



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

### Succah Daf Chuf Daled

- **Q: R' Meir** seems to contradict himself!? On the one hand he is not concerned for the breaking of the bottle, but on the other hand he is concerned for the death of the animal that is used for the succah wall!? **A:** Death is more common. Breaking of a bottle is not, because it can be given to a watchman to safeguard.
- **Q: R' Yehuda** seems to contradict himself!? On the one hand he is concerned for the breaking of the bottle, but on the other hand he is not concerned for the death of the animal that is used for the succah wall!? **A:** The reason **R' Yehuda** does not allow one to leave over the terumah and ma'aser at the end of the bottle is not because he is concerned that the bottle will break. It is because he does not hold of the concept of "breirah", which must be used to say that the wine left over at the end is the wine that was separated as terumah and ma'aser.
  - **Q: R' Yehuda** said to **R' Meir**, "aren't you concerned that the bottle may break"! We see that **R' Yehuda** was concerned for this!? **A:** He was saying to **R' Meir**, "I hold that leaving over the wine won't work, because I don't hold of breirah. However, you, who hold of breirah should still hold that it doesn't work because of the concern that the bottle may break!?"
  - **Q:** We see that **R' Yehuda** is concerned for death, because he says that we must prepare a replacement wife for the Kohen Gadol on Yom Kippur in case his wife was to die!? **A:** It is only there, regarding the Avodah that brings a kapparah, that he was concerned for possibilities that he is normally not concerned for.
- **Q:** According to **R' Zeirah** and **Abaye**, the reason **R' Meir** says that an animal may not be used as a succah wall is a gezeirah D'Rabanan (they were machmir, because it may run away or die). However, D'Oraisa it should be a valid succah wall (because a live animal is treated like any other object). If so, why does **R' Meir** say that when it comes to an animal acting as a grave cover, that we are meikel and it is does not become tamei? If D'Oraisa it is treated as any other object, then he cannot be meikel!? **A: R' Acha bar Yaakov** said, the reason **R' Meir** says that an animal is not valid for a succah wall is because a wall that stands because of breath is not considered to be a valid wall (breath is not tangible and therefore can't be the basis for a wall). **A2:** Others said that **R' Acha bar Yaakov** said, anything that cannot be made by a human being cannot serve as a wall.
  - The difference between these two versions would be a wall created by a blown up leather bottle. According to the first version this can't serve as a wall (it stands because of breath), but according to the second version it is a valid wall (it is man-made).
- The Braisa said that **R' Yose Haglili** adds that an animal may not be used to write a "get" on.
  - **Q:** What is **R' Yose Haglili's** reasoning? **A:** The pasuk regarding "get" says "sefer". One would think it may only be written on klaf. The pasuk therefore says "v'kasav lah" which teaches that it can be written on anything. If so, the word "sefer" only excludes writing a "get" on a living object, or on food.
    - The **Rabanan** say, the pasuk doesn't say "basefer" – "in a sefer", which would suggest like this drasha. The pasuk says "sefer", which teaches that the "get" must be written in a way that makes a separation between the husband and wife.
    - The **Rabanan** use the word "v'kasav" to teach that a divorce may only take place via a written document, not via money. We would think that just like marriage

comes about via a document or money, through a hekesh we should say that a “get” can be done in the same way.

- **R’ Yose Haglili** learns this from the words “sefer krisus” – only a document can make a divorce.
- The **Rabanan** use the word “krisus” to teach that it must be a document that fully severs the relationship (it can’t be made on a condition that obligates the woman to do something or not to do something, forever).
- **R’ Yose Haglili** learns that from the fact that the pasuk says “krisus” when it could have just said “kares”.
  - The **Rabanan** don’t darshen these extra letters to the word.

#### MISHNA

- If one makes a succah among the trees so that the trees are its walls (but they do not support the succah), the succah is valid.

#### GEMARA

- **R’ Acha bar Yaakov** said, a wall that moves in the wind is not considered to be a wall.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna says, if trees are the walls it is valid, and we know that trees move in the wind!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing mature, thick trees that don’t move in the wind.
    - **Q:** Even such trees have branches that move in the wind (and may form the walls)!? **A:** He weaves the branches together so that they don’t move in the wind.
      - **Q:** If so, what is the chiddush of the Mishna? **A:** We would think that we should be goizer and not allow such a succah out of concern that it may lead one to use the tree on Yom Tov. The Mishna teaches that the succah is nonetheless valid.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that a tree, and wall of reeds can serve as a corner board to surround a well, to permit the drawing of water from it on Shabbos. The tree and reeds move in the wind and yet they are considered to be walls!? **A:** Here too, the Braisa is discussing where he weaves the branches or reeds together so that they don’t move in the wind.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that if a tree’s branches bend over and come to within 3 tefachim of the ground, one may carry within the area enclosed by the branches (i.e. between the trunk and the branches). The drooping branches clearly move in the wind!? **A:** Here too, the Braisa is discussing where he weaves the branches together so that they don’t move in the wind.
    - **Q:** If so, why does **R’ Huna the son of R’ Yehoshua** say that one may not carry under this tree if it is larger than a beis sasayim (which is the halacha for something that is enclosed for other than residential purposes)? Since he wove the walls into place, that is considered as if it was enclosed for residential purposes!? **A:** This is because the purpose of the area is to provide shade for workers or watchmen who tend to the fields outside. The halacha is, to carry in an enclosure whose principle purpose is to serve the outside, the enclosure may not be larger than a beis sasayim.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that on Shabbos one may carry in a clearing surrounded by stalks of grain, because the stalks act as walls. Stalks of grain clearly move in the wind!? **A:** Here too, the Braisa is discussing where he weaves the stalks together so that they don’t move in the wind.