



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

Succah Daf Yud Beis

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.
 - **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 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 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.