



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Succah, Daf ך – Daf טו

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H  
v'l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

#### -----Daf ך--10-----

- **Q:** How much space between the s'chach of the lower succah and the s'chach of the upper succah (i.e. the height of the upper succah) is enough to make the lower succah passul (and we don't simply view it as one set of s'chach)? **A: R' Huna** said, if there is a tefach of space it is passul, because we find that the covering over a tefach of space is considered to be a roof for purposes of tumas ohel. **R' Chisda and Rabbah bar R' Huna** said that only a space of at least 4 tefachim is a problem, because we find that 4 tefachim is the smallest size of a makom chashuv (a significant area). **Shmuel** said, only a space of 10 tefachim is a problem, because that is the height that is needed to make a succah valid, so that is the height that is needed to make the lower succah passul as well.
  - **Q:** In the Mishna **R' Yehuda** says, if there is no one living in the upper succah, the lower succah is valid. That can't be understood simply, because why should someone's presence determine the validity of the succah? It must mean that **R' Yehuda** says, that if the upper succah is not *fit* to be lived in, meaning that it is less than 10 tefachim high, then the lower succah is valid. That would mean that the **T"K** (who we pasken like) must hold that even when it is less than 10 tefachim, the bottom succah is still passul. This is problematic according to **Shmuel**!? **A: R' Dimi** said, **R' Yehuda** should be understood as saying, that if the lower succah is not strong enough to support someone living on top of it, the lower succah is valid (he was not discussing the height issue at all).
    - **Q:** Even according to this understanding, the **T"K** (by saying that the lower succah would still be passul in that case) must hold that we don't say that the measurements to make a succah valid are the measurements that (if possessed by the upper succah) would make the lower succah passul. This is not like **Shmuel** said!? **A:** The **T"K** agrees that if it can't support people living in the upper succah, the lower succah would be valid. The machlokes between the **T"K** and **R' Yehuda** is where the lower succah can support it only with difficulty ("ahl yidei hadchak"). **R' Yehuda** says the lower succah would be valid in that case and the **T"K** says it would be passul.

#### MISHNA

- If one spread a sheet over the s'chach to help shade from the sun (even though there was sufficient s'chach), or if he spreads one beneath the s'chach to catch the falling leaves, or if he places the canopy on a (4 post) canopy bed inside the succah, the succah is passul (one who sits in such a succah or in the canopy bed is not yotzeh).
- One may spread a sheet over a canopy bed that has only 2 posts (one in the middle on each side of the width, where the sheet is draped over, and its sides slope downward).

#### GEMARA

- **R' Chisda** said, spreading a sheet under the s'chach is only a problem when it is spread there to catch the leaves. However, if it is spread there for decorative purposes, it is not a problem.
  - **Q:** That is obvious (it is exactly what the Mishna says)!? **A:** We would have thought that the same halacha applies to a sheet spread for decorative purposes, and the Mishna only discusses a sheet spread to catch the leaves, because that is the more typical case. **R' Chisda** therefore teaches that a sheet spread for decorative purposes is treated differently.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can say that a Braisa is a proof to **R' Chisda**. The Braisa discusses hanging different decorative objects (including sheets) in the succah, and doesn't say that it is a problem for the validity of the succah! **A:** The Braisa may be referring to where these items are hung on the walls of the succah.
    - **Minyamin** (the servant of **R' Ashi**) got his shirt very wet. He spread it over the succah to dry. **R' Ashi** told him, "Remove it so people don't think you can use that for s'chach". He said to **R' Ashi**,

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

“People will see it is wet and realize that is why I spread it over the succah”! **R’ Ashi** said, “I meant that you should remove it as soon as it dries”.

