



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

Succah Daf Yud Tes

- 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 3rd 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 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' Nossan**, 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 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.