

4 Elul 5781
August 12, 2021



Sukkah Daf 36

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

The Mishnah had stated: Split, punctured. Ulla bar Chanina taught the following Baraisa: If it is completely punctured [it is invalid even if the hole is] of the minutest size; if it is not completely punctured [the hole must be of the minimum size] of an issar.

Rava enquired: If there developed in an esrog the symptoms [which render an animal] tereifah, what is the law? — But concerning what does he inquire? If concerning [an esrog which is] peeled, have we not [already] learnt it? If concerning one that is split, have we not learned it as well? If concerning one that is punctured, have we not learned it as well? — The enquiry he raised was concerning [the law] Ulla cited in the name of Rabbi Yochanan [who taught]: If the [contents of the] lung pour out as from a ladle¹ [the animal] is fit to be eaten, and Rava explained that this applies only when the arteries are still whole, but if the arteries are rotted [the animal is] tereifah. Now what is the ruling here?² Is it possible that this applies to the former case only, where, since the air cannot affect it, it could become healthy again,³ but not in the latter case where, since the air can affect it, it inevitably decays, or is it possible that there is no difference? — Come and hear: An esrog which is swollen, decayed, pickled, boiled, and Ethiopian, white or speckled, is invalid. An esrog which is round as a ball is invalid. And some add if two are grown together. If an esrog is half-ripe, Rabbi Akiva declares it invalid, and the Sages valid. If it was grown in a mold, so that it has the appearance of another species, it is invalid. At any rate it teaches ‘swollen or decayed’, which

implies, does it not, swollen from outside or decayed from within? No! Both refer to the exterior, and yet there is no discrepancy. The one refers to a case where the esrog is swollen although it is not decayed; the other to a case where it was decayed without being swollen. (36a1 – 36a2)

The Master has said: An Ethiopian esrog is invalid. But has it not been taught: If it is Ethiopian it is valid, if it is like an Ethiopian, it is invalid? — Abaye answered: In our Mishnah also we learned of one that is like an Ethiopian. Rava answered: There is no difficulty. The former refers to us,⁴ the latter to them.⁵ (36a3)

The Mishnah had stated: A half-ripe esrog, Rabbi Akiva declares invalid, and the Sages declare it valid. Rabbah observed: Both Rabbi Akiva and Rabbi Shimon say the same thing. As to Rabbi Akiva there is the statement just quoted. But what is the ruling of Rabbi Shimon? — That which we have learned: Rabbi Shimon declares esrogim to be exempt [from maaser] when they are small. Said Abaye to him: But perhaps it is not so! Rabbi Akiva may uphold his view only here, since the esrog must be ‘hadar’, which [an unripe esrog] is not, but there he may hold the opinion of the Rabbis; or else, Rabbi Shimon may have maintained his view only here, since it is written: You shall surely tithe all the increase of your seed, [which confines liability to maaser to such produce only] as men bring forth for sowing, but in the present instance he might agree with the Rabbis, and there is nothing more [to say about it]. (36a3 – 36b1)

¹ The flesh inside is decayed and liquified.

² In the case of the esrog. The seed kernels are regarded as corresponding with the arteries of the lungs.

³ Were the animal alive. An injury which, were the animal alive, would disappear, does not render the animal tereifah.

⁴ Babylonians.

⁵ In Eretz Yisroel, Ethiopian esrogs are unknown and therefore they are declared invalid. In Babylon, Ethiopian esrogs were common and valid

The Mishnah had stated: If it was grown in a mold, so that it has the appearance of another species, it is invalid. Rava Stated: They taught this only in the case where 'it has the appearance of another species', but if it has its natural shape it is valid. But is not this obvious, seeing that it was taught: 'the appearance of another species'? — It was necessary only in a case where it was molded in the shape of planks joined together.⁶ (36b1)

It was stated: An esrog which has been gnawed by mice, Rav ruled, is no longer 'hadar'. But it is not so? Didn't Rabbi Chanina in fact, taste a part of it, and fulfilled his obligation [with the remainder]? — Doesn't then our Mishnah present a contradiction against Rabbi Chanina? — One might well explain that our Mishnah presents no contradiction against Rabbi Chanina since the former might refer to the first day of the Sukkos,⁷ while the latter might refer to the second day; but [doesn't Rabbi Chanina's ruling present] a contradiction against Rav?⁸ — Rav can answer you: [The gnawing by] mice is different, since they are repulsive.

