



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Succah, Daf ט״ – Daf ל״

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

-----Daf ט״--17-----

#### MISHNA

- If the s'chach is placed 3 tefachim from the wall (leaving an empty space), the succah is passul.
- If there is a hole in the roof of a house and one puts valid s'chach over that hole, if there are 4 amos between the wall and the opening with the s'chach, it is passul. The same would hold true for porches in a courtyard, over which s'chach was placed. The same would be in a large succah where passul s'chach was placed near the walls and valid s'chach is placed in the center.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** Why did the Mishna have to give 3 cases to illustrate the concept of dofen akuma? **A:** If we would just give the case of the house, we would say dofen akuma only applies there, because the walls are made for the house. However, the walls of the courtyard are not made for the porches and therefore maybe we would not say dofen akuma there. And, if we were to only say these two cases, we would think, only there do we say dofen akuma, because the space between the s'chach and the walls are filled with items that are not inherently passul as s'chach (the roof is made of wood, which is only passul because of ta'aseh v'lo min he'asuy). However, in the 3<sup>rd</sup> case where he placed inherently passul s'chach, maybe we would not say dofen akumah. That's why the Mishna says all 3 cases.
- **Rabbah** found the **Rabanan** saying in the name of **Rav** that an empty space of 3 tefachim makes the succah passul, and passul s'chach of 4 tefachim makes a succah passul. **Rabbah** asked them, you say that 3 tefachim of empty space makes a succah passul based on our Mishna. The same Mishna says that passul s'chach only makes a succah passul when it is 4 amos!? The **Rabanan** responded, **Rav and Shmuel** both say, our Mishna is discussing when the passul s'chach is on the side, and it works via dofen akuma. **Rabbah** said, I then asked them, if there was passul s'chach less than 4 tefachim next to empty space less than 3 tefachim, it would be valid. However, if one was to fill some of the empty space with passul s'chach, the succah would become passul (there would be more than 4 tefachim of passul s'chach). How can it be that empty space (which is more stringent in that a smaller amount of it makes the succah passul) would not make the succah passul, but placing passul s'chach there does make it passul? The **Rabanan** responded, that same question exists according to you when there is passul s'chach less than 4 amos next to an empty space less than 3 tefachim! **Rabbah** replied, according to me, when the passul s'chach is less than 4 amos, the requisite amount doesn't exist to make it passul (it's a size requirement, not based on theory). This won't combine with the empty space, because the size requirements are drastically different. However, according to you, the size of 4 tefachim is based on the theory that 4 tefachim of passul s'chach creates a separation of the valid s'chach on the succah. Since the empty space is based on the same theory, they should combine and make the succah passul!
  - **Q: Abaye** asked **Rabbah**, even according to you they should combine, because in a succah of minimum measurement, empty space and s'chach passul will each make the succah passul even if they are present in only 3 tefachim. Therefore, they have the same "shiur" and should combine!?! **A: Rabbah** said, in that case the succah is passul because it lacks the minimum size necessary for a succah, not because of the size of the passul s'chach.
  - **Q:** Why does he say that whenever things do not have the same minimum shiur, they cannot be combined? A Mishna says that different materials combine for the shiur of tumah, even though each type of material has its own distinct shiur!? **A: R' Shimon** explains that the case of the Mishna is different, because they all share the minimum size needed to become tamei though being sat upon by a zav, since even when just one square tefach, they are fit to be used as a patch for a donkey saddle.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- In Naharda'ah they said, **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, passul s'chach in middle of the succah makes the succah passul even when just 4 tefachim. When it is at the succah wall, it is only passul when it is 4 amos. **Rav** said, in both cases it is only passul when it is 4 amos.
  - **Q:** The earlier Mishna said that that if one puts a 4 tefach board on a succah, it is valid. How would **Shmuel** explain this? **A:** He would say it is discussing when it is put on the side near the wall.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, boards do not combine to make a succah passul, but **R' Meir** says that they do. According to the version of **Rav** that even in middle of the succah it is only a problem when the passul s'chach is 4 amos, this is understandable, because it refers to the boards combining to 4 amos. However, according to the version that says in middle it is passul when only 4 tefachim, how can this be explained? If they are already 4 tefachim, it is passul. If they are less than 4 tefachim, they are simply sticks, which clearly can't be a problem when 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 near the wall (where all agree it is not passul at less than 4 amos).
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, if one covered a succah with boards of 4 tefachim, **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. According to the version that in middle of the succah it is passul at 4 tefachim, why is this a valid succah when there are boards of 4 tefachim in middle of the succah!? **A:** **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** said, the Braisa is discussing a succah which is exactly 8 amos. At each end he placed a 4 tefach board, and then alternated between valid s'chach and a board toward the middle of the succah. The result is that the middle 8 tefachim of the succah is covered with valid s'chach. After taking into account dofen akuma, the middle 8 tefachim are the main part of this succah, and is large enough to create a valid succah.

