

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

[Reverting to] the main text: Rabbi Ami bar Tavyomi said: If he covered with worn-out pieces of clothing it is invalid. What are worn-out pieces of clothing? — Abaye said: Small strips of cloth less than three [tefachim] square which are unfit to be used either by rich or by poor. It has been taught in agreement with Rabbi Ami bar Tavyomi: In the case of a mat of sedge or rushes, its remnants, even if diminished,¹ may not be used for s’chach;² in that of a mat of reeds, a large one³ may be used for s’chach, a small one⁴ may not be used for s’chach.⁵ Rabbi Eliezer said: The former also is susceptible to tumah⁶ and may not be used as s’chach. (16a1)

The Mishnah had stated: If he hollows out a haystack.⁷ Rav Huna said: This only refers to where there is not a hollow of one tefach [in height] extending to seven [tefachim square],⁸ but if there is a hollow of one tefach extending to seven, it is a [valid] Sukkah.⁹ So it has also been taught: If he hollows out a haystack to make for himself a Sukkah, it is a [valid] Sukkah. But have we not Learnt: It is not a Sukkah? Deduce, therefore, from there [that the explanation is] according to Rav Huna. This is conclusive.

Some put it in the form of a contradiction. We have learnt: if he hollows out a haystack to make for himself a sukkah, it is not a valid Sukkah. But has it not been taught that it is [a valid] Sukkah? — Rav Huna answered: There is no difficulty. The latter refers to where there is a hollow of a tefach extending to seven [tefachim] while the former refers to where there is no hollow of a tefach extending to seven [tefachim]. (16a1 – 16a2)

MISHNAH: If one suspends the walls from above downwards, if they¹⁰ are higher than three tefachim from the ground, it is invalid. If he raises them from the bottom upwards, if they are ten tefachim high, it is valid.¹¹ Rabbi Yosi says: Just as from the bottom upwards a height of ten tefachim suffices, so from the top downwards does a height of ten tefachim [suffice]. (16a2)

GEMARA: On what principle do they differ? — One Master holds the opinion that a hanging partition¹² renders [the Sukkah] valid, and the other Master holds the opinion that a hanging partition does not render it valid.¹³

¹ From the minimum required to make them susceptible to tumah, i.e., six tefachim square.

² Since in origin they constituted a vessel.

³ Which cannot be regarded as a ‘vessel’ since it is usually used as a covering.

⁴ Which may be regarded as a vessel.

⁵ On account of its susceptibility to tumah.

⁶ In his opinion a large one also is used as a rule for sitting purposes and must, therefore, be regarded as a vessel.

⁷ It is not a valid Sukkah because the s’chach was not placed there with the intention of being used for shade.

⁸ The minimum size of a Sukkah.

⁹ The reason for invalidating a Sukkah which has been hollowed out of the haystack is as stated previously. “you shall make” which implies but not from that which has been made’. This reservation it is to be noted applies only to the

s’chach but not to the walls. Now, if in piling up the haystack there was left a space below of the mentioned dimensions, the top of the haystack can be said to have been constructed in the very first instance to provide s’chach (for the space below) and as such is valid for the Sukkah which has been hollowed out. Where, however, there was no such space left in the first instance, the s’chach which the top of the haystack provides comes into existence only as the automatic result of the hollowing out and consequently is invalid for the Sukkah.

¹⁰ Their lower ends.

¹¹ Even though they do not reach the top.

¹² If it is ten tefachim high.

¹³ When its lower end, however, is within three tefachim from the ground it is no longer regarded as a hanging partition, but as one resting on the ground – on account of lavud.

