

29 Tammuz 5781  
July 9, 2021



Sukkah Daf 2

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

MISHNAH: There is a debate regarding a Sukkah that is higher than twenty amos (cubits) high. The Chachamim maintain that it is invalid and Rabbi Yehudah maintains that it is valid. A Sukkah that is smaller than ten tefachim (handbreadths), or that does not have at least three walls, or if there is more sun than shade, it is invalid. (2a1)

The Gemara quotes a Mishnah in Eruvin that records a debate regarding a mavoi (alleyway) whose korah, crossbeam, is higher than twenty amos. The Chachamim maintain that it is not valid and one must lower the korah to a height of less than twenty amos and Rabbi Yehudah maintains that one is not required to lower the korah.

Why in our Mishnah does it state that the Sukkah is invalid, whereas the Mishnah in Eruvin states a remedy for the korah that is higher than twenty amos. The Gemara answers: With regard to the Sukkah, since it is a Biblical ordinance, it is proper for the Tanna to state that it is “invalid,” whereas regarding the korah over a mavoi, however, since the injunction is only Rabbinical, a remedy is given. Alternatively, you may say that even with a Biblical ordinance a remedy may be given, but with regard to the Sukkah, as the ordinances relating to them are numerous, it was stated that it is “invalid” (as that is a clear manner), whereas regarding the korah over a mavoi, since their details are not so numerous, a remedy is indicated. (2a1 - 2a2)

From where do we know these words (that a Sukkah higher than twenty amos is invalid)?

Rabbah states that this based upon the following verse: *So that your generations will know that I caused the Children of Israel to dwell in Sukkos.* When one sits in a Sukkah whose

s’chach, covering, is higher than twenty amos, he is not aware that he is dwelling in a Sukkah, as he does not notice the s’chach.

Rabbi Zeira says that a Sukkah that is higher than twenty amos is invalid is based upon the following verse: *And a Sukkah will be for shade in the daytime from the heat.* Until twenty amos, a person sits in the shade of the Sukkah; when the s’chach is higher than twenty amos, one is not sitting in the shade of a Sukkah, but rather, he is sitting in the shade of the walls.

Abaye asked him: But if so, if a man made his Sukkah in Ashteros Karnayim (a lowland which is between two mountains), would the Sukkah also be invalid?

He answered him: In that case, remove the ‘Ashteros Karnayim’ and there will remain the shade of the Sukkah, but here, remove the walls, and you have no shade of a Sukkah.

Rava offers a third reason why a Sukkah that is higher than twenty amos is invalid: It is written: *In Sukkos you shall dwell for seven days.* The Torah declared: For the whole seven days leave your permanent abode and dwell in a temporary abode. [With a Sukkah] up to twenty cubits [high] a man makes his abode a temporary one; [in one] higher than twenty cubits, a man does not make his abode temporary, but permanent (and is thus invalid).

Abaye asked him: But if so, if he made walls of iron and placed the s’chach over them, would the Sukkah also be invalid?

Rava answered him: It is this that I mean to tell you: In a Sukkah up to twenty amos, which a man makes his temporary dwelling, even if he makes it permanent, he has fulfilled his obligation; but in a Sukkah higher than twenty amos, where a man generally makes it a permanent dwelling (for otherwise, it will not endure), even if he makes it temporary, he has not fulfilled his obligation.

The Gemara notes: They all do not agree with Rabbah's reason, since that verse refers to the knowledge of future generations (that the Jews in the Wilderness were surrounded by the Clouds of Glory; it is not teaching us that one should be aware that he is sitting in a Sukkah). Nor do they say like Rabbi Zeira, since that verse refers to the Messianic age.

The Gemara asks: What, however, does Rabbi Zeira answer to this objection? The Gemara answers: He could answer: If so, the verse could read: *And it will be for shade in the daytime*. Why then was it stated: *And a Sukkah will be for shade in the daytime from the heat*? Therefore, you must infer both points (that "Sukkah" means something that provides shade, and that God will erect a structure in the Messianic era, and it will be one which provides shade and shelter).

The Gemara notes further that they do not say like Rava, on account of the objection of Abaye. (2a2 - 2b1)

In accord with whom is that which Rabbi Yoshiyah said in the name of Rav? The argument cited in the *Mishnah* is only when the walls of the Sukkah do not reach the s'chach, but if they do reach the s'chach, even the Chachamim agree that the Sukkah is valid – even if it is higher than twenty amos. In accord with whom was this taught? This is according to Rabbah who holds that (in general, a Sukkah higher than twenty amos is invalid because) the eye does not notice the s'chach, and here where the walls reach the s'chach, we apply the reasoning that one's eyes will travel up the wall and will notice the s'chach. (2b1)