### -----Daf 18-----

- **Abaye** said, if there is an empty space of 3 tefachim in a large succah (larger than the minimum size succah), and one fills part of it with valid or passul s'chach, it effectively reduces the space and the succah is valid. If the same is done for the same space in a minimum size succah, it is only valid when it is filled with valid s'chach, not with passul s'chach.
  - All would agree that we would apply lavud to a space near the wall. With regard to whether we would say lavud in middle of the succah, there is a machlokes between **R' Acha** and **Ravina**: one says lavud is applied in middle as well, and the other says that it is not.
    - The one who says lavud is applied in the middle learns this from a Braisa that says that if a korah at the entrance to a mavoy is made of 2 pieces that don't quite meet in the middle, it is a valid korah as long as the pieces are less than 3 tefachim from each other.
      - The other shita will say that lavud is applied in the middle there, because the concept of a korah is D'Rabanan.
    - The one who says that lavud is not applied in the middle learns this from a Mishna which says that a skylight which is a tefach wide is considered as an open roof for tumah that is in the house or under it. We see that lavud is not applied in middle of the house.
      - The other shita will say that the halachos of tumah are learned via a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai and therefore cannot be the source for application elsewhere.
- **R' Yehuda bar Ilai** taught, if a house has a hole in its roof and valid s'chach is placed over it, it is a valid succah. **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yose** said, you need to qualify that the way my father did, that this is only true if there is less than 4 amos between the s'chach and the walls.
- **R' Yehuda bar Ilai** taught, the "avruma" fish is kosher. **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yose** said, you need to qualify that the way my father did, that this is only true in certain places.
  - **Abaye** similarly taught that the "tzachanta" fish from Bav Nahara is mutar.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The reason can't be because its waters flow and a non-kosher fish couldn't survive there, because we see that they do. It can't be because its waters are salty and a non-kosher fish couldn't survive there, because we see that they do. It must be because its sediment does not produce the proper environment for non-kosher fish.
  - **Ravina** said, today, since other rivers empty into the Bav Nahara, these fish are assur.
- If one placed s'chach over the porches protruding from the houses surrounding an alleyway (thereby covering the center of the alleyway with valid s'chach), and there are pillars at the point where the porches meet the center portion of the alleyway, and the pillars are less than 3 tefachim apart, the center of the alleyway is a valid succah. If there are no pillars, **Abaye** says it still a valid succah because we say "pi tikra yored v'sosem" (the edge of the porch is viewed as creating a wall down at its edge), and **Rava** says that it is not (we do not say pi tikra).
  - **Q: Rava** asked **Abaye**, according to you, if the middle wall of a 3 wall succah falls down, the succah should still be valid because we should view the edge of the s'chach on that third side as forming a wall!? **A: Abaye** answered, I would agree that pi tikra can't be said in that case, because the succah is like an open alleyway which allows an unobstructed flow of traffic.
  - **Q: Maybe** we can say that they argue in the same machlokes as **Rav** and **Shmuel**. We have learned that **Rav** allows one to carry on Shabbos under a roofed structure that has no walls and is in an open field, because he says pi tikra, and **Shmuel** does not allow it, because he does not say pi tikra!? **A:** All would agree that **Shmuel** must hold that the succah in our case would be passul. However, it may be that **Rav** would say that in the case of the roofed structure, the "walls" that are formed are for the benefit of the structure and are therefore viewed as enclosing the structure. However, the halachic "walls" created by the porches are formed for the benefit of the porches, and therefore may not be viewed as enclosing the succah.
  - **Q: Our Mishna** says, if the porches are 4 amos deep, the succah is passul (because there is too much space between the s'chach and the walls). According to **Abaye** we should say pi tikra on the edges of the porches!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing a case where the s'chach was placed at the same level as the porches, not above it. Therefore, the edges are not noticeable and one cannot say pi tikra.
  - In Pumbedisa they said the machlokes was only regarding where there were pillars, and the machlokes was whether we say lavud. However, the halacha does not follow this version.
  - **R' Ashi** once saw **R' Kahana** putting s'chach over porches which had no pillars beneath them. He said to him, don't you hold of **Rava** that such a succah would be passul? He answered, there is a pillar that is flush with the succah wall when viewed from the inside, but protrudes when viewed from the outside. That protrusion (which is at least a tefach wide) serves as the 3<sup>rd</sup> wall of the succah.