We have learned elsewhere: [There is a dispute as to how to remedy a situation where there is a well of water that is situated between two courtyards and one cannot draw water from the well. Some opinions maintain that a barrier must be set up inside the well and other opinions maintain that it is sufficient if the barrier is erected at the top of the well. This dispute is also predicated on whether a suspended wall is deemed to be a proper wall.] From a cistern between two courtyards (*when an eiruv has not been prepared*), no water may be drawn on the *Shabbos* (*because there is a concern that the water is coming from the other courtyard*), unless a partition ten *tefachim* high has been made for it - either below (*which, the Gemora will explain*) or within its rim. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said: Beis Shammai ruled: below, and Beis Hillel ruled: above. Rabbi Yehudah observed: The partition could not be more effective than the intervening wall (*between the courtyards*). Rabbah bar Bar Chanah said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: Rabbi Yehudah made his ruling on the lines of the view of Rabbi Yosi who holds that a suspended partition effects permissibility even on dry land, for we learned in a *Mishnah*: If one weaves the walls from above to below (*the reference is to the walls of a sukkah; he takes horizontal boards, and beginning from the top, adds boards to fill in the open frame; he does not, however, reach the ground*): if they are three *tefachim* high above the ground, it is invalid; from below to above: if they are ten *tefachim* high, it is valid. Rabbi Yosi ruled: As walls of the height of ten *tefachim* are valid if they rise from below to above (*even though they do not reach the s'chach*), so are those that stretch from above to below valid if their height is ten *tefachim* (*even if they do not reach the ground*).

The *Gemora* notes: This, however, is not correct, for neither does Rabbi Yehudah hold the view of Rabbi Yosi, nor does Rabbi Yosi hold that of Rabbi Yehudah. The *Gemora* explains:

¹⁴ In order to enable them to carry the scroll from the house where it was kept, through a courtyard in which no eiruv had been prepared, into the Synagogue.

¹⁵ That were on the way; and thus they formed a narrow passage between the house in which the scroll was kept and the Synagogue. Since no other door opened into the passage it was permissible to carry the scroll through it even in the absence of all eiruv.

¹⁶ As a sheet is a suspended partition it follows that at that time the validity of a suspended partition was duly recognized.

Rabbi Yehudah does not hold the view of Rabbi Yosi, since Rabbi Yehudah maintained his view only in respect of an *eiruv* of courtyards which are merely a Rabbinical institution, but not in that of *sukkah*, which is Biblical. Nor does Rabbi Yosi hold the view of Rabbi Yehudah, since Rabbi Yosi maintained his view only in respect of *sukkah*, which is merely a positive commandment, but not in that of *Shabbos*, which involves a prohibition punishable by stoning. And should you ask: In agreement with whose view was that incident at Tzipori (*concerning a suspended partition which was used on Shabbos*) decided upon? [*Now, R' Yosi, who was the leader of that town, did not hold that a suspended partition may be used.*] The answer is that it was not decided upon being in agreement with the view of Rabbi Yosi, but with that of Rabbi Yishmael son of Rabbi Yosi. And what was the incident? When Rav Dimi came he related: The people once forgot to bring a Torah scroll of the Torah on the *Shabbos* eve and on the following day they¹⁴ spread a sheet upon the pillars,¹⁵ brought the scroll of the Torah and read from it.¹⁶ 'They spread!' But is this permitted, seeing that all¹⁷ agree that not even a temporary tent may be put up on the *Shabbos*? The fact is that they found sheets spread upon the pillars and so they brought the scroll of the Torah and read from it. (16a2 – 16b2)

Rav Chisda said in the name of Avimi: A mat slightly more than four *tefachim* [wide] is permitted as a *Sukkah* wall.¹⁸ How does one place it? — One suspends it in the middle less than three [tefachim] from the ground and less than three from the top,¹⁹ and whatever [space] is less than three *tefachim* is treated as *lavud*. But is not this obvious? — One might have said that we apply the law of *lavud* once, but we do not apply *lavud* twice [to the same wall], therefore he informed us of this. It was objected: A mat slightly more than seven [tefachim] is permitted as a *Sukkah* wall!²⁰ — With

¹⁷ Even those who allow a certain form of additions to an existing tent.

¹⁸ If it is as long as the required wall.

¹⁹ The *Sukkah* referred to is one that is exactly ten *tefachim* high, and the placing of a mat slightly more than four in the middle leaves a space of less than three on either side.