- If decorative sheets are hung under the s’chach, and there is 4 tefachim of space between the s’chach and the sheets, **R’ Nachman** says it is still a valid succah, and **R’ Chisda** and **Rabbah bar R’ Huna** say that the succah is passul.
  - **R’ Chisda** and **Rabbah bar R’ Huna** went to visit the Reish Galusa on Succos, and **R’ Nachman** brought them to a succah whose decorative sheets were 4 tefachim below the s’chach. They didn’t say anything. **R’ Nachman** asked, “Have you changed your view”? They responded, we are here doing the mitzvah of visiting the Reish Galusa, and we are therefore patur from the mitzvah of succah.
- **R’ Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, it is mutar to sleep in a canopy bed (even a 4 post bed whose sheet creates a flat roof) in a succah, as long as there is less than 10 tefachim of space between the bed and the canopy.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that one who sleeps in a canopy bed in a succah is not yotzeh the mitzvah of succah!? **A:** The Braisa is discussing a case where there is more than 10 tefachim of space.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that one who sleeps *under* a bed is not yotzeh the mitzvah of succah!? **A:** That too is discussing where the bed is more than 10 tefachim off the ground.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna said that such a canopy bed is problematic in a succah!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing where there is more than 10 tefachim of space.
  - **Q:** A Braisa clearly says that a 4 post canopy bed is problematic in a succah even when there is less than 10 tefachim of space!? **A:** The bed discussed in the Braisa was more permanent in nature and was therefore problematic with even less space.
    - **Q:** The case of one succah on top of another is a case of a more permanent structure, and yet **Shmuel** said that it is only passul if there is 10 tefachim of space!? **A:** To make a succah passul we need 10 tefachim of space. To make something (i.e. the canopy bed) to be considered as its own ohel, even less than 10 tefachim of space will do.
- **R’ Tachlifa bar Avimi in the name of Shmuel** said, if one sleeps without clothing in a 4 post canopy bed (where the curtains hang down and totally enclose the bed), he may stick his head outside the curtain and say Shema (the canopy is not considered a tent, but is rather treated like a shirt, which therefore separates his head from his nakedness).
  - **Q:** A Braisa says this may not be done!? **A:** The Braisa is discussing where there is 10 tefachim of space, and the canopy bed is therefore its own ohel (in which case the person’s head is considered to be where the majority of his body is). **Shmuel**, however, is discussing a case where there is not 10 tefachim of space.
  - The Gemara says, that a house, even if there is not 10 tefachim of space, will always be considered an ohel, because of the permanence of the structure.
- **Another version** of what **R’ Yehuda said in the name of Shmuel** is, that he said one may sleep in a canopy bed with sloping sides (no flat roof) in a succah, even if there is 10 tefachim of space between the bed and the canopy.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says this is not so!? **A:** The Braisa is discussing where there is a tefach of flat roof before it begins sloping.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that even “naklitin” (a 2 post canopy bed which doesn’t have a tefach wide flat roof) may only be used in a succah if it has less than 10 tefachim of space between the bed and the canopy!? **A:** Naklitin are more permanent in structure and therefore must have less than 10 tefachim of space.
    - **Q:** If so, they should be problematic even if there is less than 10 tefachim of space, just like a 4 post bed!? **A:** Naklitin are more permanent than a typical sloping sides canopy bed, but are not considered permanent when compared to a 4 post canopy bed. Therefore it is treated somewhat in between.

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## -----Daf X'---11-----

- **Rabbah bar R' Huna** said, it is mutar to sleep in a kilah bed (2 post canopy bed) in a succah even if it has a flat roof the size of a tefach, and even if there is 10 tefachim of space between the bed and the canopy.
  - This must follow **R' Yehuda** who says that a temporary ohel built in a more permanent ohel does not nullify the status of the permanent ohel. **R' Yehuda** said this when he said that they would sleep under the beds in the succah and the Elders never said anything.
    - **Q:** Why didn't **Rabbah bar R' Huna** just say that the halacha follows **R' Yehuda**? **A:** We would think that is only the case regarding sleeping under a bed, since it is made to sleep on top of, but the kilah bed, which is being used as intended, would be passul to sleep in.

### MISHNA

- If one placed a grapevine, a melon vine, or ivy onto the s'chach, the succah is passul. However, if there is a majority of valid s'chach, or if he cuts the items from the ground, the succah is valid.
- The general rule is: something that has the ability to become tamei, or does not grow from the ground, may not be used for s'chach.

