

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) A stolen sukkah

A Baraisa records a dispute between R' Eliezer and Chachamim regarding a stolen sukkah or one built on public property.

R' Nachman clarifies the exact issue under dispute.

Two incidents related to stolen wood used to make a sukkah are recorded.

2) A dry lulav

A Baraisa records a dispute regarding the validity of a dry lulav.

Rava explains that the dispute applies only to the lulav but all opinions agree that a dry esrog is invalid.

Rava's qualification is unsuccessfully challenged from different Baraisos.

The Gemara digresses to clarify two points mentioned in one of the Baraisos cited to challenge Rava's explanation. The two points clarified are the restriction against introducing a fifth species and, secondly, the restriction against using a fruit other than an esrog.

The Gemara resumes its unsuccessful challenges to Rava's explanation.

3) A lulav from an asheira

The ruling of the Mishnah that a lulav from an asheira is invalid is challenged from a statement of Rava indicating that a lulav that was used for idolatry is only Rabbinically invalid.

The Gemara explains that the Mishnah refers to a lulav used in violation of the Biblical prohibition against idolatry.

4) A lulav with a severed top

R' Huna rules that only a lulav with a severed top is invalid but if it is merely split it is valid.

The Gemara begins to challenge the ruling of R' Huna. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

A dried-out lulav and a replacement esrog

אמר מר לא מצא אתרוג לא יביא לא רמון ולא פריש ולא דבר אחר. פשיטא. מהו דתימא שלא תשכח תורת אתרוג קא משמע לן זימנין דנפיק חורבא מיניה

The Gemara on the bottom of 'עמוד א' had said that it is proper to take a dried lulav and to hold it if no kosher lulav is available. Rabbi Yehuda tried to prove his opinion that the *הדר* is not needed by the four minim from the case of the people of the *כרכים* who could not find any green, fresh lulavim, and they were forced to take dried ones. The *חכמים* told Rabbi Yehuda that the fact that these people took a dried lulav was no proof, because they were faced with an emergency, and it was better for them to hold onto any lulav, even one which was not halachically acceptable, in order not to allow the mitzvah of lulav to be forgotten.

The halachah is that the mitzvah of the four species is only valid when all four are taken together. Taking even three out of the four is not even a partial mitzvah. The Rosh cites Ra'aved who discusses a situation where no other *מינים* can be found other than a lulav. He notes that just like in our Gemara, where we allow holding onto a dried-out lulav, if no kosher specimen can be found other than a lulav a person should hold onto it by itself. In this case, we do not worry that a misunderstanding may occur and that the person himself or others might hold onto only a lulav the next year as well. This is not a problem, because the mitzvah to take all four items is explicit in the Torah, and there is no risk that people might forget how the mitzvah should be done properly when all the *מינים* are available.

In our Gemara, when no esrog can be found, we do not allow a person to hold onto a pomegranate or a similar fruit, because we are concerned that it may lead to misconduct in subsequent years. We are afraid that even when a kosher esrog will be available, a person may again take the non-esrog fruit he held in the previous year. Therefore, it is better not to hold anything when no esrog is to be found. Why, though, is this different from the case of the dried lulav, which may be held, in order that the mitzvah not be forgotten? In both cases, the dried-out esrog and the replacement, "pomegranate-esrog," the item to be held is technically invalid. Yet we allow holding a dried lulav, but not a replacement esrog.

The difference is that by an esrog, the Torah does not identify the specific fruit by name, and it is only the Gemara which reveals it to us after an exhaustive analysis. Here, we are afraid that using a replacement one year, such as a pomegranate, might lead to using it again the next year. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

A green Esrog

הירוק ככרתי ר' מאיר מכשיר ור' יהודה פוסל... משום דלא גמר פירא
An esrog that is green like a leek, R' Meir says it is valid. R' Yehudah says it is invalid ... because it is not yet fully mature.

