



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Succah, Daf כ – Daf טו

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf כ--2-----

MESECHTA SUCCAH

PEREK SUCCAH -- PEREK RISHON

MISHNA

- A succah whose s'chach is higher than 20 amos is passul, but **R' Yehuda** says it is valid.
- A succah that is not at least 10 tefachim tall, or that does not have at least 3 walls, or one in which there is more sun than shade, is passul.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Regarding the halachos of a mavui, the Mishna says that the korah cannot be higher than 20 amos. The **T"K** there says, if it is higher it should be lowered, and **R' Yehuda** says it need not be lowered. Why does the Mishna there not say "passul", but instead gives the way to fix it, and in our Mishna the **T"K** simply says "passul"? **A:** Succah is D'Oraisa, so it is more befitting to say passul, whereas the halachos of mavui are D'Rabanan and therefore it is more befitting to give the way to fix it. **A2:** Our Mishna gives many different invalidities of the succah, and would therefore have the list the way to address each and every one of them. It is therefore simpler and easier to just say "passul".
- **Q:** How do we know that a succah whose s'chach is higher than 20 amos is passul? **A:** **Rabbah** said, the pasuk says "L'man yeidu doroseichem ki basuccos hoshavti". When the s'chach is higher than 20 amos it is not noticeable, and it is not "known" that one is sitting in a succah. **A2:** **R' Zeira** said, the pasuk says "v'succah tihyeh l'tzeil yomam". When the s'chach is higher than 20 amos, the shade in the succah is created by the walls, not the s'chach.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked **R' Zeirah**, if one were to make a succah between two large mountains (where the mountains provide all the shade) it would surely be a valid succah, so why is this different? **A: R' Zeira** answered, in the case of the mountains, if the mountains are removed, the s'chach as is would provide the shade. However, if the s'chach is higher than 20 amos, even if the walls are removed, the area under the s'chach would be mostly sunny. Therefore it is passul.

A3: Rava said, the pasuk says, "basuccos teishvu shivas yomim". This teaches that the succah should be a temporary dwelling ("for 7 days"). A wall higher than 20 amos must be properly supported and is therefore considered a permanent structure.

- **Q: Abaye** asked, if someone were to make a succah less than 20 amos, but would use iron walls, are you saying that that would be passul as well!? **A: Rava** answered, when less than 20 amos tall, since it *can* be made in a temporary fashion, even if it is made in a permanent fashion, it is valid. When taller than 20 amos, since it must be made in a more permanent fashion, even if it is made in a temporary fashion, it will be passul.
- The source of **Rabbah** is not used by the others, because they say that pasuk is telling the Yidden to remember the "ananaei kavod" when they sit in the succah. The source of **R' Zeirah** is not used by the others, because they say that pasuk is referring to the times of Moshiach, not a regular succah. The source of **Rava** is not used by the others, because they agree with the question of **Abaye**.
- **R' Yoshiya said in the name of Rav**, the machlokes between the **T"K** and **R' Yehuda** in our Mishna is only where the wall doesn't meet the s'chach. If it does, all would agree it can even be higher than 20 amos. This follows the view of **Rabbah**, because when the wall meets the s'chach, one's gaze follows the wall up and he notices that he is sitting under s'chach.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Huna in the name of Rav** said, the machlokes between the **T"K** and **R' Yehuda** in our Mishna is only where the succah is only 4x4 amos. However, if it is more than 4x4, all would agree that the s'chach may be higher than 20 amos. This follows the view of **R' Zeira**, and when the succah is larger than 4x4, the shade inside is from the s'chach, as opposed to from the walls.
- **R' Chanan bar Rabbah in the name of Rav** said, the machlokes between the **T"K** and **R' Yehuda** in our Mishna is only where the succah is only large enough to fit one's head, most of his body, and his table. However, if the succah is larger, the s'chach may even be higher than 20 amos. This statement doesn't fit according to **Rabbah, R' Zeirah, or Rava**.
 - **Q: R' Yoshiya** argues on the others, because they say the machlokes is based on the size of the succah, and he says it has nothing to do with that. However, maybe we can say that **R' Huna** and **R' Chanan bar Rabbah** argue as to the minimum size that a succah may be (and they both agree that if the succah is larger than the minimum size, the s'chach may be higher than 20 amos)? **A:** It may be that they both agree that the minimum size for a succah is for it to be large enough to fit one's head, most of his body, and his table. They argue in the following: **R' Chanan** says once it is larger than that, the **T"K** would agree that the s'chach may be higher than 20 amos, and **R' Huna** says, the **T"K** argues up to the point that the succah is 4x4 amos.
 - **Q:** A Braisa brings the machlokes between the **T"K** and **R' Yehuda** regarding a succah whose s'chach is higher than 20 amos. It then brings the following. **R' Yehuda** said to the **Rabanan** (the **T"K**), it once happened that the Elders visited Queen Hilni on Succos, and she was in a succah whose s'chach was higher than 20 amos, and they said nothing to her. The **Rabanan** responded, that is no proof that s'chach may be higher than 20 amos, because Hilni was a woman, and therefore patur from having to sit in a succah altogether (which is why they didn't correct her succah). **R' Yehuda** then said, Hilni had 7 sons, who presumably were chayuv in succah, and yet the Elders didn't correct her succah! Also, Hilni did everything according to the way the **Chachomim** said things should be done! The Gemara now asks, why did **R' Yehuda** have to give this second reason (i.e. Hilni did all according to the **Chachomim**)? **R' Yehuda** was saying as follows. If you (**Rabanan**) will say that maybe the sons were minors, I will tell you that she had 7 sons, which means that at least some of them were old enough to be chayuv in succah D'Rabanan (they were old enough not to need their mother). If you will say that Hilni didn't follow the D'Rabanan mitzvos, I will tell you that she followed all that the **Chachomim** said to do! Now, according to **R' Yoshiya**, this makes sense, because a queen would probably have a succah whose walls didn't meet its s'chach, for purposes of ventilation. However, according to the others, that the **Rabanan** only argue in a succah of very small size, this would mean that Queen Hilni sat in a tiny succah, which does not seem logical for a queen to have done! **A: Rabbah bar R' Adda** said, she was sitting in a larger succah that was made up of a number of small rooms (each the size of a minimum succah and therefore judged as if each was a succah on its own).
 - **Q:** It still seems illogical to say that a queen would sit in such small rooms? **A: R' Ashi** said, it was actually a large succah that had some smaller side rooms. The machlokes was, that the **Rabanan** felt that the sons would hang out in the large (and therefore kosher) part of the succah, which is why they did not correct the fact that her room was passul, since, as a woman, she was anyway not chayuv in the mitzvah of succah. **R' Yehuda** held that the sons would hang out with their mother, and still the Elders did not correct her room, which shows that s'chach above 20 amos is valid, even in a succah of minimum size.