### GEMARA

- **R' Yosef said in the name of Rav**, after cutting these items from the ground, one must lift them and place them back down to make the succah valid. **R' Huna** said, **Shmuel** said that, not **Rav**. We find that **Rav** says, that tzitzis that were knotted onto clothing as one string (it wasn't cut before tying, and the tzitzis are therefore passul), if he then cuts it, the cutting is considered the "making" of the tzitzis and they are valid. Similarly, **Rav** would presumably say that the cutting of the vines is the "making" of the s'chach, and there would therefore be no need to lift them and place them back down.
  - **Q:** We find that **Shmuel** said that if one used the same string to make tzitzis on two corners and then cut the strings (so that they are then separated), it is valid. Presumably this means that he cuts them apart after all the knotting is done, and we see that **Shmuel** must hold that the cutting is the "making" of the tzitzis!? **A:** He meant that if he cut them and then knotted them it is valid.
    - **Q:** That would seem obvious!? **A:** We would have thought that even threading the string for two corners with one string makes the tzitzis passul. **Shmuel** teaches that as long as they are cut before the knotting, it is valid.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that tzitzis that were put on without being cut apart are passul!? **A:** **Rav** would say, it means they are passul until they are cut apart.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that tzitzis that were cut apart after they were knotted are passul!? **Q2:** A Braisa says that if vines are placed on top of the succah, the succah is passul based on the drasha of "ta'aseh v'lo min he'asuy". This must mean that the vines were detached from the ground (because, if they weren't, they are passul based on the fact that they are attached to the ground, not because of ta'aseh v'lo min he'asuy), and still they are passul, which is problematic according to **Rav**!? **A:** The Braisa is discussing where the vines were torn off by hand and still situated near the ground they were attached to. Therefore, since it is not noticeable that they were detached, they are passul (it is a gezeirah of the **Rabanan**). However, the first question remains a **Kashyeh** on **Rav**.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can say that this is the machlokes between Tanna'im of a Braisa. The Braisa says that if one pulled off the berries from the hadassim (to make them kosher, as we will learn) on Yom Tov, **R' Shimon bar Yehotzadak** says the hadassim are passul, and the **Rabanan** say they are valid. Now, presumably all say that we learn the halachos of the 4 minim (lulav, esrog, haddasim and aravos) from succah, that they too must be "ta'aseh v'lo min he'asuy" (that the 4 minim must be valid at the time they are bound together, not first after they are bound together). Based on this, the **Rabanan** must hold that cutting the vines by the s'chach is considered "making" the s'chach, and therefore pulling off the berries is considered to be "making" the binding, and they are valid. **R' Shimon bar Yehotzadak** must hold that cutting the vines does not constitute "making" the s'chach. **A:** It may be that all hold that the cutting of the vines does not constitute "making" the s'chach. The machlokes may be whether we learn

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

the 4 minim from succah, that the 4 minim must also be “ta’aseh v’lo min he’asuy”. **A2:** The machlokes may be whether or not the lulav, haddassim and aravos need to be bound together to be valid. **R’ Shimon bar Yehotzadak** holds that they must be bound, and also learns from succah that they must be “ta’aseh v’lo min he’asuy”. The **Rabanan** say that they need not be bound.

ZEH HAKLAL KOL DAVAR SHEMIKABEL TUMAH...

- **Q:** From where do we learn these requirements? **A: Reish Lakish** said, the succah is meant to remind us of the “succos” that the Yidden were in when in the Midbar (which was the ananei hakavod). The pasuk says that clouds are created from the earth (“v’eid yaaleh min ha’aretz”), and clouds are obviously not mekabel tumah. Therefore, s’chach must have those same characteristics as well.
  - **Q:** That makes sense according to the view that the “succos” referred to in the passuk (which the Yidden were in when in the Midbar) is the ananei hakavod. However, according to the view that it was actual succos, what is the source for these characteristics of s’chach? **A: R’ Dimi said in the name of R’ Yochanan**, the pasuk says “chag hassucos ta’aseh lichah”, which teaches that the s’chach should be like the Chagigah. Just like an animal is not mekabel tumah and grows (via nourishment) from the ground. So too s’chach must have those traits as well.
    - **Q:** Based on the drasha, s’chach should have to be made of a living thing, just like a Chagigah!?
    - **A: Ravin said in the name of R’ Yochanan**, the pasuk says “chag hassucos ta’aseh lichah b’aspicha m’garnicha u’miyikvecha”. This teaches that s’chach must be like the leftovers of the threshing – not mekabel tumah and grown from the ground.
      - **Q:** Maybe we should learn that the s’chach should be like the grapes and grain itself (not just the leftover of the threshing), which would mean that food (which is mekabel tumah) can be used as well!? **A: R’ Zeira** said, the pasuk says “yekev”, which means wine, not grapes, and it is impossible to use wine as s’chach.
      - **Q: R’ Yirmiya** asked, maybe it refers to congealed wine, which could be used!? **A: R’ Ashi** said, the pasuk says “Migarnicha” and “Miyikvecha” which teaches that it is what *comes from* the wine, not the wine itself.
    - **A: R’ Chisda** said, the pasuk say that the Navi said to bring different types of branches with leaves to make the s’chach for a succah.

### -----Daf ג'-----12-----

MISHNA

- One may not use bundles of straw or wood or “zradin” for s’chach. If he unties the bundles, they are valid s’chach.
- All items that we said are passul to be used as s’chach are mutar to be used as walls.

