



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

Succah Daf Yud Aleph

- **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 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, haddasim 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.