-----Daf ל--3-----

- **R' Shmuel bar Yitzchak** said, the halacha is that a succah must (at a minimum) be large enough to fit one's head, most of his body, and his table. **R' Abba** asked him, you seem to be following **B"S** (because **B"H** say that one need not have his table in the succah). **R' Shmuel bar Yitzchak** answered, that it is true, he follows **B"S**.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** asked, who says that **B”S** and **B”H** argue about the minimum size of a succah? Maybe they are arguing regarding a larger succah, and the argument is whether one may eat in the succah when his table is outside the succah. **B”S** say one may not, because that may cause him to eat over his table, which is outside the succah, and **B”H** is not concerned for this and therefore allow it!? **A:** They must argue in regard to the minimum size of a succah as well. There are 2 Braisos that seem to contradict each other. In one Braisa the **Chachomim** (the **T”K**) say that a succah must be large enough to fit one’s head, most of his body, and his table. In another Braisa the **Chachomim** say that a succah must only be large enough to fit one’s head and most of his body. [In both Braisos, **Rebbi** argues and says that the succah must be a minimum of 4x4 amos]. It must be that the first Braisa follows **B”S** and the second Braisa follows **B”H**, and this proves that they argue with regard to the minimum size of a succah as well.
 - **Mar Zutra** said, a Mishna suggests this as well, because when they argue in the Mishna the terminology used is “kosher” and “passul”, which is terminology used to describe the succah itself.
 - **Q:** That Mishna also suggests that they are arguing about a larger succah and whether the person in the succah is yotzeh, because the Mishna says, “if one is sitting in a succah but the table is outside...”. If the machlokes in the Mishna was about the minimum size of the succah, it should be written as “a succah that can only hold...”? **A:** They actually argue on both points.
 - **Q:** A Braisa lists a number of halachos that apply to houses, but only when the house is at least 4x4 amos. Must we say that this Braisa only follows the view of **Rebbi**? **A:** The **Rabanan** only say that a succah may be smaller than 4x4 because it is a temporary dwelling place. However, they would agree that a house, which is a permanent dwelling place, must be at least 4x4 amos to be considered a proper house.
 - The Braisa said that a house smaller than 4x4 amos: is not chayuv in mezuzah, or to have a fence around its roof, does not become tamei from nega’im, is not subject to the redemption limitations on houses that are sold in a walled city, and do not allow one who built it to become exempt from the army like someone who built a new house and had not yet lived in it. The reason such a house is not treated like a house for these purposes is because regarding each of these halachos the pasuk says “bayis”, and such a small house is not called a “bayis”.
 - The Braisa said such a house is not included in an eiruv, or a shituf, and an eiruv may not be left in that house. The reason for this is because such a house is not considered fit to be lived in.
 - **Q:** Why may an eiruv not be placed in it, but a shituf may be placed in it? **A:** A shituf may even be left in the chatzer itself, so it can be left in such a house as well.
 - The Braisa said such a house is not considered a house which can be used to combine two cities for purposes of techumin. In this way it is even worse than a hut. The reason for this is that a hut is fit for its intended purpose, but a house that small is not fit for its intended purpose (i.e. to be lived in).
 - The Braisa said such a house is not split by brothers or partners.
 - **Q:** Does this mean that if a house is at least 4x4 amos it will be divided? We have learned that we don’t force a chatzer to be divided unless each partner will end up with a piece that is 4x4 amos!? **A:** The Braisa means that the house is not considered a house for purposes of splitting up a chatzer. A chatzer is divided among brothers or partners, by giving some precedence to the number of houses owned in the chatzer (the amount of precedence is a matter of machlokes). The Braisa teaches that that is only true for houses that are destined to remain. However, a house of this size is destined to be destroyed, and is therefore not given the status of a house for this purpose.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 7--4-----