GEMARA

- **R’ Yaakov** said, I heard from **R’ Yochanan** an explanation for 2 Mishnayos – our Mishna, and the Mishna that says that if one hollows out a haystack to use it as a succah, it is passul. He explained one as being passul so as to prevent one from coming to use his storehouse (gezeiras otzer) as a succah (the covering, although valid s’chach, was placed there for storage, not to provide shade, and is therefore passul), and one of them as being passul for reasons of ta’aseh v’lo min he’asuy. However, **R’ Yaakov** could not remember which explanation was given for which Mishna.
  - **R’ Yirmiya** said, that **R’ Chiya bar Abba in the name of R’ Yochanan** said, one may not use bundles of straw or wood, as a gezeirah for the case of when one places a bundle on top of a succah for storage or to dry and then later decides to leave it there as s’chach for the succah (in which case it would be assur D’Oraisa as “ta’aseh v’lo min he’asuy”, and therefore every case of bundles is assur as a gezeiras otzer). If the reason for this Mishna is “gezeiras otzer”, the reason for the other Mishna must be ta’aseh v’lo min he’asuy.
    - **R’ Yaakov** did not know this statement of **R’ Chiya bar Abba**, which is why he was unsure.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Ashi** asked, why does **R' Yochanan** say that our Mishna is discussing a pessul only based on a gezeirah, and the other Mishna is discussing a pessul only based on ta'aseh v'lo min he'asuy?  
**A: R' Yochanan** would say, our Mishna which says "one should not use them as s'chach" implies that it is talking about a pessul D'Rabanan (if it was a pessul D'Oraisa, the Mishna would have said "it is not a succah"). The other Mishna says "it is not a succah", which implies that it is a pessul D'Oraisa.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, a male arrow stick (which has no receptacle, and is therefore not mekabel tumah) may be used for s'chach, and a female arrow stick (which has a receptacle and is therefore mekabel tumah) may not be used for s'chach.
  - **Q:** It is obvious that a male arrow stick is valid for s'chach!? **A:** We would think to be goizer for the case of a female arrow stick.
  - **Q:** It is obvious that a female arrow stick is passul for s'chach!? **A:** We would think that a receptacle that is meant to be filled permanently (the arrow head is meant to be placed into the stick permanently) does not have the status of a receptacle and should not be mekabel tumah.
- **Rabbah bar bar Chana said in the name of R' Yochanan**, processed flax may not be used for s'chach (because it is mekabel tumah), totally unprocessed flax may be used for s'chach (it is not mekabel tumah), and regarding somewhat processed flax, **R' Yochanan** was unsure. **Rabbah bar bar Chana** was unsure what **R' Yochanan** meant by "somewhat processed" flax, whether he referred to flax that was beaten but not yet combed (which would mean that flax which was soaked but not yet beaten would be considered "unprocessed") or whether flax that was only soaked and not even beaten is already considered to be "somewhat processed".
- **R' Yehuda** said, one may use "shushei" and "shevatzrei" plants as s'chach, because they are not fit for human consumption and are therefore not mekabel tumah. **Abaye** said that one may use "shushei" for s'chach, but may not use "shevatzrei", because it has a very bad odor which will cause the person to leave his succah.
- **R' Chanan bar Rava** said, one may use "hizmi" thorns and "higi" thorns for s'chach. **Abaye** said, one may use hizmi, but not higi, because its leaves fall off and will cause the person to leave his succah.

### -----Daf ל"ג-----13-----

- **R' Gidal in the name of Rav** said, the growth around a palm tree may be used for s'chach. This is so even though they are bound together, because they are naturally bound together and therefore allowed. Even if one then ties them it is still valid, because it is considered to be one item, and one, bound item, is not called a bundle (which would be passul).
- **R' Chisda in the name of Ravina bar Shilah** said, the growth around reeds may be used as s'chach. This is so even though they are bound together, because they are naturally bound together and therefore allowed. Even if one then ties them it is still valid, because it is considered to be one item, and one, bound item, is not called a bundle (which would be passul).
- **R' Chisda in the name of Ravina bar Shilah** said, the "swamp marror" may be used for the mitzvah of marror on Pesach.
  - **Q:** A Braisa describing the "eizov" to be used for the parah adumah says that only proper eizov may be used, not a species of eizov that has another descriptive name. Marror should be the same and therefore "swamp marror" should not be valid for the mitzvah!? **A: Abaye** said, a species which was called by different names before Matan Torah cannot be used for the mitzvah. A species which wasn't, may be used (and marror was not called by this descriptive name before Matan Torah). **A2: Rava** said, this marror is plain marror, which is why it may be used. It is called "swamp marror" because it is found in the swamp.
- **R' Chisda** said, tying a single item is not called a "bundle". Tying 3 items together clearly creates a "bundle". Whether tying 2 things together creates a "bundle" is subject to the machlokes between **R' Yose** and the **Rabanan**. A Mishna discusses the eizov requirement for the parah adumah waters and says that 3 stems are needed to be bundled together. **R' Yose** argues and says that 3 are needed initially, but it is valid even if only 2

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

remain. We see that the **Rabanan** say 3 items tied together constitute a bundle, and **R' Yose** says that even 2 items constitute a bundle.