### -----Daf 19-----

- A Braisa says, s'chach that goes out of a succah is treated like a succah.
  - **Ulla** said, this refers to s'chach that overhangs beyond the succah, and the Braisa teaches that it is considered to be a valid succah as well.
    - **Q: A succah** needs 3 walls!? **A:** The case is where there are 3 walls behind the succah as well.
    - **Q: A succah** must be at least 7x7 tefachim!? **A:** The case is where that area has that measurement.
    - **Q: A succah** must have more shade than sun!? **A:** The case is where there is more shade than sun.
    - **Q: If so,** what is the chiddush? **A:** We would think that since the walls are really made for the interior of the succah and not for the area beyond the succah, that the back succah should be passul. The Braisa teaches that it is valid. **A2: Rabbah and R' Yosef** said, the case discussed is where the 3<sup>rd</sup> wall of a 3 wall succah extends beyond the parallel wall, and the s'chach extends along with it. We would think that the extended area is considered its own succah and needs to meet the minimum measurement and have 3 walls of its own. The Braisa teaches that it is part of the main part of the succah, and is therefore valid on account of it. **A3: Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the Braisa means to discuss a succah whose majority is more

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

shady than sunny, but which has one area that is more sunny than shady. We would think that the succah should be passul. The Braisa teaches that it is not. The Braisa means “s’chach that goes out of a succah” – s’chach that is partly not valid, is still treated like a succah. **A4: R’ Oshaya** said, the Braisa refers to less than 3 tefachim of passul s’chach in a succah that is 7x7 tefachim. The Braisa teaches that it is a valid succah. The Braisa means “s’chach that goes out of a succah” – s’chach that is not fit under the halachos of succah...

- **Q: R’ Hoshaya** asked, empty space of less than 3 tefachim does not passul a minimum size succah, so passul s’chach in that amount will clearly not passul either. Why did the Braisa have to teach this? **A: R’ Abba** said, the cases are different, because one may sleep under the passul s’chach, but not under the empty space.
  - **Q:** Can it be that the empty space combines to make the minimum size succah, but is not considered valid to sleep under? **A: R’ Yitzchak ben Elyashiv** said, we find this concept regarding a mikvah, where watery mud can combine to make the required 40 se’ah needed for a mikvah, but does not by itself provide tahara for one who toivels in it itself.

### MISHNA

- **R’ Eliezer** says, if one makes a succah shaped like a beehive (the walls and the roof are one), or leans his s’chach against a wall, it is passul. The **Chachomim** say it is valid.

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, **R’ Eliezer** agrees that if either of these are lifted a tefach off the ground, or if in the second case he separates it a tefach from the wall, it will be valid.
- The **Rabanan** validate the cases in the Mishna, because they say that sloping roofs have the status of roofs as well.
  - **Abaye** saw that **R’ Yosef** slept in a canopy bed with a sloping roof in a succah. He asked him, you seem to hold like **R’ Eliezer** who says that a sloping roof is not considered a roof, but the **Rabanan** say that it does!? **R’ Yosef** answered, I found a Braisa that says that it is the **Rabanan** who say that a sloping roof does not have the status of a roof. **Abaye** asked, you are following a Braisa over a Mishna!? **R’ Yosef** said, we see in a Braisa that our Mishna’s version of the machlokes only follows the view of **R’ Nosson**, the view of an individual.