- If the s'chach of a succah was higher than 20 amos, and one decreases that 20 amah space by placing cushions on the floor of the succah, that will not be a valid reduction of the space, because even if he is "mevateil" the cushions to remain there throughout the duration of the Yom Tov, since most people would not be mevateil cushions in that way, his bittul is ineffective (and the cushions are therefore not considered to be part of the floor of the succah).
 - If one wants to raise the floor by placing down straw, which he is then mevateil to the floor, it acts as an increase to the floor. Surely, if one places down dirt and is mevateil it there, it is effective as well.
 - If one places down straw, without expressly being mevateil it, but where it is known that he will not be needing to remove it, or if one placed down dirt without any express intent, and even without us knowing that he will not be needing it, the effectiveness of these items will be subject to a machlokes between **R' Yose** (straw that was placed without express intent, but with the knowledge that they will not need to be removed, and dirt that is left there even without that knowledge, both become batel; however, dirt that will have to be removed has the status of straw that was placed without that knowledge and they do not become batel) and the **Rabanan** (they say even straw and dirt only become batel when one was expressly mevateil them).
 - If the leaves from the s'chach hang down to within 20 amos of the ground, and there are enough leaves that they could make most of the succah shady, the succah is valid.
 - If a succah was 10 tefachim tall, but the leaves from the s'chach hung down to below 10 tefachim, **Abaye** thought to say that if the leaves could not provide shade for most of the succah, they would be considered as non-existent (based on the concept of the last case) and the succah should remain valid. **Rava** said to him, this succah will anyway be passul, because the hanging leaves have created a scenario of unpleasant living (it is very cramped).
 - If one builds a platform (which is tall enough so that the space between it and the s'chach is less than 20 amos) reaching 3 of the succah's walls, and the platform covers an area equal to at least the minimum size of a succah (large enough for his head, most of his body, and his table), the succah will be valid. If the platform only reaches two of the walls, if there is less than 4 amos between the end of the platform and the wall, the succah is valid.
 - **Q:** What is the novelty of this second halacha? A Mishna already teaches us the halacha of "dofen akumah" (when the wall is less than 4 amos away we view it as a "bending wall" and it is considered to reach the s'chach)!? **A:** From the Mishna we may think that we only apply dofen akuma when the wall is otherwise valid (just somewhat separated from the s'chach). In our case, the wall by itself is taller than 20 amos and therefore invalid. We therefore needed to be taught that we would apply dofen akuma in this case as well.
 - If one builds the platform in middle of the succah (not touching any wall), if the platform is within 4 amos to all the walls, the succah is valid.
 - **Q:** Why is there a need to teach the concept of dofen akumah yet again? **A:** We would have thought that we can only say dofen akuma to one wall, not to multiple walls at one time.
 - If the succah was shorter than 10 tefachim and one dug into the ground thereby increasing the height, if there is less than 3 tefachim between the newly dug out area and the walls, it is valid.
 - The reason this must be so close (and we do not allow up to 4 amos of space) is because walls do not have the status of halachic "walls" when they are less than 10 tefachim. To create "walls", the dug out area must be within 3 tefachim.
 - If one builds a pillar that is 10 tefachim tall, with the area atop the pillar having the size of a minimum succah, and puts this pillar in a succah whose s'chach is over 20 amos high, **Abaye** thought to say that we would say "gud asik", which would view the sides of the pillar as reaching up to the s'chach (creating halachic walls), thereby creating a valid succah on the top of the pillar. **Rava** said that will not work, because we need noticeable walls to create a succah, and this "succah" would not have noticeable walls.
 - A Braisa says, if one erected a frame (4 poles without walls) on the roof of a house, and spread s'chach on top of it, **R' Yaakov** said it is a valid succah, and the **Chachomim** said it is passul.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Huna** said, the machlokes is only where the frame is erected at the edge of the roof. In that case **R' Yaakov** says we say gud asik on the walls of the house, and they are considered to be noticeable (since the walls of the house are noticeable), and the **Chachomim** say that these walls are not noticeable above the roof and therefore gud asik cannot be applied. However, if the frame was erected in middle of the roof, all would agree that it would be an invalid succah, because the poles of the frame itself do not constitute walls. **R' Nachman** said that the machlokes is even when the frame is built in middle of the roof. **R' Yaakov** says that the poles at the corners of the frame act as complete walls (since they are a tefach wide towards both adjacent “walls”), and the **Chachomim** say that a succah needs at least 2, actual, physical walls equal to the size of a minimum succah, and a 3rd wall that is at least a tefach.
 - **Q:** Does **R' Nachman** mean to say that the **Chachomim** would agree that the succah would be valid when the frame is at the edge of the roof, or do they argue in both cases? **A: TEIKU.**
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that when a frame is built on the ground and covered with s'chach, **R' Yaakov** says it is a valid succah. Building the frame on the ground is like building it in middle of the roof, and yet he says it is valid!? **A:** This refutes the version of **R' Huna – TEYUFTA!**
 - **Q:** In addition, from the fact that this Braisa says that they argue when built on the ground (which is like in the middle of the roof), it must be that they agree that it would be valid if built on the end of the roof!? This seems to refute the first part of **R' Huna's** statement as well!? **A: R' Huna** would say that in truth they argue in both cases. The reason the Braisa states the machlokes in terms of the case of the middle of the roof, is to teach that **R' Yaakov** says it is valid *even* in that case.
 - A Braisa says, when one sticks 4 poles into the ground and covers them with s'chach, **R' Yaakov** says it is valid as long as the poles are thick enough that if carved into a right angle, there would be a tefach towards each side. If the poles are that large, there are considered to be 4 walls and therefore a valid succah. The **Chachomim** say that a valid succah must have 2 complete walls and a third that is at least a tefach.