- **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Yose** says, initially there must be 3 stems tied together, even b'dieved. We see that he also requires 3 items to be tied together to constitute a bundle!? **A:** It is the **Rabanan** (the **T"K** in the Mishna) who hold that 3 items are needed for a bundle only l'chatchila. In fact, we find a Braisa that says that the **Rabanan** hold this way.
- **Mareimar** darshened that the bundles of Sura may be used for s'chach even when tied in a bundle, because they are only bundled for purposes of units of measure to be sold (they are not left that way to dry so there is no concern for gezeiras ha'otzar).
- **R' Abba** said, the huts made of willow branches (the branches are tied together tightly on top, and held together by a knotted string on the bottom) may be used for s'chach if they are untied on the top.
  - **Q:** They are still tied on the bottom!? **A: R' Pappa** said, the knot on the bottom must be opened as well. **A2: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** said, it may be used even if the bottom knot is still in place, because any tying that was not done for the sake of transport is not a problem.
- **R' Abba in the name of Shmuel** said, the vegetables which may be used for the mitzvah on Pesach act as a roof to spread tumas meis, but do not act as a roof to stop the tumah from rising up. They also are considered as empty space when used as s'chach (which makes the succah passul if larger than 3 tefachim) rather than as passul s'chach (which makes the succah passul if larger than 4 amos). The reason we treat this l'chumra in each case is because these vegetables crumble when they dry out, and we therefore must treat them as non-existent even before they dry out.
- **R' Abba in the name of R' Huna** said, grapes harvested for their wine are not considered to have "yados" (their stems are not considered to be "handles" which would then also have the ability to be mekabel tumah), because their stems are not needed. **R' Menashyeh bar Gadda in the name of R' Huna** said, if one cuts grain for the purpose of using it for s'chach, the straw is not considered "yados" (because he doesn't need or want the kernels attached, because they are passul for s'chach).
  - The one who holds that grain cut for s'chach doesn't have "yados" will clearly hold that grapes harvested for wine don't have yados, because the stems are detrimental for the winemaking process and are not wanted there. However, the one who says the grapes don't have yados may hold that the grain does have yados, because the kernels serve the purpose of preventing the straw from flying away.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, if one uses straw with the grain for s'chach, the **T"K** holds it is valid if there is more straw than grain. **Acheirem** say that there must be more straw than the grain *and* the yados. Would **R' Menashyeh** have to say that his halacha is a machlokes among these Tanna'im (whether we say the grain has yados when cut for s'chach)? **A: R' Menashyeh** would say, the case of the Braisa is where he initially cut the grain for food, and then decided to use it for s'chach. That is why the **Acheirem** say there are yados.
    - **Q:** If that is the case, why do the **Rabanan** say there are no yados? We can't say that since he decided to use it for s'chach it loses the yados, because an intent for use can only be changed with an *action*, not with another intent!? Although we find one view that a food's status may be changed with another intent, there is another view that an action is needed. According to the view that an action is needed, how do the **Rabanan** say that there are no yados here? **A:** The case is where the stems were crushed, thereby removing the yados designation.
      - **Q:** If so, why do the **Acheirem** say that there is still a yados designation? **A:** They hold like **R' Yose**, who says that if there is any use for the stems/straw, they retain their yados designation. Since the straw serves the purpose of having something of the s'chach to grab onto when taking apart the succah, it retains its yados designation.

-----Daf 7'---14-----

- The Gemara had quoted a Mishna that said, if the yados of food were "baisan", they are no longer mekabel tumah. **R' Yose** said they remain tamei.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yochanan** said that “baisan” means one crushed the yados, and **R' Elazar** says it means that one untied them.
  - **Q:** According to **R' Elazar** it can make sense why **R' Yose** says that they are still mekabel tumah. However, according to **R' Yochanan**, why would **R' Yose** say that they are mekabel tumah!? **A:** **Reish Lakish** said, even when crushed, they assist the moving of the grain with the pitchfork. Therefore, they serve a purpose and can become tamei.
  - **R' Elazar** said, the tefillos of tzaddikim are compared to a pitchfork. Just like the pitchfork moves the grain from one place to another, so too their tefillos brings Hashem to “move” from midas hadin to midas harachamim.