### MISHNA

- With regard to a large mat of reeds, if it was made for purposes of laying on it, it is mekabel tumah and therefore is not valid to be used for s’chach. If it was made to be used as s’chach, it is not mekabel tumah and may be used as s’chach. **R’ Eliezer** says, large and small mats: if they were made for laying on, they are mekabel tumah and are not valid for s’chach, and if they were made for s’chach, they are valid for s’chach and are not mekabel tumah.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna has conflicting inferences. First it says that only when made for laying upon is it mekabel tumah, suggesting that if it is made without any specific intent it is not mekabel tumah. Then it says that if it is made for s’chach it is not mekabel tumah, which suggests that if it is made without any specific intent it is mekabel tumah!? **A:** The first part of the Mishna is discussing a large mat (which is typically made to provide shade), and the second part of the Mishna discusses a small mat (which is typically made to lay upon).
  - **Q:** This same question applies to **R’ Eliezer’s** statement in the Mishna, however the answer given cannot be used there (he is discussing both large and small mats)!? **A: Rava** said, all agree that a large mat is typically made for providing shade, and therefore, without intent to the contrary, it may be used for s’chach. The machlokes between the **T”K** and **R’ Eliezer** is regarding a small mat. The **T”K** says that it is typically (and therefore presumably) made to lay upon, and **R’ Eliezer** says that it is typically made to

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

provide shade. The Mishna should be understood as follows: a large mat that was made to lay upon is mekabel tumah and may not be used as s'chach. If it is made without special intention, it is treated as if it was made to provide shade, and therefore may be used as s'chach and is not mekabel tumah. **R' Eliezer** argues and says that a small mat is treated like a large mat.

- **Q: Abaye** asked, if this is correct that **R' Eliezer** means to stress the status of the small mat, he should say “whether a large one or a small one” (which shows that the small one is the one that we would think should be treated differently), not “whether a small one or a large one”, which is what he says in the Mishna!? **Q2:** A Braisa says that **R' Eliezer** is actually arguing regarding a large mat, and says that even a large mat may only be used when it is expressly made for purposes of providing shade!? **A: R' Pappa** said, all agree that a small mat is presumably made for laying upon. The machlokes is regarding a large mat. The **T”K** says, without any express intent, it is presumably made to provide shade (and is therefore valid to be used as s'chach) and **R' Eliezer** says it is presumably made for laying upon. The words of **R' Eliezer** can be explained as meaning, that if it is made without express intent, it is *treated* as if it was made for laying upon.

### -----Daf 20-----

- A Braisa says, mats made of “shifa” or “gemmi” (soft plant material), if they are large, they may be used for s'chach, if they are small they may not be used for s'chach (presumably they were made for laying upon). Mats made of reeds or “chilas” (hard materials), if they are braided they may be used for s'chach (because they are too hard to have been made for laying on), but if they are woven, they may not be used for s'chach (these are smooth and presumably were made to lay upon). **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yossi in the name of his father** says, in both cases, they may be used for s'chach. **R' Dosa** said like this as well.
- A Mishna says, **R' Dosa** says, all “chotzalos” can become tamei from a meis. The **Chachomim** say they can become tamei “medras”.
  - **Q:** A Mishna says that anything that can become tamei medras can become tamei meis as well!? **A:** The **Chachomim** mean that it can *even* become tamei medras.
  - **Q:** What are chotzalos? **A: R' Avdimi bar Hamduri** said it is “marzovlei”. **R' Abba** explained that marzovlei are bags used by shepherds, often as pillows. **A2: Reish Lakish** said that they are mats. We find that **Reish Lakish** explains the machlokes regarding chotzalos as referring to mats that people don't typically sit on, but occasionally do.
  - **Q:** How could **R' Dosa** say that chotzalos can become tamei meis when he was quoted earlier as allowing mats to be used for s'chach? **A:** The Mishna is discussing mats that have a rim to hold items placed on them (and are therefore considered keilim, which are mekabel tumah). The Braisa is discussing mats without rims.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, **R' Dosa** says, chotzalos made of “sha'am” or gemi plants, goat hair, or horse hair can become tamei from a meis. The **Chachomim** say that they can even become tamei medras. According to **R' Avdimi bar Hamduri**, those made of plants (they don't have a tight weave) can be used for holding larger fruit, and those made of animal hair can be used for holding even smaller items. However, according to **Reish Lakish**, the mats made of hair can be said to be used as curtains or as a sifter, which is why they would become tamei meis. But, why would the mats made of plants become tamei!? **A:** They are used to cover barrels of beer.
    - Another version of this question asked what the usefulness of the bags made of plants are. The Gemara answers that it can be used to hold large fruits.
- A Braisa says that mats may be used for s'chach. **R' Chisda** said, this refers to mats that don't have a rim.