-----Daf 7---5-----

V'SHE'EINA GAVOHAH ASARA TEFACHIM

- **Q:** How do we know that such a succah is passul? **A: Rav, R' Chanina, R' Yonason and R' Chaviva** taught, we know that the Aron was 9 tefachim high and the kapores was one tefach high (for a total height of 10 tefachim). The pasuk says that Hashem rested and spoke from the top of the kapores. **R' Yose** once taught that the Shechina never came down to this earth, and Moshe and Eliyahu never went up to the Heavens, based on the pasuk “Hashamayim shamayim LaShem, v'ha'aretz nasan livnei adam”. Based on this, the Shechina only rested on the kapores, because at 10 tefachim high, it was considered to be a separate domain. We see that 10 tefachim makes a separation, and by extension, that walls of 10 tefachim have the status of “walls”.
 - **Q:** The pasuk says that the Shechina came down onto Har Sinai? **A:** It stayed 10 tefachim above the mountain.
 - **Q:** The pasuk says that Hashem will “stand” on Har Hazeisim!? **A:** He will be 10 tefachim off the mountain.
 - **Q:** The pesukim says that Moshe and Eliyahu went up to Heaven!? **A:** They remained 10 tefachim below Heaven.
 - **Q:** The pasuk says that Moshe went up to the Kisei Hakavod!? **A:** He remained 10 tefachim below.
 - **Q:** The pasuk says that Moshe grabbed onto the Kisei Hakavod!? **A:** Hashem lowered it to 10 tefachim below Heaven.
 - **Q:** We know that the Aron was 9 tefachim tall (the pasuk says the height was 1.5 amos). How do we know that the kapores was one tefach high? **A: R' Chanina** taught, we learn it from the crown of the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Shulchan. Just like that was a tefach (as stated in the pasuk), so too the kapores was a tefach high as well.