### MISHNA

- **R' Yehuda** says one may use boards for s'chach. **R' Meir** says it is not allowed.
- If one uses a board that is 4 tefachim wide, the succah remains valid, but he should not sleep under that board (Rashi explains the board is within 4 amos to the wall, and the succah is therefore valid through the concept of dofen akumah).

### GEMARA

- **Rav** said, the machlokes is only regarding boards that are 4 tefachim wide. **R' Meir** says, since roofs of houses were built using boards of that width, we may not use it for s'chach as a gezeirah that one should not think that he may use his house as a succah. **R' Yehuda** is not concerned for this and therefore doesn't make this gezeirah. However, all would agree that boards less than 4 tefachim wide may be used. **Shmuel** says they only argue regarding boards less than 4 tefachim wide. However, all would agree that boards 4 tefachim wide may not be used.
  - **Q:** According to **Shmuel**, does that mean that even narrow boards less than 3 tefachim may not be used? How is that different than sticks or reeds!? **A:** **R' Pappa** explained, all agree that boards larger than 4 are passul and less than 3 are valid. The machlokes is regarding boards that are between 3 and 4 tefachim wide. **R' Meir** says they are wider than the amount of lavod and are therefore passul. **R' Yehuda** says, they are smaller than a makom chashuv of 4 tefachim, and are therefore valid.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna seems to be a proof to **Shmuel**, because it says that if there is a board of 4 tefachim, one should not sleep under it. According to **Shmuel**, this follows **R' Yehuda** and **R' Meir**. However, according to **Rav**, this would not be true according to **R' Yehuda**!? **A:** It may be that that part of the Mishna only follows **R' Meir**.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, boards do not combine to make a succah passul, but **R' Meir** says that they do. According to **Shmuel**, the Braisa is discussing whether boards combine to a size of 4 tefachim (because all agree that a board 4 tefachim wide is passul). However, according to **Rav** who says that all agree that boards less than 4 tefachim are valid and the machlokes is only regarding boards of 4 tefachim, even **R' Meir** would agree that the smaller boards are valid, so why would it be an issue to have them combined? **A:** The Braisa may be dealing with boards that are 4 tefachim wide (which **R' Meir** says is passul s'chach), and the issue being dealt with is whether they combine to 4 amos, at which amount they would passul the succah even near the wall.
    - **Another version** of the proof was that the Braisa fits well according to **Shmuel**, because **R' Meir** is saying that they combine to make 4 amos of passul s'chach at the wall. However, according to **Rav**, why would **R' Yehuda** have to say that they don't combine? According to him, boards that are 4 tefachim wide are valid and are no different than sticks. Clearly they would not combine to become passul!? The Gemara answers that since **R' Meir** says that they do combine to the 4 amos, **R' Yehuda** said that they don't.
  - There is a Braisa that says like **Rav** (the machlokes is only regarding boards that are 4 tefachim wide), and **R' Yehuda** brought a proof from the fact that they once used boards of 4 tefachim when they were trying to fool the goyim into believing that they weren't keeping the mitzvah of succah. The **Rabanan** said that is no proof, because that was a “sha'as sakana” and is therefore different.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- There is a Braisa that says like **Shmuel** (that the machlokes is regarding boards less than 4 tefachim). The Braisa then says, **R' Meir** would agree that if in between each board of 4 tefachim there is a space of equal size, and that space is then filled with valid s'chach, the succah will be valid.
- If a board of 4 tefachim is stood up on its thickness, so that the width is not actually covering the succah, **R' Huna** says the succah would be passul, and **R' Chisda and Rabbah bar R' Huna** say it is valid.
  - **R' Chisda and Rabbah bar R' Huna** asked **R' Nachman** what the halacha is in this case. He told them that it is passul, just as if they were metal studs. **R' Huna** told them, I told you my view is correct! They said to him, it's not like you gave us a reason for your view. He said, it's not like you asked me for a reason.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof to **R' Huna** from a Braisa. The Braisa says that if one uses a board of 4 tefachim as s'chach, in a way that only 3 of the 4 tefachim are on top of the succah, it is passul. Presumably, this must mean that the boards were stood up on their thickness, and we see it is passul! **A:** It may be that the board was placed at the end of the succah and part of the board hung over off the succah. The rule is that s'chach that extends beyond the succah is considered part of the succah as well. That is why the board's full 4 tefachim are considered as being part of the succah and the succah is therefore passul.

