made it ma'aser).
- The statement of **R' Assi** quoted partially above, stated: **R' Assi** said, according to **R' Meir**, who says that ma'aser sheini is considered to belong to Hashem, an esrog of ma'aser sheini cannot be used to fulfill one's obligation on Succos, matzah of ma'aser sheini cannot be used to fulfill one's matzah obligation on Pesach, and dough made of ma'aser sheini would be patur from challah. According to the **Rabanan**, who say that ma'aser sheini is considered to belong to the

person, an esrog of ma'aser sheini may be used, matzah of ma'aser sheini may be used, and dough of ma'aser sheini would be chayuv in challah.

- **Q: R' Pappa** asked, it is understandable why the dough would be patur according to **R' Meir**, because the pasuk regarding challah says "arisoseichem" – **your** dough. The din regarding an esrog makes sense as well, because the pasuk says "lachem" – **yours**. However, why can't matzah of ma'aser be used!? **A: Rabbah bar Shmuel** said, there is a gezairah shava from matzah to challah to teach that it must be "yours".
- Maybe we can bring a proof to **R' Assi**, because a Braisa says that **R' Meir** says dough of ma'aser sheini is not chayuv in challah and the **Rabanan** say that it is.
  - **Q:** This is a *clear* proof! Why say "maybe" this is a proof? **A:** The Gemara meant to say, maybe we can say that since the Braisa says they argue regarding a dough of ma'aser, they would similarly argue regarding an esrog and matzah of ma'aser. However, it is possible to say that the Braisa only says that **R' Meir** would hold this way regarding dough, because the Torah says the word "arisoseichem" multiple times.

#### SHEL TERUMAH TEMEI'AH PESSULA

- This esrog would be passul, because it may not be eaten.

#### V'SHEL TERUMAH TEHORAH LO YITOL

- **R' Ami** and **R' Assi** argue as to the reason an esrog of terumah should not be used: one says because it will become wet from the lulav and thereby become "muchshar l'kabel tumah", making it one step closer to making the terumah become tamei (which one may not do), and the other says because handling the esrog over the entire Yom Tov will make the esrog become spoiled, which one may not do to terumah.
  - The difference between the shitos is where one makes the esrog terumah besides the outside peel. The concern for making the whole esrog muchshar still applies, however the concern for spoilage does not (only the peel spoils from the handling).

#### V'IHM NATAL KESHEIRAH

- Such an esrog is valid, because it is mutar to be eaten, and is considered to be owned by the Kohen who has it.

#### V'SHEL DEMAI

- **Q:** One may not eat demai, so why does **B"H** say that an esrog of demai may be used? **A:** Since, if a person wants, he can make all his possessions hefker, and thereby become a poor person, in which case **B"H** say he may eat demai, it is therefore valid for him now as well.

#### SHEL MA'ASER SHEINI SHE'B'YERUSHALAYIM

- Such an esrog should not be used for the reasons given by the different opinions above (he makes it muchshar, or he spoils it).

#### V'IHM NATAL KESHEIRAH

- According to the opinion that an esrog must be mutar to eat, this esrog may be used according to all, because it is mutar to eat. According to the opinion that an esrog must be considered as belonging to the person, the Mishna follows the **Rabanan** who say that ma'aser sheini is considered to belong to the one who made it ma'aser.

#### ALSAH CHAZAZIS

- **R' Chisda said in the name of Rav**, this is only a problem if the boils are on one area of the esrog. However, if they are spaced over a few areas, it would be valid.
  - **Q: Rava** asked, it is even worse if it is spread over a few areas, because the esrog is then spotted all over!? **A: R' Chisda's** statement was made regarding the next part of the Mishna that said that if the boils only cover a minority of the esrog, it is valid. On that, **R' Chisda said in the name of Rav**, that is only if they are in one spot. However, if they are spread over a few areas, the esrog is passul.
  - **Rava** said, if there is even the slightest boil on the "nose" of the esrog (the place where the body of the esrog begins to slant towards its top), the esrog is passul.

#### NITLAH PITMASO

- **R' Yitzchak ben Elazar** said, this refers to when the piece resembling a spice crusher is broken off.

## NIKLAH

- **Rava** says, if an esrog's outer layer is peeled, and the esrog then becomes a reddish color, it is still valid.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna said that a peeled esrog is passul!? **A:** When the entire esrog is peeled it is valid (because it is one uniform color). When only parts of the esrog are peeled, it is passul (because it looks like a spotted esrog).