In accord with whom is that which Rav Huna said in the name of Rav? The argument cited in the *Mishnah* is only when the Sukkah's interior is four square amos, but if the Sukkah is wider than four square amos, even the Chachamim would agree that the Sukkah is valid – even if it is higher than twenty amos. In accord with whom was this taught? This is according to Rabbi Zeira who said that it is because of shade, and here we apply the reasoning that the Sukkah is spacious, so the shade is coming from the s'chach. (2b1 - 2b2)

In accord with whom is that which Rav Chanan said in the name of Rav? The argument cited in the *Mishnah* is only if the Sukkah is large enough that it will accommodate a person's head, most of his body and his table, but if it will accommodate more than a person's head, most of his body and his table, even the Chachamim agree that the Sukkah will be valid – even if it is higher than twenty amos. The Gemara notes that this is not consistent with any of the opinions cited above. (2b2)

The Gemara elaborates on this discussion: It is understandable that Rabbi Yoshiyah disagrees with Rav Huna and with Rav Chanan bar Rabbah, since they provide a minimum measurement in the length of the Sukkah, while he does not provide a minimum measurement as to its length; but regarding Rav Huna and Rav Chanan bar Rabbah, can we say that they differ on what minimum size constitutes the validity of the Sukkah, where this master (Rav Huna) holds the opinion that the validity of the Sukkah depends upon its being a minimum of four amos square, while this master (Rav Chanan bar Rabbah) maintains that the validity of the Sukkah depends upon its capacity of containing his head, most of his body, and his table?

The Gemara disagrees: No! Both may agree that the validity of the Sukkah depends upon its capacity of containing his head, most of his body, and his table, but here they differ on the following principle: This master (Rav Chanan bar Rabbah) holds the opinion that they (the Chachamim and R' Yehudah) differ where the Sukkah can contain only his head, most of his body, and his table, but if it is larger than this, both agree

that it is valid, while this master (Rav Huna) maintains that they differ regarding a Sukkah whose size is between one capable of containing his head, most of his body and his table, and one four amos square, but if it is more than four amos square, both agree that it is valid.

The *Gemora* asks on Rav Huna and Rav Chanan bar Rabbah from the following *Baraisa*: A Sukkah which is higher than twenty amos is invalid. Rabbi Yehudah, however, validates it – even if it is up to forty or fifty amos. Rabbi Yehudah offers a proof to his opinion that a Sukkah higher than twenty amos is valid from an incident concerning Queen Helena in Lod. The Queen was sitting in a Sukkah that was higher than twenty amos and the elders (came to visit her) were entering and leaving there and they did not inform her that her Sukkah was invalid. The Chachamim countered to him that this incident is not a proof, because Helena was a woman, and a woman is exempt from the mitzvah of Sukkah. Rabbi Yehudah responded that Helena had seven sons (and certainly one of them had reached the age where he would be required to dwell in a Sukkah), and furthermore, Queen Helena was scrupulous in that she performed all her deeds according to the words of the Chachamim.

Why did he say this second statement that furthermore, Queen Helena was scrupulous in that she performed all her deeds according to the words of the Chachamim? Rabbi Yehudah responded as follows: If you will answer that her sons were minors and minors are exempt from the obligation of the Sukkah; since however she had seven, there must have been at least one who was old enough not to be dependent on his mother. And if you will object that the obligation of dwelling in a Sukkah for a child who is not dependent on his mother is merely a Rabbinical one, and she took no heed of a Rabbinical injunction, come and learn: and furthermore, Queen Helena was scrupulous in that she performed all her deeds according to the words of the Chachamim.

Now, the *Gemora* concludes its challenge: This *Baraisa* is understandable according to the one who says that they (the Chachamim and Rabbi Yehudah) differ regarding the case

where the walls did not reach the *s'chach*, since it is the way of a queen to sit in a Sukkah whose walls do not reach the *s'chach*, because of the air (the ventilation flowing through the opening); but according to the one who states that they differed only in the case of a small Sukkah, is it then proper for a queen to sit in a small Sukkah?

Rabbah bar Adda answered: The ruling was necessary only in the case of a Sukkah constructed with many compartments.

The *Gemora* asks: Is it then proper for a queen to sit in a Sukkah with many compartments?

