

3 Elul 5781
August 11, 2021



Sukkah Daf 35

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

An esrog which is stolen or dried out is invalid. One from an asheirah (*a tree that was worshipped as avodah zarah*) or from an *ir hanidachas* (*a subverted city; one that was condemned to be destroyed by fire on account of a majority of its residents worshipping idols*) is invalid. If it was of orlah (*the fruit that grows from a tree; the first three years of its life, they are forbidden for all benefit*) or of terumah that was *tamei*, it is invalid. If it was of terumah that was *tahor*, initially, he should not take it, but if he did take it, it is valid. If it was demai (*produce purchased from an am ha’aretz; since we are uncertain if ma’aser was separated, one is obligated to separate ma’aser rishon from it*) Beis Shammai declare it invalid, and Beis Hillel declare it valid. If it was of ma’aser sheini in Yerushalayim (*a tenth of one’s produce that he brings to Yerushalayim and eats there in the first, second, fourth and fifth years of the Shemitah cycle; it can also be redeemed with money and the money is brought up to Yerushalayim, where he purchases food and eats it there, or animals for korbanos*), initially, it should not be taken, but if he took it, it is valid.

If the majority of it is covered with boils, or if its pittum (stemlike protrusion at its top) is removed, if it is peeled, split, punctured and part of it is missing, it is invalid. If only a minority part is covered with boils, if its stem was removed, or if it is punctured but none 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.

Concerning the minimum size of an esrog, Rabbi Meir says: the size of a nut; Rabbi Yehudah says: that of an egg. Its maximum size is such that one should be able to hold two in one hand; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. Rabbi Yosi says: Even if one can hold one esrog in both hands. (34b3 – 34b4)

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: *The fruit of the hadar tree*. This refers to an esrog, whose fruit and bark have the same taste. The *Gemora* asks: Perhaps it refers to peppers, as it was taught in a *Baraisa*: Rabbi Meir would say: Since the verse says (*regarding the fruits that grow from a tree in its first three years*): *You shall regard its fruit as forbidden*, do I not know that it is speaking of a tree for food? Why then does the Torah say: *food tree*? It is to include a tree of which the wood has the same taste as the fruit. And which is this? It is the pepper tree. This teaches us that pepper is subject to the law of *orlah*, and it also teaches you that the land of Israel lacks nothing, as it is written: *A land in which you shall eat bread without poverty, you shall not lack anything in it!* The *Gemora* answers: There, pepper is excluded, since it is impossible to use it (for the mitzvah to take with the lulav); for how shall he proceed? If he takes one pepper kernel, it is unrecognizable; and if he takes two or three, the Torah surely said, one ‘fruit’ and not two or three fruits. Its use therefore is impossible. (35a1)

Rebbe said: Read not hadar but ha-dir; just as the stable contains large and small [animals], perfect and blemished ones, so also [the fruit spoken of must have] large and small, perfect and blemished. Haven’t then other fruits



large and small, perfect and blemished? — It is this rather that was meant: Before the small ones come, the large are still existent [on the tree].

Rabbi Avahu said: Read not hadar, but ha-dar, a fruit which remains upon its tree from year to year.

Ben Azzai said: Read not hadar, but hudor, for in Greek water is called hudor. Now what fruit is it that grows by every water? Say, of course, it is the esrog. (35a1 – 35a2)

The Mishnah had stated: IF from an asheirah or from a subverted city, it is invalid. What is the reason? — Since it is condemned to be burned, [it is considered as though its minimum size is destroyed.

