

# Daf Notes

Insights into the Daily Daf

1 Tishrei 5767

Sukkah Daf 21

September 23 2006

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of **Asher Ben Moshe** o"n.  
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.

Visit us on the web at [www.dafnotes.blogspot.com](http://www.dafnotes.blogspot.com)

To subscribe, please send email to: [Majordomo@eagleintl.com](mailto:Majordomo@eagleintl.com)

## Highlights

1. Rabbi Yehudah and the Chachamim debate whether an ohel not made by man is deemed to be an ohel regarding tumah or not. Rabbi Yehudah derives from a *gezeirah shavah* regarding the Mishkan that only an ohel that is made by man is susceptible to tumah, whereas the Chachamim maintain that the word ohel that is repeated regarding the mishkan comes to include even an ohel that was not man-made. (21a1)
2. There is a dispute regarding the children who were brought to the Shiloach spring to fill up water for the purpose of sprinkling on the sequestered Kohen who would perform the service of the Parah Adumah. The Tanana Kamma maintains that the children would descend into the water to fill up the cups whereas Rabbi Yose maintains that the children would remain sitting on the doors that had been placed on top of oxen and they would lower the cup by using a rope. (21a1-21a2)
3. Rabbi Yehudah agrees that an ohel that is not made by man but is as large as a fist is deemed to be an ohel regarding tumah. (21a2)
4. Rabbi Yehudah maintains that that they did not place doors on the oxen because a child would then be over-confident and he would stick his head or one of his limbs beyond the door and then he would become tamei from the *kever hatehom*, the grave in the deep. Rather, the child would ride directly on top of the ox and he would be afraid to lean over and thus he would not stick his head or limb out. (21a3-21b1)
5. The thesis that Rabbi Yehudah agrees that an ohel that is non man-made will be deemed to be an ohel if it is the size of a fist is challenged from our Mishna regarding sleeping under the bed in the Sukkah. The Mishnah implies that Rabbi Yehudah did not deem the bed to be an ohel because one who sleeps under the bed has fulfilled his obligation of dwelling in a Sukkah. Yet, if Rabbi Yehudah maintains that an ohel that is the size of a fist or more is an ohel, the one who sleeps under the bed should not be able to fulfill his obligation. The Gemara offers several answers to solve this difficulty. (21b1-21b2)
6. Rabbi Shimon maintains that a temporary ohel can negate a permanent ohel, whereas Rabbi Yehudah maintains that a temporary ohel cannot negate a permanent ohel. (21b2)
7. Rabbi Shimon said that from the *sichah* of Rabban Gamliel we learn two things. The Gemara infers from the fact that Rabbi Shimon used the word *sichah*, casual conversation, and not the word *dibbur*, which means his words, that one must study even the casual conversation of Torah scholars. Proof to this is from the verse that states *valeihu lo yibol*, whose leaves do not wither, which can be interpreted to mean that even the leaves, i.e. the speech of a Torah scholar, do not

with, but his words contain teachings.

(21b2)

## **Iyunim-Hashkafah**

### **Shabbos and the Torah scholar**

The Gemara states that even the casual conversation of Torah scholars requires study. The Zohar states that a Torah scholar is in the category of Shabbos. One should be careful to

minimize his speech on Shabbos. This idea is alluded to in this Gemara, because a Torah scholar, who is in the category of Shabbos, is careful with his speech.

## **Iyunim-Halacha**

### **A bed without shade**

The Mishna states that one who sleeps under a bed inside a Sukkah does not fulfill his obligation. The Gemara explains that this is referring to a bed which is higher than ten tefachim, which creates a barrier between the person and the Sukkah. The Rishonim question this, as we find elsewhere that something which is even a tefach high is considered an *ohel*. Why, then, is there a concern only regarding a bed that is ten tefachim high? The Rif writes that the reason one does not fulfill his obligation of dwelling in a Sukkah is because the bed is ten tefachim, and this would constitute a Sukkah within a Sukkah and for this reason one does not fulfill his obligation. There are various challenges to the explanation of the Rif. The

*Baal HaMaor* disagrees with the Rif. The *Ramban* in *Milchamos* offers a novel approach that explains why one who sleeps under a bed inside the Sukkah does not fulfill his obligation. The *Ramban* writes that the s'chach on top of the Sukkah is deemed to be invalid with regard to the space under the bed. The reason for this is because the s'chach cannot provide shade under the bed as the bed is providing shade. One would assume that the Sukkah should be valid, but one cannot fulfill his obligation. Thus, according to the *Ramban*, the Sukkah is invalid with regard to the one sleeping under the bed, because the Sukkah is not providing the person with shade.

### **Supports for the s'chach**

The Gemara states that one should not support the s'chach with something that is susceptible to tumah. Since many people are currently engaged in constructing their Sukkah, it would be appropriate to mention some of the halachos pertaining to the support for the s'chach. These halachos are quoted with sources in the *Sefer Nitei Gavriel* from Rav Gavriel Zinner. Shulchan Aruch Orach Chaim 629 rules that it is preferable not to place the s'chach on something which is susceptible to tumah. It is also preferable that one should not place something which is susceptible to tumah on top of the s'chach in order that the s'chach should not scatter or fall. This issue was discussed previously on Daf 13 regarding kernels of grain. This Halacha is true even if it is only rabbinically susceptible to tumah. There are authorities who maintain that the supporting beams for the s'chach should not

be more than four tefachim wide whereas other opinions maintain that this is not a necessary requirement. One is allowed to place the s'chach directly on a stone wall but some opinions rule stringently and maintain that one should place reeds on top of the wall under the s'chach. Most halachic authorities rule that one does not have to be particular regarding the supports for the supporting beams of the s'chach. The *Pri Megadim*, however, rules that one should not attach his supports to the Sukkah with nails and pegs in a manner that without those supports the boards would fall. The *Chazon Ish* rules similarly. If one would use screws in order that the beams should not move from their positions, this would not be a concern. Even if one supports the s'chach with something that is susceptible to tumah, and certainly if he has no other option, it does not invalidate the Sukkah.