-----Daf 10---15-----

### MISHNA

- **R' Yehuda** says, the roof of a house that has not yet been plastered: **B" S** say one must move all the boards and then take out every second board and place valid s'chach in its place, and **B" H** say, one of those two things must be done (either move every board *or* remove every second board and place valid s'chach in its place). **R' Meir** says, moving the boards does not help (he says boards of 4 tefachim may not be used as s'chach) and the only way to validate it is to remove every second board and put valid s'chach in its place.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** The view of **B" H** makes sense – they say that the roof even without the plaster is passul, because of the concept of ta'aseh v'lo min he'asuy. Therefore, by *either* moving the boards *or* replacing them, he has addressed that problem. However, what is **B" S's** concern? If they are concerned for ta'aseh v'lo min he'asuy, one of the two actions should suffice. If they are concerned for the possibility of people thinking that a regular roof may be used for s'chach, then only removing every other board and replacing it with valid s'chach should validate the succah and moving them should be unnecessary!? **A:** **B" S** are actually concerned for the possibility of people thinking that a regular roof may be used for s'chach. Therefore, they mean to say, even if one moves the boards, the only time it will be valid is if every other board is removed and replaced with valid s'chach.
  - **Q:** Based on that, **R' Meir** is saying exactly what **B" S** said!? **A:** **R' Meir** is saying that **B" S** and **B" H** do not argue regarding this, and they actually both hold that the only way to validate the succah is to remove every other board and replace it with valid s'chach.
  - **Q:** Based on this, the machlokes between **R' Yehuda** and **R' Meir** in our Mishna is whether we are goizer that one may not use boards for the possibility of people thinking that a regular roof may be used for s'chach. However, we have already learned this machlokes in the last Mishna!? **A:** **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the machlokes in the last Mishna was regarding whether one may use smooth boards (even narrower than 4 tefachim) or not, since they are similar to keilim, which are mekabel tumah. This Mishna deals with boards that are 4 tefachim wide.
    - **Q:** **Rav** said on the last Mishna, that male arrow sticks are valid s'chach but female arrow sticks are not (because they have a receptacle). He wasn't goizer in the case of the male stick for the case of the female sticks which are keilim, so presumably **R' Meir** (who we pasken like) would also not be goizer in the case of wood boards for the case of keilim (and yet, according to this explanation he is goizer)!? **A:** Both Mishnayos are centered around whether we are goizer for the possibility of people thinking that a regular roof may be used for s'chach. In the second Mishna, **R' Yehuda** is saying to **R' Meir**, this concern that you have follows the view of **B" S**, and

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

not **B”H**! **R’ Meir** replies, **B”S** and **B”H** do not argue about this, and both are in agreement that this is a valid concern for a gezeirah.

- **Q:** How would **Shmuel** (who says that **R’ Yehuda** agrees that boards of 4 tefachim are passul to use as s’chach) explain **R’ Yehuda** in our Mishna who seems to allow the boards of 4 tefachim to be used according to **B”H** by simply moving them, without removing every other board!? **A:** He will say that **R’ Yehuda** only says boards of 4 tefachim are passul when you are initially installing them as s’chach, because we are concerned that one will think he can use the roof of his house as s’chach as well. However, when one shows that he knows that a roof may not be used (by showing that he is moving each and every board so that it is not ta’aseh v’lo min he’asuy), a board of 4 tefachim will be valid to use according to **B”H**.

### MISHNA

- If one builds a structure (to hold the s’chach) of spits and bed frames, if there is empty space between them equal to the space that they take up, and he fills that space with valid s’chach, the succah is valid.
- If one hollows out a haystack to allow him to go inside and use it as a succah, it is not a valid succah.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** Our Mishna seems to refute **R’ Huna the son of R’ Yehoshua**, because he says that with regard to the walls needed to permit carrying on Shabbos, if the open spaces equal the walls, it is assur to carry there. Similarly, with regard to a succah, if the space with valid s’chach equals the amount of space with passul s’chach, the succah should be passul. Yet, our Mishna says that when they are equal the succah is valid!? **A:** The Mishna means that although there is an equal amount of space as invalid s’chach, there is also enough room to be able to put in and take out the valid s’chach (which too is filled with valid s’chach). That means that there is actually more than an equal amount.
  - **Q:** The spaces can be made to be exactly equal in size!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing where they are not equal in size, rather the valid s’chach slightly exceeds the invalid s’chach. **A2: Rava** said, the Mishna is discussing where the valid s’chach was placed perpendicularly across the poles of invalid s’chach. Therefore, even if the spaces in between are exactly equal to the amount of invalid s’chach, there is still more valid s’chach than invalid s’chach.

