

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

1) A HOLE IS *INVALID* WHEN SOME FLESH OF THE ESROG IS MISSING

(a) (Ula b. Chanina): If the hole runs through the Esrog, the Esrog is invalid in any size; if it is not that deep, it is valid.

(b) Question (Rava): What is the law if the Esrog develops symptoms akin to the Tereifos of an animal?

1. Question: Anything to which Rava might be referring has already been taught (as valid or invalid) in a Mishnah!?

2. Answer: Rava is asking about the application of the law of Ula citing R. Yochanan regarding the liquified flesh around the lung.

i. R. Yochanan ruled the animal still valid.

ii. Rava qualified this ruling as applying only when the bronchial tubes are still intact.

iii. In the parallel case of Esrog, the flesh is liquefied but the seeds (equivalent to the blood vessels in the lungs) are still intact.

iv. Rava's question is whether we view the fact that the Esrog is exposed to air (unlike the lung cavity) as rendering it already rotten, or does it not make a difference.

(c) Answer: We learn in the Beraisa that a Tafuach and Saruach are among the listed invalidities of the Esrog.

1. Surely the Saruach is our case where the skin (and area around the seeds) is intact but the flesh is rotten.

2. We see, then, that Rava's case is invalid!

(d) No indication may be drawn from that Beraisa since both Tafuach and Saruach may refer to external features which may exist exclusively of one another.

2) ESROG *HA'KUSHI*

(a) Among the listed invalidities is the Ethiopian Esrog.

(b) Question: But our Mishnah taught that it is valid, while one which is *similar* to a Kushi is invalid!?

(c) Answer (Abaye): The Mishnah means to invalidate an Esrog similar to a Kushi (ie. a black Esrog found outside of Kush, where black is not normal, is invalid).

(d) Answer (Rava): We are speaking of an actual Esrog from Kush which would be valid in Bavel (its proximity to Kush makes a Kush Esrog common there), while in Eretz Yisrael it would be invalid.

3) AN ESROG THAT IS *BOSER*

(a) In the above-cited Beraisa there is an argument whether an Esrog ha'Boser is invalid (R. Akiva) or valid (Chachamim).

(b) (Rabah): R. Akiva and R. Shimon are of one opinion.

1. R. Akiva as cited.
2. R. Shimon exempts tiny Esrogim from Ma'aser (presumably for the same reason as R. Akiva, that they are not considered a fruit and lack Hadar).

(c) (Abaye): R. Akiva may not be of one mind with R. Shimon.

1. R. Akiva may invalidate the unripe Esrog because of its lack of Hadar, but may agree with Chachamim regarding its qualification for Ma'aser (since it may, after all, be eaten)!
2. Alternately, R. Shimon may have exempted it from Ma'aser inferring this from the Pasuk (that to be obligated the fruit must be fit for use as a seed) but hold like Chachamim regarding Esrog.

(d) Thus the opinions of R. Akiva and R. Shimon may not be equated.

4) AN ESROG GROWN INTO A MOLD

(a) The Beraisa above invalidates an Esrog which was shaped by the form placed around it during its growth.

(b) (Rava): This holds only if the mold forces it into a new shape, not if it is in the shape of an Esrog.

(c) Question: That is obvious, as the Beraisa itself mentions the new shape as the source of invalidation!?

(d) Answer: We need Rava's halachah to permit the case where the form made the Esrog look like a series of slats connected in the shape of an Esrog.

5) CHASER

(a) (Rav): An Esrog which was bitten by mice lacks Hadar.

(b) Question: But R. Chanina would eat some of his Esrog and then use it for the Mitzvah!?

1. Question: How will R. Chanina understand the Mishnah which invalidates an esrog which is missing part of it?

2. Answer: R. Chanina was speaking on the second day of Yom Tov.

(c) Answer: Mice are different than humans, for they are repulsive (and would be invalid even on the second day).

(d) Alternate rendition of the above:

1. (Rav): An Esrog bitten by mice is still Hadar, as supported by R. Chanina's practice.

2. Question: How will R. Chanina understand the Mishnah?

3. Answer: He permits the Chaser on Yom Tov Sheni.

6) A SMALL ESROG

(a) (Rafram b. Papa): The argument regarding Esrog is the same as the one regarding the size of stones used for sanitary purposes.

(b) There, too, R. Meir allows the carrying of stones up to the size of a walnut and R. Yehudah allows until an egg.