²⁰ Since it prescribes the minimum of seven *tefachim*, it follows that only one *lavud* is permitted.



reference to what was this taught? With reference to a large Sukkah;²¹ and what does it inform us?²² That walls may be suspended from above downwards in agreement with Rabbi Yosi. (16b2 – 16b3)

Rabbi Ami said: A board which is slightly more than four [tefachim] wide²³ is²⁴ permitted for a Sukkah wall when he places it less than three [tefachim] from the termination of the adjacent wall, since a space less than three [tefachim] is treated as lavud. What does he inform us? — He informs us this: That the minimum extent of a small Sukkah is seven [tefachim]. (16b3)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Keeping the Torah “Safe” from Impurity

The Gemara explains the dispute cited in the Mishna regarding a wall of a Sukkah that starts more than three tefachim above the ground. This dispute is parallel to the laws of Shabbos where there is a dispute if a suspended wall is deemed to be a wall and would thus create a private domain with regard to carrying on Shabbos. The Gemara cites an incident that occurred in Tzipori where the people forgot to bring the Sefer Torah to the shul prior to Shabbos and they carried it on Shabbos, relying on sheets that were spread on posts prior to Shabbos. The *Aruch LaNer* wonders why they did not have a gentile carry the Sefer Torah. The *Aruch LaNer* answers that they did not employ a gentile because it is degrading to have a Sefer Torah carried by a gentile. The question of the *Aruch LaNer*, however, is difficult to understand, as Rashi writes that the reason the Sefer Torah was in the house was because the people sought to protect the Sefer Torah from the gentiles. This would imply that the Jews did not wish to make it known to the gentiles that they were in possession of a Sefer Torah (See *Shearim Mitzuyanim B’Halacha* who mentions this.)

The Rambam in Hilchos Sefer Torah (10:8) rules that any person who is tamei, such as a *niddah* (a woman who has menstruated) or a gentile is permitted to touch a Sefer Torah as we have a principle that Torah cannot contract tumah. *Sefer Otzar HaYedios* cites a responsa from the *Divrei Hillel* who rules based on the words of the Rambam that if a gentile was in shul on Simchas Torah, he should be allowed to hold the Sefer Torah because it may otherwise cause the gentiles to hate the Jews. The *Rema* in Orach Chaim 88 quotes sources who maintain that a woman should not enter a shul while she is a *niddah*. Furthermore, a woman who is a *niddah* should not pray, mention the Name of Hashem or even touch a sefer. The Rema also quotes sources who disagree with this ruling. The Rema concludes that the custom is in accordance with the first opinion. However, the Rema limits this restriction to a woman who is still menstruating whereas a woman who has ceased to see a flow but is in the stage of becoming pure is not restricted from entering a shul, praying, reciting the Name of HaShem or from touching a sefer.

DAILY MASHAL

Together for Purity

The Gemara quotes a Mishnah in Keilim as proof that materials with disparate minimum measurements can combine with each other. The Gemara states that the reason that they can combine with each other is because each material can contract tumah when a *zav* sits on the material. Perhaps this idea is analogous to the nation’s hatred for the Jewish People. The Medrash states that Midyan and Moav were always enemies, but they united to cause harm to the Jewish People. The converse should also be true. Even if Jews do not see eye to eye on all issues, we should at least unite for matters of purity and sanctity, and when HaShem sees that we can demonstrate signs of friendship, He will likewise nullify the plans of the gentiles and redeem us from the exile.

²¹ I.e., one more than ten tefachim in height which precludes the assumption of more than one lavud. All that can be done is to suspend the mat at a distance of less than three tefachim from the roof so that its size (being slightly more than seven tefachim) combines with the space between it and the roof (which is

somewhat less than three tefachim) to constitute (by the rule of lavud) a suspended wall of ten tefachim in height.

²² Is it not obvious that a ten tefachim high wall is valid?

²³ And is ten tefachim high.

²⁴ Placed vertically.