- **Q:** Why don't we learn the height measurement from the keilim themselves (instead of the crown of a keili)? **A:** That would give a much larger measurement, and we have the rule that "tafasta merubah lo tafasta".
- **Q:** Why don't we learn the height measurement from the tzitz (which was only 2 fingers wide)? **A:** We learn the kapores, which is a keili, from the crown, which is part of a keili, rather than learning it from the tzitz, which is a decorative piece.
- **Q:** Why don't we learn the height measurement from the crown of the Aron, which had to only be the slightest amount? **A:** We learn the kapores, which is a keili, from the crown of the Shulchan, which is a keili, rather than learning it from the crown of the Aron, which is only an *accessory* to a keili.
 - **Q:** The crown on the Shulchan is also an accessory!? **A:** That crown was on the body of the Shulchan, and therefore had the status of a keili.
 - **Q:** What about according to the view that the crown was up on top of the Shulchan? **A:** We learn the kapores, regarding which the Torah gave some measurements, from the crown of the Shulchan, regarding which the Torah gave measurements, rather than learning it from the tzitz or the crown of the Aron, regarding which the Torah gave no clear measurements.
- **R' Huna** said, we know the kapores was a tefach, because the pasuk says regarding it, "ahl **pnei** hakapores keidma". There is no human face ("pnei") that is less than a tefach, so the kapores must have been a tefach.
 - **Q:** Maybe it was as large as the face of the Bar Yuchnei bird (a tremendous bird)? **A:** "Tafasta meruba lo tafasta".
 - **Q:** Maybe it was only as large as the face of a tiny bird? **A:** **R' Acha bar Yaakov** said, **R' Huna** learned via a gezeirah shava on the word "pnei" from the pasuk "mei'eis pnei Yitzchak aviv".
 - **Q:** Why doesn't he learn the gezeirah shava from the pasuk of "pnei Elokim"? **A:** "Tafasta meruba lo tafasta".
 - **Q:** Why doesn't he learn the gezeirah shava from the pasuk of "pnei hakeruvim"? **A:** **R' Acha bar Yaakov** said, we have a tradition that the face of the Keruvim were also a tefach, and **R' Huna** learned from here as well.
 - **Q:** What does the word "keruv" mean? **A:** **R' Avahu** said, it means "child".
- **Q:** How do we know that the space beneath the s'chach must be a minimum of 10 tefachim? Maybe the space together with the s'chach must be a minimum of 10 tefachim (just like the Aron was 10 tefachim when measured with its cover)? **A:** A Braisa says that the keruvim in the Mishkan reached 1/3 of the Mishkan's height, just like the keruvim of the Beis Hamikdash reached 1/3 of the height of the Beis Hamikdash. The Mishkan was 60 tefachim tall (10 amos), which means that the keruvim (which stood on the 10 tefach high Aron) reached 20 tefachim high (which means that they alone were 10 tefachim high). The pasuk says that the keruvim "sochechim (similar to the word s'chach) b'chanfeihem" (shading with their wings). Their wings, which were above their heads (based on the pasuk saying "l'malah"), and therefore shading an open area of 10 tefachim, are referred to as "sochechim". From here we learn that the s'chach must be over a 10 tefach space.
 - **Q:** This is ok according to **R' Meir** who says that all amos of the Mishkan refer to amos of 6 tefachim. However, **R' Yehuda** says that although the amos of the building were amos of 6 tefachim, the amos of the keilim were amos of 5 tefachim. This means that the Aron was 8.5 tefachim tall. Based on the keruvim reaching 20 tefachim, this would mean that the keruvim were 11.5 tefachim tall, which means that their wings were "sochechim" over an area of 11.5 tefachim. If so, maybe the minimum height for a succah should be 11.5 tefachim!? **A:** **R' Yehuda** must hold that the 10 tefach minimum is a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai. Like **R' Chiya bar Ashi in the name of Rav** said, measurements for prohibitions, the halachos of chatzitza, and the halachos of "mechitzos" (walls and partitions) are learned via a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 1--6-----