**HADRAN ALACH PEREK SUCCA!!!**

**PEREK HAYASHAN TACHAS HAMITAH -- PEREK SHEINI**

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- One who sleeps under a bed in a succah is not yotzeh the mitzvah. **R' Yehuda** said, we used to sleep under beds in the succah and the Elders never said anything to us.
  - **R' Shimon** said, it once happened that Tavi, the slave of **R' Gamliel**, was sleeping under a bed in the succah. **R' Gamliel** said, you see that Tavi is a talmid chachom, because he knows that slaves are patur from the mitzvah of succah and therefore he may sleep under the bed in the succah. We see from here that if one sleeps under a bed in the succah he is not yotzeh the mitzvah of succah.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** How can sleeping under a bed cause a problem since a bed is not even 10 tefachim off the ground!? **A:** **Shmuel** said, the Mishna is discussing a bed that was ten tefachim high off the ground.
- A Mishna says that a naturally occurring space has the status of an ohel for purposes of tamei meis. **R' Yehuda** says it does not, because only a man-made ohel has that status for purposes of tamei meis.
  - **R' Yehuda** learns this from a gezeirah shava from the Mishkan. Just as there the “ohel” it was man-made, so too regarding tamei meis it must be man-made. The **Rabanan** say that the Torah says the word “ohel” many times regarding tumah to teach that it need not be man-made.

### -----Daf נב---21-----

- **Q:** How can we say that **R' Yehuda** says that a naturally occurring ohel does not have the status of an ohel for purposes of tumah? A Mishna describes the process of how certain children were raised in environments that precluded the possibility of the child becoming tamei from a meis, and says that these tahor children would draw water for the parah adumah process, if needed. The Mishna says, when going to the stream to draw the water, the child would be transported on a board over the back of an ox, so that the board would act as an ohel over the ground, just in case there was a meis buried at some point along the way. A Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** says the child was transported directly on the back of a wide ox, which itself acted as the ohel, without need for a board. Now, an ox is a “naturally occurring” ohel, and yet **R' Yehuda** says that it acts as an ohel for purposes of tumah!? **A: R' Dimi in the name of R' Elazar** said, **R' Yehuda** agrees that if the space of the ohel is larger than a tefach, even if it is naturally made it has the status of an ohel.
  - **Q:** The board on top of the ox created a space of a lot more than a tefach, and yet **R' Yehuda** says that should not be done!? **A: Abaye** said, **R' Yehuda** would agree that the board could have been used. He meant to say that it is not needed, because the wide ox was sufficient. **A: Rava** said, **R' Yehuda** held that the board should not be used, because the child would feel securely balanced on it, and possibly stick out his head or one of his limbs beyond the board, thereby exposing himself to possible tumah. By making the child ride on the ox, he would be too scared to do so.
  - **Q:** In our Mishna **R' Yehuda** says one may sleep under a bed in the succah (because the bed does not have the status of an ohel), even though the bed is much more than a tefach off the ground!? **A:** The bed is meant to be used on its top, therefore under the bed does not get the status of an ohel.
    - **Q:** An ox is also meant to be used on top, and yet **R' Yehuda** says that the ox creates an ohel underneath!? **A: Ravin in the name of R' Elazar** said, underneath the ox is used as an ohel by the shepherds, who protect themselves from the sun and the rain there.
    - **Q:** A bed is used as an ohel for the shoes that are placed underneath it as well!? **A: Rava** said, the backs of animals protect their insides and are therefore referred to, and are considered as, an ohel. **A2:** A bed is a temporary ohel (it constantly gets moved) and a succah is a more permanent ohel. A temporary ohel cannot remove the status of a permanent ohel, and therefore the one who sleeps under the bed is considered to be sleeping in the succah.
      - **Q: R' Shimon** also says that a succah must be more permanent (he says a succah must have 4 walls), and yet he says that one may not sleep under a bed in the succah!? **A:** He holds that a temporary ohel *can* remove the status of a more permanent one.