Rav Ashi answers: The Sukkah that Queen Helena sat in was comprised of different compartments. The Queen sat in a small room for reasons of modesty and since women are exempt from the mitzvah of dwelling in a Sukkah, the Queen was not concerned that the Sukkah was higher than twenty amos, thus rendering the Sukkah invalid. The debate between the Chachamim and Rabbi Yehudah was regarding where her children were dwelling. Rabbi Yehudah maintains that the children were together with the Queen and therefore it is a proof that a Sukkah higher than twenty amos is valid. The Chachamim, however, maintained that the Queen's children were dwelling inside a room in the Sukkah where the *s'chach* was lower than twenty amos and therefore there is no proof that a Sukkah higher than twenty amos is valid. (2b2 - 3a1)

#### INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

##### ***A Little Bit Shady***

A Sukkah is designed to provide shade. The Mishnah states that if the sunny area of a Sukkah is greater than its shaded area, the Sukkah is invalid. Rashi explains that the minority of shaded area on the Sukkah floor is negated by the majority of sunny area. The commentators wonder why it was necessary for Rashi to offer this reason. Is it not obvious that a Sukkah that does not have the necessary amount of shade is invalid? Why does Rashi have to mention that the minority of shaded area is negated? The Eimek Bracha cites Tosfos

here to answer this question. The Gemara states that there are those that maintain that if a Sukkah is higher than twenty amos, but is wider than four square amos, the Sukkah will be valid. Tosfos explains that the Chachamim have established that even if a Sukkah is more than a thousand amos high, if it is wider than four squared amos, there still will be some shade coming from the s'chach into the Sukkah. It is evident from the words of Tosfos that for a Sukkah to be valid, it is required that the Sukkah should provide at least minimal shade. A Sukkah that has a minority of shaded area would be valid if not for the fact that it is negated by the majority of sunny area. Regarding a Sukkah that has a minority of valid shade and there is a majority of shade which is invalid, i.e. when the shaded area is due to the height of the walls, then the Sukkah is valid. The reason for this is because there is a principle that shade cannot negate shade.

#### ***Shade at Twenty Amos***

The Chachamim maintain that a Sukkah that is higher than twenty amos is invalid. One of the reasons offered by the Gemara is that one is obligated to sit in the shade of the Sukkah, which refers to the s'chach. When the Sukkah is higher than twenty amos, there will be no shade from the s'chach. Rather, the shade will be from the walls. Ritva wonders about this, because in the middle of the day, when the sun is directly above, the shade will be from the s'chach and not from the walls? Ritva offers two answers. One answer is that the sun is only directly above in the summer months when the sun travels in middle of the sky. In the month of Tishrei, however, when the sun is always to the side, there will be no shade from the s'chach even in the middle of the day. The second answer of the Ritva is that since in the middle of the day the walls do not provide shade, there will also not be any shade from the s'chach. The Aruch LaNer expresses his bewilderment to this answer, as the reality is that there is shade in the middle of the day. The Aruch LaNer offers a means of explaining the answer of the Ritva.

#### ***Spelling of the Word "Sukkah"***

The Cheishek Shlomo notes that the word Sukkah is always spelled in the Talmud with the letter vav, yet in Scripture the

word Sukkah is always spelled without a vav. The word Sukkos in the plural form, however, is spelled with a vav. Rabbi Chaim Vital in Pri Eitz Chaim and other kabalistic works write that the numerical value of the word Sukkah is ninety-one, which is the same numerical value as the two Names of HaShem, adon-oy and the Shem Havayah. This is true when the word Sukkah is spelled with the letter vav. The Cheishek Shlomo cites a verse in Tehillim 76:3 where the word Sukkah is spelled with a vav. It is said vayehi vesahleim sukko, which can be translated to mean then His Sukkah was complete, i.e. when the word Sukkah equals in numerical value ninety-one, then umnaso b'tziyon, the Name of HaShem and His throne will be complete in Zion. The Cheishek Shlomo suggests that this is the meaning of the words that we recite in the Friday evening prayers, haporeis sukkas shalom, Who spreads the shelter of peace. This shelter of peace alludes to the Gemara in Bava Basra 75 that states that in the future, HaShem will fashion a Sukkah for the righteous.

#### **DAILY MASHAL**

##### ***Synthesizing Wisdom and Insight into Knowledge***

The Gemara cites a verse as proof that a Sukkah that is higher than twenty amos high is invalid. It is said so that your generations will know that I caused the Children of Israel to dwell in Sukkos. The word used for will know is yeidu. We beseech HaShem in the Shemone Esrei to grant us wisdom, insight and knowledge. Daas, knowledge, is a synthesis of wisdom, Chochmah, and binah, insight. On Rosh Hashanah we are instilled with awe of HaShem, and it is said the beginning of wisdom is fear of HaShem. On Yom Kippur we are granted atonement for our sins, and Yom Kippur is the culmination of the Ten Days of Repentance. The Gemara in Megillah 17b states that the blessing of repentance in the Shemone Esrei follows the blessing of insight, because it is said and understand with its heart. Once one has insight, he can truly repent and be granted atonement. Following Yom Kippur is Sukkos, when the wisdom and insight are synthesized in a creation of daas, knowledge. This idea can be part of our focus when we dwell in the Sukkah for seven days and contemplate the miracles HaShem has performed for us throughout history.