- **R' Chiya bar Ashi in the name of Rav** said, the halachos of “shiurin” (the measurements used for various things in the Torah), of “chatzitzos” (that one cannot have anything separating his body from the water when he immerses in a mikveh), and “mechitzos” (the structure of walls) are all Halachos L’Moshe M’Sinai.
 - **Q:** The halachos of “shiurin” are learned from a pasuk!? The pasuk lists all the “shivas haminim” and **R' Chanan** says, each one of the minim is listed to teach us a particular shiur: **Chita** – achilas pras of wheat bread is the time one needs to be in a house with a negah to make his clothing tamei, **Se'ora** – a human bone fragment the size of a barley is metameh through touching and carrying, **Gefen** – the amount of solid grape product that a nazir must eat to be chayuv is equal to a revi'is of wine, **T'eina** – one is chayuv for carrying the size of a dried fig of food on Shabbos, **Rimon** – a hole the size of a rimon renders a keili useless even for a regular user (as opposed to a merchant), **Zeis Shemen** – the majority of shiurin are kezayis, **D'vash** – one who eats food the size of a date on Yom Kippur is liable!? **A:** The shiurin are not actually written in the pasuk. In truth they are a Halacha L’Moshe M’Sinai and the **Rabanan** use the pasuk as an “asmachta” (support), but not as a true source.
 - **Q:** The halacha of “chatzitza” is learned out from a pasuk!? **A:** The Halacha L’Moshe M’Sinai teaches that a chatzitzah may not exist even in one’s hair.
 - **Q:** That is also learned from a pasuk!? **A:** The Halacha L’Moshe M’Sinai teaches the halacha taught by **R' Yitzchak** that only a chatzitza that covers most of the hair **and** is something that the person objects to its being there is considered a chatitzah. The **Rabanan** were then goizer that if something has one characteristic (either it covers most **or** he objects to its being there) it is also considered a chatzitza. They were not goizer on something that has neither characteristic, because that would be a gezeirah on top of a gezeirah.
 - **Q:** The halacha of “mechitzah” is learned out from a pasuk which says that the Aron was 1 and a half amos tall (which is 9 tefachim) and the “kapores” was a tefach tall, which means the top of the Aron was 10 tefachim tall. The Gemara learns from here that walls 10 tefachim high create a new reshus!? **A:** The Halacha L’Moshe M’Sinai is needed according to **R' Yehuda** who says that the amos used for the keilim (including the Aron) were amos of 5 tefachim (which means that the Aron was less than 10 tefachim tall and could not establish that a wall 10 tefachim high is needed to separate a reshus).
 - **Q:** According to **R' Meir** who says the Aron was 10 tefachim tall, what does the Halacha L’Moshe M’Sinai teach? **A:** It teaches the halachos of “gud achis and gud asik” (that a wall extends up and down), “lavud” (spaces less than 3 tefachim are considered to be closed), and “dofen akumah”.

V'SHE'EIN LAH SHALOSH DEFANOS

- A Braisa says, a succah needs 2 walls which must be proper walls (that are connected to each other at a right angle) and a 3rd wall that can be as small as a tefach. **R' Shimon** says, there must be 3 proper walls and a 4th wall that can be as small as a tefach.
 - **Q:** What is the point of machlokes?
 - **A:** The **Rabanan (T"K)** say that we darshen words as they are written in the pasuk. The pesukim say the word “basuccos” 3 times, only once written with a “vuv” (which suggests that the word is plural). One mention of the word is needed to teach the chiyuv of succah (and cannot be used for a drasha). That leaves 2 mentions of the word, one of which is written in the plural, for a total of 3. We learn from here that a succah needs 3 walls. The Halacha L’Moshe M’Sinai teaches that the 3rd wall need only be a tefach. **R' Shimon** holds that we darshen words based on the way they are read. Therefore, each word “basuccos” is read as plural. One mention of the word is needed to teach the chiyuv of succah. That leaves 2 mentions of the word, which are 4 available drashos. This teaches that a succah needs 4 walls, one of which the Halacha L’Moshe M’Sinai teaches need only be a tefach.
 - **A2:** All agree that we darshen based on the way a word is read. However, the **Rabanan** say that the available 4 drashos are used as follows: one to teach that s'chach is needed and the remaining 3 to teach that a succah needs 3 walls, of which one may be as small as a tefach. **R'**

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Shimon says that a drasha is not needed to teach regarding the s'chach and therefore there are 4 drashos available for the walls.

- **A3:** All agree that we darshen based on the way a word is written (which leaves 3 available drashos). However, the **Rabanan** say that the Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai takes away from one of the 3 walls (and says that one need only be a tefach), and **R' Shimon** says that it comes to add onto the 3 walls of the drashos (and says that a 4th wall is needed, but it need only be a tefach).
- **A4:** All agree that we darshen based on the way a word is written (which leaves 3 available drashos). All also agree that the Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai takes away from a wall needing to be a proper wall (and is not adding an additional wall). The machlokes is whether the first word needed to teach the chiyuv of succah may be used as part of the drasha as well. The **Rabanan** say that it may not (so only 3 are available for a drasha), and **R' Shimon** says that it may (so there are 4 available for the drasha).
- **R' Masna** said that **R' Shimon's** reasoning is based on the pasuk that says that a succah protects from the heat, from storms and from the rain. If there are not 4 walls, a succah cannot offer such protection.

-----Daf 7-----

- **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 reshus 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 reshus 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.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **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).