AMAR R' SHIMON MA'ASEH B'TAVI AVDO

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon** said, from “the chatter” of **R' Gamliel** we learn 2 things: that slaves are patur from the mitzvah of succah, and that one who sleeps under a bed in the succah is not yotzeh.
  - **Q:** Why doesn't he say “from the words” of **R' Gamliel**? **A:** He is teaching that even the “chatter” of talmidei chachomim needs to be studied.

### MISHNA

- If one places his s'chach on a bedframe, it is valid. **R' Yehuda** says, if the s'chach cannot be supported without the bedframe, it is passul.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** What is the reasoning of **R' Yehuda**? **A:** **R' Zeira** and **R' Abba bar Mamal** argue: one says because it is too temporary in nature, and the other says because the bedframe is mekabel tumah (and it is supporting the s'chach, which may not be mekabel tumah).
  - The difference between these views would be where one used metal studs to support his s'chach (it is more permanent but is mekabel tumah)
  - **Abaye** said, it is only problematic when the bedframe is supporting the s'chach. However, if there is a separate support and the bedframe is only acting as the walls of the succah, the succah would be valid.

## -----Daf כב--22-----

### MISHNA

- A succah that is “meduvleles”, and whose shade is more than its sun, is valid.
- A succah whose s'chach is very thick, like a house, even if one cannot see the stars through it, it is valid.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** What does “meduvleles” mean? **A:** **Rav** said, it means there is a very thin layer of s'chach, with spaces in between them, but no space is 3 tefachim. **Shmuel** said, it refers to a 2 layer s'chach, where the spaces left in the lower level have s'chach in that corresponding spot in the upper level.
  - **Rav** says that the first part of our Mishna refers to one case: a succah with a thin layer of s'chach is valid *if* its shade is more than its sun. **Shmuel** says that this part of the Mishna is referring to 2 cases: a succah which has 2 layers of s'chach, where the spaces of each layer correspond to s'chach on the other layer is valid. Also, a succah whose shade is more than its sun is valid as well.
  - **Abaye** said (according to **Shmuel**), the 2 layers of s'chach combine to make a valid succah only if there is less than 3 tefachim between the 2 layers.
    - **Rava** said, 3 tefachim of space between the two is only a problem when the pieces of sections of s'chach on the upper level are less than a tefach wide. If they are a tefach wide, even if there is more than 3 tefachim of space between the 2 levels, the succah will be valid, because we say “chavot rami” (we view the upper level as if it falls into the empty space, below).
    - **Rava** said, we see this tefach qualification regarding tumah in a house where there are 2 levels, and the boards of the upper roof correspond to the spaces in the lower roof. A Braisa explains, that if the boards and spaces are a tefach, then we would say “chavot” and the entire house is considered to be under one roof. If there is not a tefach, we would not say “chavot”.
      - **Q:** **R' Ashi** asked, we find a Braisa that says, if there are 2 korahs next to each other horizontally, but at different height levels, we view them as if they are together (and if together they meet the minimum requirements for a korah, it is a valid korah). The Braisa is discussing where each korah is less than a tefach, and still the Braisa seems to say that we say “chavot”!? **A:** **R' Kahana** said, the Braisa may be talking about where there is less than 3 tefachim of space between the two korahs, which is why we don't need them to be a tefach. However, if there was more than 3 tefachim of space, we would only say “chavot” if the korah was a tefach wide.

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## VISHETZILASA MERUBAH MEICHAMASAH KESHEIRAH

- **Q:** This Mishna suggests that if there is an equal amount of shade and sun the succah would be passul. However, the first Mishna of the Mesechta suggests that if they are equal it will be valid!? **A:** Both Mishnayos mean that if there is more sun than shade at the ground level of the succah, it would be passul, but an equal amount at ground level would be valid. Our Mishna is discussing at the s'chach level. If it is equal at the level of the s'chach, it will be more sun than shade at the ground level, and it is therefore passul. The first Mishna is discussing at the ground level. If it is equal at that level, it means that there is more shade than sun at the s'chach level, and it is valid.

## ME'UBAH K'MIN BAYIS

- A Braisa says, if the s'chach is so thick that the stars cannot be seen through it, the succah is still valid. If it is so thick that even the rays of sun cannot be seen through it, **B"Y** say the succah is passul, and **B"H** say it is valid.