### OY BA’ARUCHOS HAMITAH

- **Q:** Our Mishna seems to follow the view of **R’ Ami bar Tavyumi**, who says that even worn out clothing can be mekabel tumah, since they were at one time part of a keili. Our Mishna says, that the wooden piece of a bedframe is passul as s’chach (because it is mekabel tumah) even though it is no longer part of the keili! **A:** Our Mishna may be discussing using one side of the bedframe along with two legs, in which case **R’ Chanan in the name of Rabbi** said, it is still considered a keili and is mekabel tumah.
  - **R’ Chanan** said this with regard to a bed becoming tamei though tumas medras. He said, one side with 2 legs can become tamei because it can be used as is by leaning it against a wall and sitting on it.
  - **Abaye** explains, the “worn out clothing” mentioned by **R’ Ami bar Tavyumi** refers to pieces of material that are less than 3x3 tefachim in size, which are therefore not useful for anyone to use as clothing or even as a patch.
    - There is a Braisa that says like **R’ Ami bar Tavyumi**. The Braisa then says that a small mat should not be used for s’chach (it presumably was made for another purpose and is therefore a keili which is mekabel tumah), but a large one may be used (it was presumably made to be used as s’chach). **R’ Eliezer** says that even a large mat should not be used for s’chach (we assume that it was made for lying on, and is therefore a keili that is mekabel tumah).

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Huna** said, this is only passul when there wasn't a hollowed space of one tefach height over an area of 7x7 tefachim that was under the haystack. If there was, the straw on top of it is considered an ohel and therefore, once it is raised to a height of 10 tefachim, it would be a valid succah.

### MISHNA

- If one built walls from the s'chach down, and the walls ended 3 tefachim above the ground, the succah is passul.
- If one built the walls from the ground up, once they reach a height of 10 tefachim the succah is valid, even if there is a large space between the walls and the s'chach.
- **R' Yose** says, just as when building up, all that is needed is a height of 10 tefachim, so too when building down, all that is needed is a height of 10 tefachim (even though there is a large space between the wall and the ground).

### GEMARA

- The machlokes is, **R' Yose** says that a wall hanging above the ground (at least 3 tefachim) is considered a wall and would allow one to carry on Shabbos, whereas the **T"K** says that such a wall does not have the status of a wall and would not allow one to carry on Shabbos based on it.
  - A Mishna says, if there is a watering pit that overlaps 2 chatzeiros (partly in one and partly in the other), neither chatzer may draw water from it unless there is a 10 tefach tall wall "down below" or within its rim. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, **B"H** say the wall must be "down below", and **B"S** say the wall can be "above". **R' Yehuda** says, the wall at ground level that separates the chatzeiros is also effective at separating the watering hole.
    - **Rabbah bar bar Channa in the name of R' Yochanan** said, **R' Yehuda** follows the shita of **R' Yose** of our Mishna, that a suspended wall is considered to be a full wall.
      - The Gemara says, this is not so. **R' Yehuda** need not agree with **R' Yose**, and **R' Yose** need not agree with **R' Yehuda**. It could be that **R' Yehuda** only says his din by eiruvei chatzeiros which is D'Rabanan, but would not say his din regarding succah, which is a D'Oraisa. It could also be that **R' Yose** only says his din regarding succah which is a mitzvas aseil. However, he would not say his din regarding Shabbos which carries the sekila death penalty.
        - Although we find a story that took place in Tzipori (where **R' Yose** was the Ruv) where they carried on the basis of "hanging walls", that story actually took place after **R' Yose's** death, and was allowed by **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yose**.
  - **R' Chisda in the name of Avimi** said, a mat that is slightly more than 4 tefachim wide may be used for the wall of a succah. The mat must be placed so that there is less than 3 tefachim below it (between it and the ground) and less than 3 above it (between it and the s'chach) and via lavud, the wall is considered to be 10 tefachim.
    - **Q:** This is obvious!? **A:** We would think that we only say lavud once for a particular wall, not twice.
    - **Q:** A Braisa says that a mat that is slightly more than 7 tefachim wide may be used for a succah wall. This suggests that lavud may only be used once!? **A:** The Braisa is discussing a succah taller than 10 tefachim, so that a mat slightly more than 4 tefachim cannot be placed in a way that there is less than 3 tefachim above and below it. Therefore, a mat of slightly more than 7 tefachim must be used so that when placed within 3 tefachim of the s'chach there is a 10 tefach wall. The chiddush of this Braisa would be like **R' Yose** of our Mishna, that when building down, all that is needed is a height of 10 tefachim (even though there is a large space between the wall and the ground).
  - **R' Ami** said, a board slightly more than 4 tefachim may be used as a 7 tefach wall of a succah by placing it within 3 tefachim to another wall.
    - **Q:** This is obvious!? **A:** **R' Ami** is teaching us that the minimum size of a succah is 7 tefachim.