-----Daf ן---8-----

- **R’ Yochanan** said, if one makes a succah that is round like an oven, if it is large enough for 24 people to be able to sit around its inside perimeter, it is valid. If not, it is passul.
 - **Q:** Presumably this would have to follow the view of **Rebbi** (because his view that a minimum succah needs to be 4x4 amos seems to be the largest required measurement)? But he doesn’t seem to follow **Rebbi** for the following reason. The average person needs an amah of space to sit. Now, we have a general rule that a circle’s circumference is 3 times its diameter. According to **Rebbi**, who says a minimum succah must be 4x4 amos, that would mean that the circle encompassing this 4 amah diameter would only have a 12 amah circumference (not the 24 stated by **R’ Yochanan**)!? **A:** The 3:1 ratio is only true when dealing with the diameter of a circle. **Rebbi**, however, is not discussing a circle, he is discussing a 4x4 amah square, whose perimeter will be more than the circumference of a circle with a diameter of 4 amos.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The perimeter of a square is 25% (of the new total, or 1/3 of the original number) greater than the largest circle that fits within that square. Based on that, the perimeter of **Rebbi's** square should be 16 amos. If so, why does **R' Yochanan** require 24 amos? **A: R' Yochanan** requires the circle to be large enough to fit a 4x4 amah succah within the circle. The circumference of that circle is more than the 16 amah perimeter of the square.
- **Q:** The diagonal of a 4 amah square (which is the diameter of the circle that encompasses the square) is equal to 5.6 amos. The circumference of the circle is 3x that, or 16.8 amos. So why does **R' Yochanan** require 24 amos? **A:** He was not being exact and therefore gave an approximation.
 - **Q:** He is too far off to say that the difference is based on the fact that he was just not being exact!? **A: Mar Kashisha the son of R' Chisda** said, a person does not need a full amah to sit. A person needs only 2/3 of an amah to sit. If so, when **R' Yochanan** says there must be room for 24 people to sit, that means there must be a circle with a circumference of 16 amos.
 - **Q:** We have explained that a 4x4 square needs a circle of 16.8 amos to encircle it, so why does **R' Yochanan** say that a round succah of 16 amos will be valid!? **A:** He was not being precise when he said 16 amos.
 - **Q:** We would accept that answer when the imprecision results in a chumra, not when it leads to a kulla!? **A: R' Assi** said, really a person needs an amah of space to sit. However, **R' Yochanan** did not mean that there must be enough room for 24 people to sit *inside* the circle. He meant that there must be room for 24 people to sit on the *outside* of the circle (which means the circle itself only needs a diameter of 6 amos, which is approximately what we said the diagonal of the 4x4 square will be equal to).
 - **Q:** This would mean that **R' Yochanan** requires a circumference of 18 amos, and we have proven earlier that only 16.8 is needed!? **A:** Now we can say that **R' Yochanan** was simply being imprecise (because it is not far off, and he is making a chumra).
- The **Rabanan of Kisri** say that the circumference of a circle is 50% larger than the perimeter of the square that it encircles. Therefore, the 4x4 square, with its 16 amah perimeter, is encircled in a circle with a circumference of 24 amos.
 - The Gemara says that we see that this is erred math, and therefore can't be the reason of **R' Yochanan**.
- **R' Levi in the name of R' Meir** said, regarding the 2 huts used by potters (an outer hut leading to an inner hut, where the inner hut was used for living and the outer hut was used for working), the inner hut may not be used for a succah (it is not made special for Succos and is not noticeable that he is staying in it for the mitzvah of succah) and is chayuv to have a mezuzah, but the outer hut may be used for succah (since he doesn't typically live in it, when he does so, it is apparent that it is being done for the mitzvah of succah), and need not have a mezuzah.
 - **Q:** The outer hut should need a mezuzah just by the fact that it is a gatehouse to the inner hut!? **A:** Since the huts are not considered to be permanent structures, the outer hut will not get the status of a gatehouse.
- A Braisa says, the succah of goyim (built for the summer months), of women, of animals, of Kutim, and a succah of any kind, are valid to be used on Succos provided that they are covered "properly".
 - **R' Chisda** explains, "covered properly" means that they are covered by a thick layer of s'chach which makes it obvious that they were built for shade, not just for privacy.
 - **Q:** What does "a succah of any kind" come to include? **A:** It comes to include the list of succos in another Braisa, that are valid as well. The Braisa says, the succah of shepherds, of fig watchers, of city watchmen, of fruit watchers, and a "succah of any kind" are valid to be used on Succos provided that they are covered "properly".

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Chisda** explains, “covered properly” means that they are covered by a thick layer of s’chach which makes it obvious that they were built for shade, not just for privacy.
- **Q:** What does “a succah of any kind” come to include? **A:** It comes to include the list of succos in the first Braisa.
 - The Tanna of the first Braisa considers his list to be superior, because they are more permanent structures. The Tanna of the second Braisa considers his list to be superior, because they are used by people who are chayuv in the mitzvah of succah.