The Mishnah had stated: If from orlah, it is invalid. What is the reason? Rabbi Chiya bar Avin and Rabbi Assi disagree on this point. One explains because there is no permission to eat it,¹ and the other explains because it has no monetary value.² It is now assumed that the one who insists on permission to eat it [in order to render it valid] does not insist upon [its having] monetary value,³ and that he who insists upon monetary value does not insist upon permission to eat it.⁴ - Now we learned: Or of terumah that is tamei, it is invalid. This is well according to the one who explains, because there is no permission to eat it, but according to the one who explains, because it has no monetary value, why [should terumah that is tamei be invalid] seeing that the man can kindle it under his cooking? The fact is [that with regard to] permission to eat it, all agree that it is an essential, and they disagree only on the question whether monetary value [is also necessary]. One Master is of the opinion that permission

to eat it is necessary but not monetary value, while the other Master is of the opinion that monetary value is also necessary. What is the practical difference between them? — The case of the maaser sheini in Jerusalem differentiates them according to Rabbi Meir.⁵ According to he who explains, because there is no permission to eat it [it is valid, since] in this case there is permission to eat it. According to he who explains, because it has no monetary value [it is invalid, since] the maaser sheini is sacred money.

It may be concluded that it is Rabbi Assi who gives [also] the reason that it has no monetary value, since Rabbi Assi said: [With] an esrog of maaser sheini according to Rabbi Meir, a person cannot fulfill his obligation on the Festival, and according to the Sages he may fulfill his obligation with it on the Festival. This is proved.

[Turning to] the main text, Rabbi Assi said: [With] an esrog of maaser sheini, according to Rabbi Meir, a person cannot fulfill his obligation on the Festival, and according to the Sages he may fulfill his obligation with it on the Festival. With matzah of maaser sheini, according to Rabbi Meir, a man cannot fulfill his obligation on Pesach, and according to the Sages he may fulfill his obligation with it on Pesach. Dough of maaser sheini, according to Rabbi Meir, is exempt from challah; according to the Sages it is liable to challah.

Rav Pappa asked: This is well with regard to dough, since it is written: Of the first of your dough.⁶ With regard to the esrog also it is written: To you [implying that — it should be yours. With regard however to matzah, does Scripture say, 'your matzah'? — Rabbah bar Shmuel, or as some say,

is not permitted to use it for such a purpose for instance as the betrothal of a wife.

⁴ An esrog of tevel though forbidden to be eaten, would consequently be valid since benefit may be derived from it.

⁵ Who regards maaser sheini as sacred, not secular money.

⁶ While maaser sheini is sacred and not entirely 'yours'.

¹ Since it is prohibited for use, it does not come within the category of 'yours'.

² Since it is forbidden to derive any benefit from it.

³ Maaser sheini, for instance, which may be eaten in Jerusalem would consequently be valid though it cannot be regarded as having monetary value since its owner according to Rabbi Meir

Rabbi Yeimar ben Shelemiah, replied: We deduce it from the word 'bread' which is common to both passages. In this connection it is written: The bread of affliction, and there it is written: Then it shall be when you eat of the bread of the land; just as in the latter case [the reference is to] what is yours and not of maaser, so in the former case, [it must be] yours and not of maaser.

Can we say that the following supports [this view]: Dough of maaser sheini is exempt from challah, according to Rabbi Meir, while the Sages say that it is liable? — 'Can we say that the following supports [this view]!' Is it not the identical statement? Rather [say that the question was whether we can say that] since they dispute in this instance, they also dispute in the others or perhaps dough is exceptional because Scripture repeated the words 'your dough'.

The Mishnah had stated: Or of terumah that is tamei, it is invalid; because there is no permission to eat it. If it was of terumah that is tahor, he should not take it. Rabbi Ammi and Rabbi Assi disagree on the reason of the ruling. One explains, because he [thereby] renders it susceptible [to tumah],⁷ while the other explains. Because he depreciates its value.⁸ What is the practical difference between them? The case where one assigned the name of terumah to it except to its outer peel. According to he who explains, because he renders it susceptible [to tumah], this does apply; according to he who explains, because he depreciates its value, it does not apply.

The Mishnah had stated: But if he did take it, it is valid; [since] according to he who explains, because there is no permission to eat it, this is permitted to be eaten, and

⁷ An article is not susceptible to tumah until it has come in contact with water. The lulav is usually placed in water to keep it fresh and when the esrog comes in contact with the wet lulav it also is rendered susceptible to similar tumah.

according to he who explains, because it has no monetary value, this surely has monetary value.

