

5 Menachem Av 5781
July 14, 2021



Sukkah Daf 7

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

The Gemara discusses a Sukkah that has two complete walls that are perpendicular to each other and the third wall is a tefach, and the question is where the third wall should be placed. Rav maintains that the third wall should be placed adjacent to the end of any of the walls. Rav Kahana and Rav Assi asked Rav: Let him erect the third wall corresponding to the head of a diagonal line? [Instead of the tefach-long wall heading straight, parallel to the opposite wall, it should head on a diagonal, in a manner in which the Sukkah would appear closed up.] Rav was silent.

It was stated: Shmuel said in the name of Levi: One erects it at the end of any of the walls. The Rabbis in the Academy also taught like this: Erect it at the end of any of the walls.

Rabbi Simon, and according to others, Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, maintains that the third wall should be an expanded tefach, and it should be placed within three tefachim from the end of one of the walls. By applying the principle of *lavud*, i.e. that anything within three tefachim is considered annexed to it, the third wall will be considered a four-tefachim wall. (6b3 - 7a1)

Rav Yehudah says: If two walls of a Sukkah are like a mavoi (parallel to each other), the third wall of a tefach can be erected on any side that he wishes. Rabbi Simon, and according to others, Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, maintains that it is necessary to have a third wall that measures four tefachim, and the third wall should be placed within three tefachim of a complete wall, and we can apply the principle of *lavud*, i.e. that anything within three tefachim is considered annexed to it.

But why did you say in the previous case that one expanded tefach suffices while here you say that there must be a strip of four tefachim? — When there are two walls that are perpendicular, a third wall measuring a tefach will suffice. When the walls are parallel and the inside of the Sukkah appears opened, however, it will be necessary to enclose the Sukkah in a better manner, and for this reason it is necessary to have a wall of four tefachim. (7a1 - 7a2)

Rava maintains that when a third wall of the Sukkah measures a tefach, the Sukkah is permitted only if he makes a *tzuras hapesach*, an outline of a doorway. [Instead of having a wall measuring a tefach, one should place two boards measuring a half a tefach each on the third side and he should place a crossbeam on top of the two boards, thus creating a *tzuras hapesach*.] There are those who say that Rava said: It is permitted also with a *tzuras hapesach*. [One should create a *tzuras hapesach* on the third side, and there is no need for the two boards to measure a total of a tefach.] There are those who say that Rava said: And the Sukkah requires also a *tzuras hapesach*. [One is required to erect a board that measures one tefach, and place it within three tefachim of the open end of a full wall, and then he must create a *tzuras hapesach* for the remainder of the wall.]

The *Gemora* relates: Rav Ashi found Rav Kahana making (the third wall of a Sukkah) an expanded tefach wide and constructing also the form of a doorway. He said to him: Doesn't the Master hold the opinion of Rava who said that

it is also valid with the form of a doorway? He answered: I accept the other reading of the statement of Rava viz., that in addition (to a board of the size of a tefach), the form of a doorway is also required. (7a2)

The Baraisa had stated: A Sukkah must have two proper walls (and the third must be at least a tefach). Rabbah states that a valid Sukkah has the status of a private domain even regarding Shabbos. [On an ordinary Shabbos, one must have three complete walls to be allowed to carry within a private domain, but on the Shabbos of Sukkos, even if the third wall is only a tefach it is considered a private domain.] The reason for this is because 'since' it is deemed to be a wall for a Sukkah, it is considered to be a wall for Shabbos as well.

Abaye asks: Do we then apply the rule of 'since'? Was it not in fact taught in a *Baraisa*: The rules relating to the structure of the wall of a Sukkah are the same as those relating to that of the Shabbos, provided only that there is no gap of three tefachim between any two posts. And the law relating to the Shabbos is more stringent than that of Sukkah, in that the wall for purposes of the Shabbos is valid only if its walled portion is more than its gaps, which is not the case regarding a Sukkah. Now this means, does it not, that the law relating to (carrying on) the Shabbos (inside) of a Sukkah is more stringent than that relating to that Sukkah itself (regarding the mitzvah of eating and sleeping there), and that we do not apply the rule of 'since'?

The *Gemora* answers: No; it means that the law relating to the ordinary Shabbos is more (stringent in its requirements with regard to a valid wall) than the law relating to the Shabbos inside of a Sukkah.