## -----Daf לז---23-----

## MISHNA

- If one makes a succah on a wagon or on top of a ship, it is valid, and one may go up into it on Yom Tov.
- If one makes a succah on top of a tree or on a camel, it is valid, but one may not go up into it on Yom Tov.
- If one makes two walls of the succah by using a tree and the third wall is manmade, or the reverse, it is valid but one may not go up into the succah on Yom Tov. If 3 are manmade and one is made using the tree, it is valid and one may go up into it on Yom Tov.
  - The general rule is, if one would remove the tree and the succah would remain standing, such a succah is valid and one may go up into it on Yom Tov.

## GEMARA

- Our Mishna, which validates a succah on a ship, follows **R' Akiva**. However, **R' Gamliel** argues and says that such a succah is not valid.
  - **Abaye** said, all agree that if the succah is not sturdy enough to withstand a normal wind on land, it would be passul when on the ship. Also, if it could withstand an unusually strong wind on land, all would agree that it would be valid. The machlokes is where it could withstand a normal wind on land but not an unusual one. **R' Gamliel** says, since it cannot withstand a normal sea wind, it has no level of permanence and is therefore passul. **R' Akiva** says, a succah only need be temporary in nature, and since it can withstand a normal wind on land, it is valid.

## OY AHL GABEI GAMAL...

- The Mishna follows **R' Meir**, who says that a succah may be built on an animal's back. However, **R' Yehuda** argues and says that it may not.
  - **R' Yehuda** says, the pasuk says a succah must be made for you for 7 days. This teaches that a succah is only valid when it is fit to be used all 7 days of Succos. Since one may not mount an animal on Yom Tov, such a succah could not be used on the days of Yom Tov. **R' Meir** says, the prohibition of mounting an animal is only D'Rabanan. Therefore, it is considered to be fit for use on all 7 days.
- A Braisa says, **R' Meir** says, if one uses a live animal as a succah wall, the succah is passul. **R' Yehuda** says it is valid. **R' Meir** would say that a live animal may not be used for a succah wall, for a lechi of a mavoi, for a corner board around a well, or for the cover of a casket, **R' Yose Haglili** says it may also not be used to write a "get" on.
  - **Q:** What is **R' Meir's** reasoning? **A: Abaye** said, he is afraid that the animal will die on Yom Tov. **A2: R' Zeira** said, he is afraid that the animal will run away.
    - If the animal used is a tied down elephant, all would agree it may be used, because there is no concern that it will run away, and even if it were to die, the dead animal would be 10 tefachim high. The machlokes would be where an untied elephant is used. According to **Abaye** there is no concern, and according to **R' Zeira** there is reason for concern.
      - **Q:** Why wouldn't **Abaye** be concerned that the animal may run away? **A:** He would be, and the machlokes is only regarding using a smaller animal that is tied up. According to

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

**R' Zeira** there is no concern (even the concern of it dying is not common and therefore not a valid concern), and according to **Abaye** we are concerned that it will die.

- **Q:** How can it be a wall when there is all that space from the ground to the animal between its legs!? **A:** He fills that area with branches.
- **Q:** Why are we not concerned that the animal will bend down, thereby becoming lower than 10 tefachim? **A:** The animal is held in a standing position by strings.
  - **Q:** If so, why is **Abaye** concerned that it may die? It will be held standing anyway!? **A:** We are concerned for the case when the animal is slightly more than 7 tefachim and the wall is created with lavud to the s'chach. If the animal were to die, it would shrink ever so slightly, but enough to make lavud inapplicable.
- **Q:** How could **Abaye** explain that **R' Meir** is concerned for death? When faced with one Mishna that seems to be concerned for the possibility of death and another Mishna that is not, **Abaye** explained that the Mishna that is concerned for death follows **R' Yehuda** (as we see he does not allow one to designate terumah and ma'aser from wine and then drink the wine, leaving over a bit at the end for the teruma and ma'aser, because he is concerned that the bottle will break, which is like being concerned for death), and the other Mishna follows **R' Meir** (who allows one to drink the wine and leave over at the end, and he is not concerned for the breaking of the bottle, just as he is not concerned for the possibility of death)!? **A:** **Abaye** meant to say that the Mishna that is concerned for the possibility of death follows **R' Meir** and the other one follows **R' Yehuda**, as we find in the Braisa regarding using an animal for the wall of a succah (where **R' Meir** does not allow it, out of concern for death of the animal).