The Mishnah had stated: If it was demai. What is the reason of Beis Hillel? - Because, if he wishes, he may declare his property to be hefker and thereby become a pauper who is entitled to benefit [from demai] we may now also apply to it the expression 'to you'. For we have learned: Poor men and traveling troops may be fed with demai. [But on the view of] Beis Shammai a poor man may not eat demai; as we have learned: Poor men and traveling troops may eat demai and Rav Huna stated, A Tanna taught: Beis Shammai say that poor men and traveling troops may not be fed with demai, while Beis Hillel say that poor men and traveling troops may be fed with demai.

The Mishnah had stated: If it was of maaser sheini . . . in Jerusalem. According to he who explained, because he renders it susceptible [to tumah] it is [here forbidden] since he renders it susceptible [to tumah]; according to he who explained, because he depreciates its value [it is forbidden] since here also he depreciates its value.

The Mishnah had stated: But if he took it, it is valid. According to he who explains, because there is no permission to eat it, [the ruling] is according to all. According to he who explains, because it has no monetary value, according to whom [is the ruling]? According to the Rabbis.

The Mishnah had stated: If the majority of it is covered with boils. Rav Chisda said: The following was said by our great Master, may the Omnipresent be his help! This was taught only [where they were] in one place, but if they

⁸ Since the peel of the esrog becomes damaged by use.

were in two or three places, [the esrog] is valid. Rava said: On the contrary! If they were in two or three places the esrog is as though speckled and invalid. Rather if the statement was at all made, it was made in connection with the latter part [of our Mishnah]: If only a minority of it is covered with boils . . . it is valid. Rav Chisda said: The following was said by our great Master, may the Omnipresent be his help! This was taught only [if they were] in one place, but if in two or three places the esrog is as speckled and invalid. Rava said: But [if a boil is] on its nose,⁹ even if it is one of the slightest extent, the esrog is invalid.

The Mishnah had stated: If its pitam is removed. Rabbi Yitzchak ben Elazar taught: If its pestle was removed.¹⁰

The Mishnah had stated: If it is peeled. Rava ruled: An esrog which was peeled so as to resemble a red date is valid. But have we not learned: If it is peeled . . . it is invalid? — This is no difficulty, since the former refers to where all of it [was peeled], the latter to where only a part was peeled.

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Magnifying Glass

Rashi and the Ran write that the reason that small spots at the top of the esrog invalidate the esrog whereas spots on other parts do not invalidate the esrog is because the top of the esrog is the area which is clearly visible to the eye.

The Magen Avrohom in Orach Chaim 648:16 quotes the *Mabit* who writes that a discoloration at the top of the esrog will only invalidate the esrog if it is visible to all. If the discoloration is so small that one can see it only by

gazing intently and others cannot even see it, the esrog will still be deemed as hadar.

The *Shearim Mitzuyanim B'Halacha* writes that this ruling is the source for those who maintain that a black spot or discoloration which can only be viewed with a magnifying glass will not invalidate an esrog. It is noteworthy that there are those who use the magnifying glass to validate a spot that others expressed concerned about.

DAILY MASHAL

Esrog; Fruit of Desire

The Gemara states that an esrog is described in the Torah as a *pri eitz hadar*, the fruit of the *hadar* tree, and the word *hadar* can be interpreted to mean *haddar*, that dwells. Thus, the esrog is a fruit that dwells on its tree from one year to the next year.

It is noteworthy that the Rishonim write that the word esrog is derived from the Aramaic word *merogeg*, which means desire. Similarly, we find that the Zohar states that regarding Shabbos it is said *the Children of Israel shall observe the Shabbos, to make the Shabbos an eternal covenant for their generations*. The Zohar states that the word *ledorosam* can be interpreted to read *lederosam*, for their dwelling places. Furthermore, it is said *thus the heaven and the earth were finished, and all their array, and the Targum Yerushalmi interprets the word vayechulu, were finished, as vechamad, and He desired*. Thus, the esrog and the Shabbos both share the same characteristics in that they are desired items and that they both have a permanent dwelling.

⁹ The part of the esrog which slopes towards the pitam.

¹⁰ According to Rashi, this means that the esrog is invalid only if the stick part below the bud is removed as well.