The *Gemora* asks: But if this is so, let it also state: The law relating to the Sukkah in general (regarding the mitzvah of eating and sleeping there) is more (stringent) than that of the Sukkah on the Shabbos, since the validity of the

Sukkah in general demands a width of an expanded tefach (for the third wall), whereas the validity of the Sukkah on the Shabbos does not require the width of an expanded tefach (for a wall) but a sidepost (of any width) alone is sufficient, for it is you who ruled that if one placed s'chach over a mavoi which has a sidepost, it is valid?

Rabbah answered: There was no need to mention this, (since it is obvious that) if we apply (the rule of 'since') from a lenient matter to one which is more stringent, we certainly apply it from the more stringent matter to the lenient one. (7a2 – 7a4)

The *Gemora* reverts to that which was mentioned above: Rabbah ruled: If one placed s'chach over a mavoi which has a sidepost, it is valid. Rabbah further ruled: If one placed s'chach over well-boards (corner pieces, an amah wide, 'enclosing' the area surrounding a well; through this leniency, the pilgrims were allowed to draw water from the well – a private domain, into the public domain), it is valid.

The *Gemora* notes: And the enunciation of (all the three laws which are based upon the principle of 'since' was) necessary, for if he had mentioned only (the law relating to) the mavoi, one might have thought (that there the Sukkah is valid) because it had two proper walls, but that in the case of the well-boards, which do not have two proper walls, the Sukkah is not valid. And if we had been informed only of the well-boards, one might have thought (that there the Sukkah is valid) because there are four walls, but that if one placed s'chach over a mavoi, where there are no walls, it is not (valid). And if we had been informed of both those laws (but not of the third), one might have thought that from the more stringent matter to the lenient one (we apply the rule of 'since'), but not from the lenient to the stringent; therefore all three cases were necessary. (7a4 - 7b1)

The Mishnah had stated: A Sukkah that has more light than shade is deemed to be invalid. Our Rabbis taught: This applies only where the sunshine is due to the scanty s'chach, but not where it is due to the [non-solid] walls, while Rabbi Yoshiyah says: Even where it is due to the [non-solid] walls. Rav Yeimar bar Shelemyah said in the name of Abaye: What is the reason of Rabbi Yoshiyah?¹ — Because it is written: And screen (v'sakosa) the Ark with the Paroches. Now since the Paroches was a partition and the Merciful One nevertheless called it s'chach (v'sakosa), it is evident that a wall must be as [close] as the s'chach. And [how do] the Rabbis [explain this verse]? — It means that the Paroches should bend over a little [at the top] so that it might look like a covering. (7b1 – 7b2)

Abaye said: Rebbe, Rabbi Yoshayah, Rabbi Yehudah, Rabbi Shimon, Rabban Gamliel, Beis Shammai, Rabbi Eliezer and Others - all hold the opinion that the Sukkah must be constructed like a permanent abode. 'Rebbe'? — As it has been taught: Rebbe said, A Sukkah which is not four amos square is invalid. 'Rabbi Yoshiyah'? — As we have [just] stated. 'Rabbi Yehudah'? — As we have learned: A Sukkah which is more than twenty amos high is not valid, Rabbi Yehudah, however, declares it valid. 'Rabbi Shimon'? — As it has been taught: Two [walls] must be of the prescribed dimensions and the third [may be] even one tefach. 'Rabban Gamliel'? — As it has been taught: If a man erects his Sukkah on the top of a wagon or on the deck of a ship, Rabban Gamliel declares it invalid and Rabbi Akiva declares it valid. 'Beis Shammai'? — As we have learned: If his head and the greater part of his body were within the Sukkah and his table was within the house, Beis Shammai declare it invalid, and Beis Hillel declare it valid. 'Rabbi Eliezer'? - As we have learned: If a man makes his Sukkah like a cone-shaped hut² or if he propped it up against a wall,³ Rabbi Eliezer declares it

invalid, since it has no roof', and the Sages declare it valid. The 'Others'? As it has been taught: Others Say: A Sukkah made like a dovecote is invalid, since it has no corners. (7b2 – 7b3)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Fit for Seven Days