7) A LARGE ESROG

(a) R. Yosi supported his view allowing a very large Esrog by reporting the incident wherein R. Akiva arrived with his huge Esrog slung on his shoulder.

(b) (R. Yehudah): That is not a support since the Rabbis corrected R. Akiva there (pointing out that it is not Hadar)!

8) MISHNAH: BINDING THE SPECIES WITH THE SPECIES THEMSELVES

(a) (R. Yehudah): The species must be bound with the species themselves.

(b) (R. Meir): Any string is adequate, as supported by the people of Yerushalayim who would use gold thread.

(c) (R. Yehudah): They would tie them with species underneath the adornment.

9) IGUD USING OTHER MATERIALS

(a) (Rava): Any material from the species, even the least significant (such as Siv), is adequate for R. Yehudah, who does not require Hadar.

(b) (Rava): The rationale of R. Yehudah is his requirement that the species be bound, thus lending significance to the binding material which, if another material is used, would introduce a fifth specie.

(c) (Rava): I learn the inclusion of Siv as a type of Lulav material from the implication of this Beraisa:

1. (R. Meir): Any vegetation may be used (as derived from the Pasuk).

2. (R. Yehudah): The S'chach must be made only of the leaves of the species, (from a Kal va'Chomer).

3. (Chachamim): Any Kal va'Chomer which results in a Kulah (since one who cannot find S'chach of the species would be without a Sukah) may not be learned.

4. Rather, any vegetation may be used, as seen clearly from the Pasuk in Nechemiah wherein Ezra tells the People to bring various leaves in addition to the species.

5. (R. Yehudah): The other vegetation were meant for the walls, and the leaves of the species were meant for the S'chach.

6. Now we know from the Mishnah that R. Yehudah permits planks as S'chach, which must be the planks of wood from the trees of the species.

7. Hence we know that even Siv (which is part of the palm tree) is valid!

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Biblical Laws and their Rationale

Rabbi Yehudah maintains that the maximum measurement of an esrog is the size at which one can hold two esrogim in one hand. Rabbi Yose maintains that an esrog is valid even if one needs two hands to hold one esrog.

Rav Yosef Engel lists approximately twenty instances throughout Shas where we find that the Torah states that something is not allowed and the prohibition is due to a concern that one will violate a different transgression.

One example that he cites is the Ran in Pesachim who suggests that perhaps the reason the Torah prohibited one to see chametz on Pesach is because the Torah was concerned that a person will eat the chametz, as chametz is something that a person usually does not stay away from.

Another example that Rav Yosef Engel cites is a Medrash in Parshas Naso that states that the Torah

prohibited a nazir from drinking vinegar wine because the Torah was concerned that the nazir may come to drink regular wine.

In the *Sefer Ma'adanei Chaim*, Rav Chaim Cohen wonders how Rav Yosef Engel, with all his erudition and scholarship in Shas and Poskim, did not cite our Gemara as one of the examples. Rabbi Yehudah maintains that an esrog cannot be too large as there is a concern that he may have mistakenly placed the lulav bundle in his left hand and the esrog in his right hand, and when he attempts to reverse them, he may drop the esrog. Rashi (based on the explanation of the Sfas Emes) and the Ritva explain that if one drops the esrog, it may cause the esrog to become deficient and the person may not realize it, and he will unknowingly not have fulfilled the mitzvah of taking the four species. Although the measurements for the four species are derived from a *Halacha LeMoshe MiSinai* which is a Biblical requirement, it is nonetheless apparent that the rationale for the maximum measurement of an esrog is due to a concern that perhaps one may drop the esrog.

The Sfas Emes maintains that based on this Gemara, we must say that Rabbi Yehudah's requirement regarding the size of an esrog is only rabbinical in nature.

DAILY MASHAL

Gold and Humility

The Mishnah states that the people of Jerusalem would bind their lulav bundles with gold strings. The Chachamim said to Rabbi Meir that they would first bind the lulav with material of the same species in order to fulfill the mitzvah properly and then they added the gold strings as decoration. It is interesting that the word that the Mishnah uses for these gold strings is *gimoniyos*, which Rashi explains is derived from the word *ki'agmon*, which means bent.

Perhaps the Mishnah is teaching us that the people of Jerusalem would glorify the mitzvah of lulav with gold fibers, which usually can be interpreted to be a display of arrogance. Nonetheless, the people of Jerusalem acted for the sake of Heaven, and their actions were done "bent over," i.e. in a humble fashion.