



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

Succah Daf Yud Daled

- 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.
 - **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.
- 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.