

2 Elul 5781  
August 10, 2021



Sukkah Daf 34

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

**Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Our Rabbis taught: ‘Willows of the brook’ means those that grow by the brook excluding the tzaftzafah which is a willow that grows on the mountains. Rabbi Zeira said: Where is its Scriptural support? — He placed it beside many waters, he set it as a tzaftzafah. Abaye said to him: Is it not possible that [the latter part] is merely an explanation: ‘He placed it beside many waters’, and what was it? A tzaftzafah? — If so, what was the need for ‘he set it’? Rabbi Avahu explained it: The Holy One, Blessed be He, said: I intended that Israel should be before Me as something placed beside many waters, that is, a willow, but they have made themselves as a tzaftzafah of the mountains. (34a1)

Some teach this verse in connection with the Baraisa: ‘He placed it beside many waters, he set it as a tzaftzafah’. To this Rabbi Zeira asked: Is it not possible that [the latter part] is merely an explanation: ‘He placed it beside many waters’ and what was it? A tzaftzafah? — If so, what could be the meaning of ‘he set it’? Rabbi Avahu explained it: The Holy One, Blessed be He, said: I intended that Israel should be before Me as something placed beside many waters, that is, a willow, and they have made themselves as a tzaftzafah of the mountains. (34a1)

Our Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: What is a willow and what a tzaftzafah? - The willow has a red stem, an

elongated leaf and a smooth edge; the tzaftzafah has a white stem, a round leaf and an edge serrated like a sickle. But has it not been taught: If it is like a sickle it is valid, if like a saw, it is invalid? — Abaye said: That was taught only with regard to the rounded willow. Abaye said: Deduce from there that a rounded willow is valid for the hoshana (i.e., the lulav bundle). But isn’t this obvious? — I would have said that since it has a distinctive name it would be thereby invalid, therefore he informs us [that it is not so]. But perhaps it is indeed so? — ‘Willows of the brook’, says the Merciful One, implying from any place. (34a2)

Rav Chisda said: Since the destruction of the Holy Temple the following three things have had their names interchanged. [What was formerly called] chilfa [is now called] aravah, and what was called aravah, is now called chilfa. What practical difference does that make? - With regard to the lulav. [What was before called] shofar [is now called] chatzotzarta, and what was chatzotzarta is now shofar.<sup>1</sup> What practical difference does that make? — In respect of the shofar for Rosh Hashanah. [What was formerly called] pesorsa [is now called] pesora, and what was pesora is now pesorsa.<sup>2</sup> What practical difference does that make? — In respect

<sup>1</sup> The shofar is the ram’s horn which is valid for sounding on Rosh hashanah, the chatzotzarta is a silver trumpet.

<sup>2</sup> The pesora is a large table, usually of a money-changer, the pesorsa a small one.

of business transactions.<sup>3</sup> Abaye said: I also add [that an organ that was formerly called] bei kasei [is now called] huvlila, and the former huvlila is now bei kasei.<sup>4</sup> What practical difference does that make? — In respect of a needle found in the fleshy part of the second stomach.<sup>5</sup> Rava bar Yosef said: I also add that [what was formerly called] Babylonia [is now called] Bursif and the former Bursif is now Babylonia. What practical difference does that make? — In respect of bills of divorcement? (34a2 – 34b1)

MISHNAH: Rabbi Yishmael says: [One must have] three myrtle-branches (hadassim), two willow-branches (aravos), one palm-branch (lulav) and one esrog. Even if two [of the hadassim] have their tips broken off and [only] one is whole [it is valid]. Rabbi Tarfon says: even if all three have their tips broken off. Rabbi Akiva said: just as [it is needed to have but] one lulav and one esrog, so [it is needed to have but] one hadas and one aravah. (34b1)

GEMARA: It has been taught: Rabbi Yishmael said: ‘The fruit of a hadar tree’ implies one; ‘Branches of date palms’ implies one; ‘a shoot of the plaited tree’ implies three; ‘willows of the brook’ implies two, and even if two [of the hadassim] have their tips broken off, and only one is whole [it is valid]. Rabbi Tarfon said: [There must be] three, [and they are valid] even if all have their tips broken off. Rabbi Akiva said: Just as [it is necessary to have but] one lulav and one esrog, so [it is necessary to have but] one hadas and one aravah. Rabbi Eliezer said to him: If one should say that the esrog should be bound with them in one bundle you can answer, is it then written: ‘The fruit of a hadar tree and branches of

date palms’? It says only: ‘The fruit of a hadar tree, branches of date palms’. And from where do we know that they are essential to one another? Scripture teaches: ‘And you shall take’, [implying] that the taking must be complete.