Others say: Rav ruled that it is 'hadar' since Rabbi Chanina tasted a part [of an esrog] and fulfilled his obligation [with the remainder]. But doesn't our Mishnah present a contradiction against Rabbi Chanina? — There is really no contradiction, since the former refers to the first day of Sukkos, while the latter refers to the second day. (36b1 – 36b2)

The Mishnah had stated: The minimum size of an esrog etc. Rafram bar Pappa observed: As is the dispute here, so is the dispute with regard to sharp-sided stones. For it has been taught: It is permitted on the Shabbos⁹ to carry three sharp-sided stones¹⁰ into [a field] lavatory.¹¹ And what must be

⁶ In the shape of the wheel of a water mill; Rava's view being that such a shape may be regarded as natural.

⁷ When, in accordance with an exposition of 'and you shall take', the esrog must be whole.

⁸ Who does not regard such an esrog as 'hadar', and consequently it is invalid even on the second day of Sukkos.

⁹ When the carrying of an object in certain domains is forbidden.

their size? Rabbi Meir ruled: The size of a nut; Rabbi Yehudah ruled: That of an egg. (36b2)

The Mishnah had stated: The maximum size etc. It was taught in a Baraisa: Rabbi Yosi related: It happened with Rabbi Akiva that he came to Synagogue with his esrog on his shoulder.¹² Rabbi Yehudah answered him: Is this a proof? They in fact said to him: This esrog is not 'hadar'. (36b2)

MISHNAH: The lulav may be bound only with [strands of] its own species; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. Rabbi Meir says it may be bound even with a linen thread. Rabbi Meir observed: It actually occurred that the people of Jerusalem used to bind their lulavim with strands of gold. They answered him: But they bound it with [strands of] its own species underneath [the strands of gold].¹³ (36b2 – 36b3)

GEMARA: Rava said: A lulav may be bound even with ivy, or even with [strips of] the roots of the palm tree. Rava further said: What is the reason of Rabbi Yehudah? He is of the opinion that the lulav must be bound so that if one uses another species, the bundling would contain five species.¹⁴

Rava further said: From where do I deduce that ivy and roots of the palm trees are deemed to be the same kind as the lulav? From that which has been taught: [It is written:] You shall dwell in Sukkos, which implies a Sukkah made of any material; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yehudah ruled: The Sukkah must be made of the same four species as the lulav. And logic demands it: If the lulav which does not apply by night as by day, is valid only with the Four Species, is there not then much more reason that the Sukkah which applies both by night and by day, shall be valid only [if the s'chach is made] from the Four Species? They answered him: Any kal vachomer argument which begins with a stringency

¹⁰ To cleanse oneself.

¹¹ Which has no walls and the movement of objects into it on the Shabbos is otherwise Rabbinnically forbidden.

¹² Owing to its huge size; which proves that there is no maximum size.

¹³ The former serving as binders and the latter as mere ornaments.

¹⁴ Instead of the four prescribed. It is forbidden to add to a mitzvah.



[of the law] and concludes with a leniency [of it] is no valid argument.¹⁵ For suppose he could not find all the Four Species, he would be sitting and doing nothing while the Torah said: You shall dwell in sukkos for seven day, implying a Sukkah of whatever material. And so in [the Book of] Ezra it says: Go out to the mountain, and fetch olive branches with leaves, and pine needles, and myrtle branches and palm-branches, and leaves of the plaited trees to make Sukkos, as it is written in the Torah. And [what does] Rabbi Yehudah [answer to this verse?] — He is of the opinion that the other [species] were for the walls, while the myrtle branches and palm-branches and leaves of the plaited trees were for the s'chach. And [nevertheless] we have learned: Boards may be used as s'chach; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. Thus it clearly follows that ivy and the trunk of the palm tree are deemed to be the same kind as a lulav. This is conclusive.

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 Yosef 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.

¹⁵ Since the ultimate effect of the stringency is a leniency.

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.