-----Daf 9-----

MISHNA

- **B”S** say that an “old succah” is passul. **B”H** say that it is valid.
 - A succah is considered to be “old” if it was built more than 30 days before Succos. However, if it was built for the purpose of the mitzvah of succah, even **B”S** agree that it is valid even if built before those 30 days.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What is the reasoning of **B”S**? **A:** The pasuk says “Chag hasuccos”, which he darshens to mean that the succah has to be built for the sake of the Yom Tov of Succos.
 - **B”H** darshen this pasuk like **R’ Sheishes**, that the pasuk teaches “Chag hasuccos LaShem” – the wood of the succah is assur to be used for any other purpose for all 7 days of Succos.
 - **Q:** **B”S** also need the pasuk to teach this!? **A:** The reasoning for his shita is from the pasuk “chag hasuccos ta’aseh lecha shivas yamim”. He darshens this to teach that the succah must be built for the chag.
 - **B”H** use this pasuk to teach that one may build a succah on Chol Hamoed. **B”S** don’t need the pasuk to teach that, because they hold like **R’ Eliezer**, that one may not build a succah on Chol Hamoed.
- **Q:** According to **B”H**, who say that a succah need not be made for the sake of Succos, other mitzvos shouldn’t have to be made for their sake either. However, that would mean that **Rav** and **Shmuel** argue on them, because they hold that the strings of tzitzis on the garment must be placed there for the sake of the mitzvah!? **A:** Tzitzis are different, because the pasuk says “gedilim ta’aseh **lach**”, which means they must be made for the sake of the mitzvah.
 - **Q:** The pasuk regarding succah also says “Chag hasuccos ta’aseh **lecha**”!? **A:** That pasuk teaches that a stolen succah is passul.
 - **Q:** Maybe the pasuk by tzitzis is also teaching that stolen tzitzis are passul!? **A:** There is another pasuk regarding tzitzis which says “v’asu **lahem**”, which means are passul if they are stolen.

MISHNA

- If one builds a succah under a tree, it is as if it was built inside a house (and is therefore passul).
- If one succah is built on top of another succah, the upper succah is valid and the bottom one is passul. **R’ Yehuda** says, if no one is living in the upper succah, the bottom one is valid.

GEMARA

- **Rava** said, a succah built under a tree is only passul if the branches of the tree provide more shade than sunlight (it protects most of the succah from the sun). However, if it does not do so, the succah will be valid. We can learn this from the Mishna, which compares this case to a succah built in a house. This comparison was made to teach that just like a house provides shade for most of the succah built inside it, so too, the tree only makes it passul if it provides shade for most of the succah built under it.
 - **Q:** Why is that so? The passul s’chach should be considered as combining with the valid s’chach and the succah should therefore be passul!? **A:** **R’ Papa** said, the Mishna is talking about where the person

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

lowered the branches and mixed it with the s'chach, in which case the passul s'chach becomes batul in the majority of valid s'chach.

- **Q:** That case is obvious!? **A:** We would think that we would be goizer in the case where they are lowered to guard one from thinking that it is valid even when they are not lowered.
 - **Q:** A Braisa already teaches that we are not goizer in this case!? **A:** We would have thought the Braisa only allows it b'dieved. The Mishna teaches that it is allowed even l'chatchila.

SUCCAH AHL GABEI SUCCAH...

- A Braisa says, the pasuk of “basuccos teishvu” teaches that one must sit in a succah, but not in a succah that is under another succah, or under a tree, or inside a house.
 - **Q:** The word “basuccos” (written in the plural) suggests that one may sit in a succah beneath another succah!? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, the word is written without a “vuv”, thus suggesting the singular rather than the plural.
- **R' Yirmiya** said, regarding a succah built underneath another succah, there are times: when both are valid, when both are passul, when the lower one is valid but the upper one is passul, and when the lower one is passul and the upper one is valid.
 - If the s'chach of the lower succah would allow more sun than shade to pass through, but the s'chach of the upper one would not, and the s'chach of the upper one is within 20 amos to the ground, both succos are valid.
 - If the s'chach of both succos are enough to shade most of the succah from the sun, and the upper s'chach is above 20 amos, both succos are passul.
 - If the s'chach of the lower succah is sufficient, but of the upper succah it is not, and the upper s'chach is within 20 amos (so the s'chach is not passul on its face), the lower succah is valid and the upper one is passul.
 - If both sets of s'chach are sufficient, and are within 20 amos, the upper succah is valid and the lower one is passul.
 - **Q:** All these cases seem to be obvious!? **A:** The third case was necessary to be taught, and it teaches that we are not goizer in that case for a case where the s'chach of the upper succah is more than 20 amos high (in which case the lower succah would be passul as well).