



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

Abaye ruled: An air space of three tefachim in a large Sukkah which is diminished with either sticks or spits¹ is a [valid] reduction;² in a small Sukkah, with sticks it is a [valid] reduction,³ with spits an invalid one.⁴ This⁵ applies only to the side, but regarding the middle, Rav Acha and Ravina differ. One says: The rule of lavud applies in the middle, while the other says: The rule of lavud does not apply in the middle. - What is the reason of the one who says that the rule of lavud applies in the middle? — Because it has been taught: If a beam protrudes from one wall but does not touch the opposite wall, and similarly in the case of two beams, one protruding from one wall and one from the other and not touching each other, if [the space between⁶ is] less than three [tefachim] it is unnecessary to provide another beam;⁷ if it is three [tefachim] it is necessary to provide another beam.⁸ And [what does] the other [answer to this]? — Beams⁹ are different [from a Sukkah] since [their erection is merely] a

Rabbinical measure.¹⁰ - What is the reason of the one who says that the rule of lavud is not applied in the middle? — Because we learned: If a skylight in [the roof of] a house was of one tefach square, and there was an object of tumah in the house, the entire house is tamei, but what is directly below the skylight is tahor.¹¹ If the tamei object is directly below the skylight, the whole house is tahor. If the skylight was less than a tefach square, and there was a tamei object in the house, what is directly below the skylight is tahor; if the tamei object is directly below the skylight, the whole house is tahor. And [what does] the other [say]? — The laws of tumah differ [from those of Sukkah] since there is a tradition to that effect.¹² (18a1 – 18a3)

Rabbi Yehudah ben Ila'i expounded: If [the roof of] a house is breached, and he placed *s'chach* over it, it is valid. Rabbi Yishmael son of Rabbi Yosi said to him: Master, explain [your words]. Like so my father

¹ Sticks are a valid, spits an invalid *s'chach*.

² And the Sukkah is valid, since there is now neither the minimum of air space nor the minimum of invalid *s'chach* to cause invalidity.

³ Since by the rule of lavud the air space is deemed to be non-existent.

⁴ Because the air space and the spits, which together extend along three tefachim cannot be regarded as a valid part of the roof and the Sukkah (being of the minimum size) is thus reduced to less than the prescribed minimum.

⁵ That an air space less than three tefachim causes no invalidity.

⁶ The beam and the wall or the two beams.

⁷ To make the necessary enclosure in connection with the movement of objects in a mavoi on the Shabbos.

⁸ As the rule of lavud is applied to the air space between the two beams so it is applied to an air space in the middle of a Sukkah.

⁹ To make the necessary enclosure in connection with the movement of objects in a mavoi on the Shabbos.

¹⁰ Biblically, the movement of objects is permitted even in the absence of a beam.

¹¹ From which it follows that the space of the skylight is not regarded as lavud making the whole roof one and everything within the room tamei.

¹² As the tradition was received in connection with the former it cannot be applied to the latter.

explained it: If there are four amos¹³ it is invalid, if less than four amos, it is valid. (18a3)

Rabbi Yehudah ben Ila'i expounded: Avruma¹⁴ is permitted. Rabbi Yishmael son of Rabbi Yosi said to him: Master, explain [your words]. Like so my father explained it: Those from such and such a place are forbidden,¹⁵ and from such and such a place are permitted.¹⁶ This is analogous to that which Abaye said: The tzachantha¹⁷ of the Bav River are permitted. What is the reason? If you will say that it is because there is a swift current there, and a non-kosher fish, since it has no spinal cord, cannot exist in there, [it could be retorted that] we see that they do exist [in rivers with rapid currents]. Will you then say that it is because it has salt water, and a non-kosher fish, since it has no scales, cannot exist [in salt water, it could be retorted that] we see that they do exist? — The reason in fact is that the muddy nature of this river does not allow non-kosher fish to breed in it. Ravina said: But nowadays that the Eisan River and the Gamda River flow into there, they are forbidden.¹⁸ (18a3)

It was stated: If a man placed a *s'chach* over a porch which has columns in front of it, it is valid;¹⁹ if it has no

¹³ Of solid roof between the walls and the valid *s'chach*.

¹⁴ A species of very small fish.

¹⁵ Since in that place very small insects abound in the water and it is difficult to remove them from the fish.

¹⁶ Since no insects live in that water.