Tikunei Zohar¹ writes that a green esrog is preferable. Some² interpret this to refer to yellow rather than green because yellow is the color of a mature esrog and green is the color of an immature esrog. Rav Yaakov Emden³, however, maintains that the Tikunei Zohar should be understood literally as indicating that green is the preferable color for an esrog because otherwise it would not be teaching anything novel. Nevertheless, Rav Emden writes that halacha does not follow Tikunei Zohar and yellow is the preferred color rather than green.

Shulchan Aruch HaRav⁴ writes that one should use an esrog that is yellow or has begun to turn yellow because yellow indicates that fruit is mature. A green esrog should not be used because there is the concern that they are not yet mature. If, however, one knew that the esrog was mature, despite its green color, it would be acceptable for use for the mitzvah.

Rav Yoel Sirkis⁵ maintains that dark green is considered a disqualifying color for an esrog similar to the color black. Thus, even if it could be determined that the esrog is mature

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why did R' Nachman ignore the pleas of the elderly woman who complained about wood stolen from her to build a sukkah?

2. Explain: תקנת מריש.

3. Why would one think to a fruit other than an esrog?

4. What does the word הדר mean if not beautiful?

and will eventually turn yellow, nevertheless, in its present state it is disqualified and may not be utilized for the mitzvah. Although most Poskim do not agree with Rav Sirkis' opinion, Rav Yaakov Ettlinger⁶ cites it as a practice a בעל נפש would be concerned about and thus avoid an esrog that retains, even partially, a dark green color.

A "trick" to stimulate a green esrog to turn yellow is to store it for two or three days in a box together with an apple. ■

1. תקוני זוהר תקונא כ"א נו
2. פירוש הכסא מלך והגר"א לתקוני זוהר הנ"ל
3. מור וקציעה סי' תרמ"ח ד"ה אבל אם
4. שולחן ערוך הרב סי' תרמ"ח סע' ל'
5. ב"ח או"ח סי' תרמ"ח ד"ה ירוק
6. בכורי יעקב סי' תרמ"ח ס"ק מ"ט ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Never give up!

אמרה ליה איתתא דהוה ליה לאבוהא תלת
 מאה ותמני סרי עבדי צווחא קמייכו ולא
 אשגחיתו בה

On today's daf, we find a very moving incident. A woman tried to recover her stolen schach by making a claim before the Rabanan. The servants of the exilarch had made off with her property, and she made a reference to Avraham Avinu in her appeal before the sages. "A woman whose forefather had 318 servants is crying out before you, and you pay her no heed!?" Rav Tzaddok Ha-Kohen, zt"l, explains that the woman mentioned Avraham Avinu because she suspected that the sages were refusing to listen because they were certain that she

had despaired of ever regaining her property. Such "יאוש" effectively severs one's connection to one's lost or stolen property, and gives the legal advantage to the other party. The servants of the exilarch were very powerful opponents against whom most people would have given up as a matter of course.

But this woman shouted, "I am a daughter of Avraham who took his 318 servants to fight an impossible battle to recover his nephew Lot!" The gematria of יאוש with the kollel is 318, and mentioning that number was this woman's way of saying, "Avraham did not give up on an impossible fight, and neither will I!" (She was awarded the cost of her lost sukkah, by the way.)

During the time of the infamous Cantonist decrees, kidnappers once snatched a group of very young boys who all learned together in the same school.

They were deposited in a special training camp far from their bereft mothers, and when the shock wore off they started to discuss their situation.

They knew that they were in grave danger. They would be forcibly baptized, and any child who resisted or refused to obey orders would be killed.

They concluded, "If we were at home we would surely say Tehillim and beg Hashem to spare us. We should therefore recite them now." To their dismay, however, they found that no one had a Tehillim, and none of them knew any chapters by heart. So the children decided that they could at least hum the tune of Tehillim which they did remember. After singing the melody passionately for only a little while, they were suddenly released. Children of Avraham must never give up hope! ■

