



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

Succah Daf Zayin

- **Q:** Where does this tefach sized wall need to be placed? **A: Rav** says, it should be placed at a right angle at the open end of one of the other 2 walls.
 - **R' Kahana and R' Assi** said to **Rav**, it would be better to place it at the end of one of the 2 walls, but diagonally towards the 2 walls!
 - **Rav** remained quiet, but we find that **Shmuel** said in the name of **Levi** exactly like **Rav** had said.
 - **R' Simon** said, the 3rd wall should be made as a large tefach and placed within 3 tefachim to the end of one of the other 2 walls, which through use of lavud creates a "wall" that is 4 tefachim long.
 - **R' Yehuda** said, if the 2 walls of a succah are parallel to each other (as opposed to being attached at a right angle), it is valid, and the 3rd wall (of a tefach) should be placed at any of the 4 ends of the other walls.
 - **R' Simon** said, when the 2 walls are set up like this, the third wall must be slightly larger than 4 tefachim, and must be placed slightly less than 3 tefachim to one of the existing walls, thereby (using lavud) creating a 3rd wall of 7 tefachim (the minimum size of a succah).
 - **R' Simon** said differently in this case than when the 2 walls are at right angles, because 2 parallel walls resemble a passageway, not a succah, and therefore needs a more substantial 3rd wall to be valid. When the 2 walls are at a right angle, it somewhat resembles a succah already, and a smaller 3rd wall is sufficient.
 - **Rava** said, when the 3rd wall of a tefach is placed at the end of one of the 2 walls which are at a right angle, it is only mutar when there is a tzuras hapesach (two vertical poles with a horizontal pole across the top of the 2 vertical poles).
 - Some explain **Rava** as giving an alternative to **R' Simon's** approach, that a "wall" of 4 tefachim must be created, and **Rava** is saying that instead of that, a tzuras hapesach may be created and used instead. Others explain that **Rava** is saying that **R' Simon's** approach is not enough, and a tzuras hapesach must be done *in addition* to the "wall" of 4 tefachim.
 - We find that **R' Kahana** held like the second understanding of **Rava**.

SHTAYIM K'HILCHASAN...

- **Rabbah** said, although on a typical Shabbos, in order for someplace to be considered a reshut hayachid the area needs to be enclosed by 3 walls, on the Shabbos of Succos, since ("miguy") we are taught that the 3rd wall of a tefach is considered a "wall" for the succah, it will also be considered a 3rd wall for purposes of Shabbos, and one may treat the inside of the succah as a reshut hayachid.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says that the walls needed for Shabbos are more stringent than those needed for succah, because the walls for Shabbos must have more closed walls than openings. Presumably this is referring to Shabbos of Succos and we see that even then the walls of a succah do not suffice for purposes of Shabbos!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to other Shabbosos of the year.
 - **Q:** If so, we should say that in a case where a succah is set up with 2 parallel walls, in which case we have said earlier the 3rd wall must be a "large tefach" and should be

placed at a distance of almost 3 tefachim from the end of one of the walls (and that a small stick (“lechi”) is not enough to be considered the 3rd wall if placed by the end of one of the other walls), we should say that since for purposes of Shabbos, if one has 2 parallel walls he only needs to place a thin lechi at the end and the lechi is considered to be a 3rd wall, we should say that “miguy” the lechi is a wall for purposes of Shabbos, it should be a “wall” for a succah on Shabbos of Succos as well!? **A:** In truth, **Rabbah** says that would be effective because of that miguy as well. The reason the Braisa does not mention it, is because if we can say a miguy from the lenient case (of succah) to the stringent case (of Shabbos), surely we can say the miguy from the stringent case to the lenient case.

- Besides these two cases of miguy, **Rabbah** said an additional case where the miguy is effective. Since regarding Shabbos the **Rabanan** allowed one to “enclose” the area around a well with 4 corner boards, if one were to cover that “enclosed” area with s’chach, it would be a valid succah on the Shabbos of Succos (since these are “walls” for purposes of Shabbos, they are walls for purposes of succah as well).
 - All 3 cases of miguy were necessary to be stated. If we would just say the case of parallel walls, we would say the miguy helps there because at least there are 2 complete, physical walls. If we were just to say the case of the corner boards around the well, we would say the miguy helps there because there are 4 halachic walls. If we would only say those two cases, we would not think that the miguy can be said to bring a leniency to Shabbos.

V’SHECHAMASAH MERUBAH MITZILASAH PESSULAH

- A Braisa says, more sun than shade in a succah is only problematic when this sun enters from the s’chach. However, if the sun enters from the walls (i.e. from the lack of complete walls), the succah is valid. **R’ Yoshiya** says, the succah would be passul in that case as well.
 - **Abaye** explained, that **R’ Yoshiya’s** reasoning is based on the pasuk that says “v’sakosa ahl ha’Aron es haparoches”. The paroches was a wall (a vertical separation) and yet the Torah uses the word “v’sakosa” to describe it. We see that the walls are part of the s’chach requirement, and must provide shade as well.
 - The **Rabanan** say that the pasuk teaches that the paroches was to be folded over on the top and in that way acted as a roof over the Aron.
- **Abaye** said, **Rebbi** (who is machmir that a succah must be at least 4x4 amos), **R’ Yoshiya** (who says that the walls must provide shade), **R’ Yehuda** (who says that the walls may be taller than 20 amos), **R’ Shimon** (who says that a succah needs 3 proper walls and a 4th at least the size of a tefach), **R’ Gamliel** (who invalidates a succah built on top of a ship or wagon), **Beis Shammai** (who say that a succah must be large enough to fit one’s head, most of his body, and his table), **R’ Eliezer** (who invalidates a succah built as a teepee or one where the s’chach is placed on the floor and leaned against a wall), and the **Acheirim** (who invalidate a round succah, because it has no corners), all hold the way they do because they say that a succah has to be fit for a more permanent dwelling (compared to those that argue on each of them regarding their particular halachos).