As to Rabbi Yishmael, whichever view he takes [he is inconsistent]. For if he demands that the hadassim be whole, why should he not demand that they all be whole, and if he does not demand it, why should even one [need to be whole]? — Said Bira'ah in the name of Rabbi Ammi: Rabbi Yishmael recanted from this view. (34b1 – 34b2)

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: The halachah is in agreement with Rabbi Tarfon. And Shmuel is consistent; for in his view [expressed elsewhere] Shmuel said to those who sold hadassim: ‘Sell at the normal price, for if not, I will expound to you as Rabbi Tarfon’. What is his reason? If you will say that he wished to take a lenient view, why didn’t he expound to them as Rabbi Akiva who is still more lenient? — Three with broken tips are common, one with an unbroken tip is uncommon. (34b2 – 34b3)

MISHNAH: An esrog which is stolen or dry is invalid. One from an asheirah or a subverted city is invalid. If it was of orlah or of terumah that is tamei it is invalid. If it was of terumah that is tahor he should not take it, but if he did take it, it is valid. If it was demai, Beis Shammai declare it invalid, and Beis Hillel declare it valid. If it was of ma’aser sheini, it should not be taken [even] in Jerusalem, but if he took it, it is valid. If the majority of it is covered with scars, or if its pitam is removed, if it is

<sup>3</sup> The seller must supply the article named in the contract in accordance with the current usage.

<sup>4</sup> The havlila is the first stomach of ruminants, the bei kasei the second stomach.

<sup>5</sup> If a needle is found in the first stomach, provided it does not perforate it, the animal remains kosher for slaughtering. If it is found in the second stomach the animal is deemed a tereifah.



peeled, split, punctured, so that any part is missing, it is invalid. If boils arose on its minority, if its stalk was missing, or if it is perforated but naught of it is missing, it is valid. An Ethiopian esrog is invalid. If it is green as a leek, Rabbi Meir declares it valid and Rabbi Yehudah declares it invalid. The minimum size of an esrog, Rabbi Meir says, is that of a nut. Rabbi Yehudah says that of an egg. The maximum [size] is such that two can be held in one hand. These are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. Rabbi Yosi said: even one [that he can hold only] in both his hands. (34b3 – 34b4)

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### ***To Tie the Esrog or not?***

The Gemara derives from the word *ulekachtem*, and you shall take, that the four species are essential to each other, i.e. that one must have all four species available when he is prepared to fulfill the mitzvah. Nonetheless, one is not required to tie the esrog together with the other species, because the verse states *the fruit of a hadar tree, (vekapos) the branches of date palms*, and it does not state *(kapos) and the branches*. This teaches us that one is not required to tie the esrog together with the other three species.

The Shulchan Aruch in Orach Chaim 651:11 rules that one must hold the esrog next to the lulav while waving the species and one must waive them all together.

The Bikkurei Yaakov quotes the Taz who rules that if one ties the lulav together with the esrog, it is invalid because it is said regarding the lulav *kapos* and not *vekapos*. The Bikkurei Yaakov questions the words of the Taz, because our Gemara merely states that from the fact that the Torah did not write *vekapos* we derive that is not required to tie the esrog even according to the opinion that maintains that one is required to

bundle the species. We maintain, however, that one is not biblically required to bundle the species at all, so why should bundling the esrog with the other species be forbidden?

The Bikkurei Yaakov offers other proofs to his thesis and concludes that if one bundles the esrog with the other species, he has fulfilled the mitzvah.

## DAILY MASHAL

### ***A perfect Game***

The Gemara derives from the word *ulekachtem*, and you shall take, that the four species are essential to each other, i.e. that one must have all four species available when he is prepared to fulfill the mitzvah.

It is noteworthy that the Gemara derives this ruling from the word *ulekachtem*. The sefarim write that the festival of Sukkos is corresponding to Yaakov, regarding whom it is said *and Yaakov journeyed to Sukkos*. The Medrash states that on Rosh Hashanah the Jews and the gentiles enter into judgment, and it is not discernable who the victor is until the Jews exit from judgment waving the lulav on Sukkos. It is said regarding the Yom Kippur service, *the he-goat will bear upon itself all their iniquities*, and the Medrash states that the word for their iniquities is *avonosam*, which is an acrostic for the words *avonos tam*, the sins of Yaakov, who is referred to as *tam*, the perfect one. Thus, Yaakov is victorious on Yom Kippur when the he-goat, symbolizing Esav, carries away Yaakov's sins, and this victory is reflected in the Jewish People waving the lulav on Sukkos. The statement of the Gemara here is thus complemented by the statement of the Medrashim that the sins of the *tam* are removed and Yaakov is then able to perform a *lekicha tama*, a perfect taking of the lulav.