The Gemara states that if one placed s'chach on a mavoi, the Sukkah is valid. Similarly, if one who places s'chach over well-boards, the Sukkah is valid. Rashi maintains that the Sukkah is only valid on Shabbos as then we can apply the principle of *migo*. We say that "since" it is deemed a wall regarding Shabbos, it is considered a wall regarding Sukkah as well. The *Aruch LaNer* wonders why the Sukkah should be valid, as we will learn further (Daf 23) that such a Sukkah should be considered invalid because it is not fit to dwell in for all seven days. The *Aruch LaNer* answers that perhaps our Gemara is proof to the opinion of the *Rif* who maintains that such a Sukkah is valid during the week as well. The *Netziv* in *Meromei Sadeh* explains why the fact that Rashi maintains that a Sukkah that is valid only for Shabbos is not a contradiction to the principle that a Sukkah be fit for one to dwell in all seven days. The reason why it is not a contradiction is because the requirement that a Sukkah must be fit to dwell in for seven days only applies to a Sukkah whose walls are not strong enough to stand for seven days or that its s'chach will dry up in that time. If the Sukkah will be valid for one day, however, then there is no contradiction to the principle that a Sukkah must be fit to dwell in for seven days. The Gemara further on (Daf 23) states that if one makes a Sukkah on top of an animal it is not valid because since such a Sukkah cannot be used on Shabbos, the Sukkah will not be valid during the week either. The reason for this is because the Sukkah must be fit to dwell in all seven days. The question on this

¹ For requiring the walls to be as close as the s'chach.

² I.e., its walls slope to a point and there is no roof; like a bell-tent.

³ Sc. it was not provided with a roof but its wall sloped from the ground to an adjoining wall.

explanation is that this would imply that a halachic disqualification for one day would invalidate the Sukkah. The *Netziv* answers that this is only true according to the Tanaaim who maintain that the Sukkah must be permanent and then we do not require a verse to teach us that the walls must be strong. Rather, the verse comes to teach us that a Sukkah must be completely fit to dwell in all seven days. According to the Tanaaim who maintain that a Sukkah can be temporary, they understand the verse to be teaching us that the Sukkah must be fit so that one can physically dwell in it. A Sukkah that is invalid for one day, however, is still deemed to be a valid Sukkah.

Eating Fruit in a Sukkah

The *Mahretz Chayus* to Yoma 79 explains the words of the Tosfos Yeshanim who appears to contradict himself. The Gemara discusses whether one must sit in a Sukkah when eating fruit and the Tosfos Yeshanim writes that one is not required to sit in a Sukkah when eating fruit. *Rabbeinu Avigdor* maintains that even though one is required to eat in a Sukkah when eating food that measures the size of an egg, on Yom Tov one is required to sit in the Sukkah even when eating food that measures the size of an olive. The *Mahretz Chayus* cites the Tosfos Yeshanim who maintains that this is true regarding fruits as well. During the week, one would not be obligated to eat fruit in a Sukkah. On Shabbos, however, when one can fulfill the mitzvah of eating *Seudah Shelishis* by eating fruit, one would be obligated to eat fruit while sitting in the Sukkah. This would be similar to our Gemara that states that what is considered to be a wall regarding Shabbos is also deemed to be a wall regarding Sukkah.

DAILY MASHAL

Sukkos and Shabbos

The Gemara discusses allowing an abbreviated third wall to be effective for carrying on the Shabbos of Sukkos. It is worth exploring the association between Shabbos and Sukkos as they prepare to be mutually exclusive. It is

noteworthy that the Torah states *you shall dwell in booths for a seven-day period; every native in Israel shall dwell in booths. So that your generations will know that I caused the Children of Israel to dwell in booths when I took them from the land of Egypt; I am HaShem, your G-d.* Regarding Sukkos the Torah uses the term *yeidu, will know*, and regarding Shabbos it is said *now you speak to the Children of Israel, saying, however, you must observe My Sabbaths, for it is a sign between Me and you for your generations, to know that I am HaShem.* Thus, the purpose of both Shabbos and Sukkos is to know that HaShem is our G-d and that He always protects us. This would explain why in the Shabbos Maariv prayers we end the blessing with the words *and spread over us the shelter of Your peace.* When we acknowledge Hashem's Presence in our midst, HaShem will protect us from all harm.