¹⁷ A species of small fish.

¹⁸ Because the non-kosher fish of those rivers flow into it.

¹⁹ Since the space between the columns is less than three tefachim we apply the law of lavud whereby they are regarded as one solid wall. In the absence of these columns, the Sukkah, sc. the center portion with the valid *s'chach*, has no walls since the courtyard walls which are separated from it by more than four amos cannot serve as its walls to the Sukkah.

²⁰ we apply the principle of *pi tikrah yoreid vesoseim*, 'the edge of the roof extends downwards and seals.' Consequently, this forms a wall on every side of the Sukkah.

door-frames, Abaye declares it valid and Rava declares it invalid. Abaye declares it valid [since] we say that the edge of the roof [of the porch is regarded as though it] descends and fills up [the space],²⁰ while Rava says it is invalid, since we do not say that the edge of the roof descends and fills up [the space]. Said Rava to Abaye: According to you who say that the edge of the roof [is regarded as though it] descends and fills in [the space, is a Sukkah valid] even if the middle wall is missing?²¹ He answered him: In that case I agree with you [that the Sukkah is invalid] since it would be like a mavoi that is open on two opposite sides. (18a3 – 19a1)

Must we say that Abaye and Rava differ on the same principle as that on which Rav and Shmuel differed for it was stated: Regarding a pavilion in an open field,²² Rav declares that it is permitted to carry [on the Shabbos] over the whole extent of it, since we say that the edge of the roof descends and fills in the space,²³ while Shmuel said that it is forbidden to carry in it except within four amos, since we do not say that the edge of the roof descends and fills in [the space]? — [No!] With regard to the opinion of Shmuel neither of them disagrees;²⁴ they only differ with regard to the opinion of Rav. Abaye agrees with Rav, while Rava can

²¹ Sc. if a Sukkah is erected with only the two opposing sides, are the planks of the roof regarded as descending to form the missing walls?

²² I.e., one that has a roof but is without walls.

²³ Forming walls around it.

²⁴ That the edge of the porch cannot be regarded as descending and forming walls for the Sukkah. For if in the case of the Shabbos where the roof was made for the pavilion its edge is not regarded as descending and forming walls, how much less could an edge be regarded as descending and forming walls in the case of a Sukkah where the roof was made for the porch and not for the Sukkah.

say that Rav ruled then only in that case, since the partitions are made for the pavilion, but in the case here, since they are not made for this purpose [he would] not [rule thus]. (18b1 – 19a1)

DAILY MASHAL

Who said Sardines are Permitted?

The Turkish *sardilash*: The author of *Sedei Chemed (Ma'areches Daled, os 4)* mentions that in his location in Turkey people would eat *sardilash* – i.e., sardines – sold in big barrels without fear of the suspicion that characterized *teris terufah*. But once he saw that the *Tiferes Yisroel* warned against sardines and herring pickled in barrels, he stopped eating them. Still, the author of *Levush Mordechai* (§148) mentions that in 5672 (1912) people ate canned sardines. The author of *Lev Yehudah* also mentions that during the mass migration to America before the First World War people were lenient and ate sardines because of the great difficulty in getting kosher meat and milk and because the prohibition was unclear.

The author of *Chelkas Ya'akov* (Responsa, 30-31) explains that eating sardines is not forbidden as we must forbid only those varieties mentioned by *Chazal*. In addition, the Gemara in *Avodah Zarah* explains that one is allowed to buy *chilak* from an expert who sees to separate it from the fish that accompanies it as the accompanying fish impairs its taste and he is worried about his livelihood if it becomes known that he sells poor-tasting fish. The firms that sell sardines also see that no other fish are mixed with them and there is therefore no fear of eating them.

The obstacle to *kashrus* in big sardine factories: Nonetheless, HaGaon Rav Moshe Sternbuch (*Teshuvos*

Vehanhagos, II, 382) remarks that big factories do not care if a non-kosher fish gets mixed in with their thousands of sardines as one fish does not harm the taste of the sardines. In addition, many different types of oil and additives are used nowadays and one should therefore only buy sardines with a reliable *hechsher* (*HaKashrus* by Rav Fuchs, Ch. 11, halachah 14; see *ibid*, that even if the can advertises “natural fish oil,” it could be that it is produced from non-kosher fish; or that there are materials produced from a hog’s pancreas).