

This month's Daf Digest is dedicated
L'ilui Nishmas Mr. Israel Gotlib of Antwerp and Petach Tikva
Yisrael Tzvi ben Zev.
By Mr. and Mrs. Manny Weiss

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The placement of the tefach wall (cont.)

R' Kahana and R' Assi offer Rav an alternative placement for the tefach wall and Rav does not respond to their suggestion.

Other Amoraim, however, agree with Rav's opinion.

A third suggestion for the placement of the tefach wall is submitted.

A dispute is recorded regarding the placement of the third wall when the two proper walls are opposite rather than next to one another.

The Gemara explains why proper walls opposite one another require a larger third wall than when the two proper walls are perpendicular to one another.

Rava maintains that tzuras hapesach must be employed in the use of the tefach wall but there are three versions how that should be accomplished.

A related incident is cited.

2) The use of tefach wall for Shabbos

Rabbah rules that since the tefach wall is effective for a sukkah it is effective as a partition for Shabbos as well.

Abaye unsuccessfully challenges this ruling.

Two more rulings are cited in the name of Rabbah where this principle is utilized and he validates partitions for the sukkah since they are valid partitions for Shabbos.

The necessity for the three rulings is explained.

3) Shade from the walls

A Baraisa records a dispute whether shade produced by the walls counts towards the calculation of the total amount of shade in a sukkah.

The rationale behind both opinions is explained.

4) A permanent dwelling

Abaye assembles a list of Tannaim who agree that a sukkah must be constructed in a way that indicates that it is a permanent dwelling.

5) A round sukkah

R' Yochanan rules that a round sukkah is valid if it will fit twenty-four people inside the perimeter of the sukkah.

The Gemara begins to analyze which opinion R' Yochanan follows when he requires such a large sukkah before it can be valid. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

The Halacha L'Moshe M'Sinai and the third wall

עושה לו טפח שוחק

The fact that the third wall of a sukkah may be comprised of a single tefach is due to a **מסיני** למשה—a Torah law from Sinai that is not scripturally based, yet traced back to Moshe Rabeinu, passed down through the generations. In explaining how this can work, Rabbi Simon teaches that a board which is a bit wider than a tefach can be placed near the edge of one of the two standing walls, and if it is within three tefachim of the edge, we can use the concept of **לבוד** to “add it” or “connect it” to the existing wall. This new, third wall is now a total of four tefachim wide, which is beyond the majority of the dimension necessary of a seven-tefach wall.

לנר asks: According to Rabbi Simon, why do we need a special **מסיני** למשה to teach us that such construction of a sukkah is valid? It seems that the already established rule of **לבוד**, in conjunction with the concept of **ככולו רובו** would suffice to validate this sukkah, without any need for a new ruling.

He answers that whenever the Torah prescribes a specific measurement that must be fulfilled, we do not use the concept of **ככולו רובו** (most of a measure is legally

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

- When, according to R' Simon, is a board of a tefach sufficient and when must the board be slightly larger than four tefachim?
- What are the different ways to incorporate a tzuras hapesach into the placement of the third wall?
- What are **פסי ביראות**?
- Why, according to R' Eliezer, is a sukkah invalid if one leaned **סכך** against a wall?

HALACHAH Highlight

A sukkah built for thieves

ואמר רבה סיכך על גבי פסי ביראות כשרה

And Rabbah said: If one puts סכך on well boards [the sukkah] is valid.

There was once a dispute that arose between the Rabbi of a community and a member of the community regarding the validity of the sukkah built and used by the Rabbi. The point of dispute revolved around the fact that the sukkah was erected on the street in a way that was unprotected from thieves. The dissenter claimed, based on a position cited in Mordechai¹ (see Daf Digest #553: Sukkah Daf 3, for an elaboration of this opinion) that when a sukkah is built in a place that is exposed to thieves the sukkah is invalid.

Rema² wrote that the position expressed by the dissenter has no basis whatsoever. The position cited by Mordechai holds that if a sukkah is built in a way that one is afraid to sleep in the sukkah because of thieves it is invalid but the fact that thieves may come and steal in and of itself does not invalidate the sukkah. Rema proceeds to cite a number of proofs to this assertion that the possibility for thieves does not invalidate a sukkah. The Gemara³ states that all of Klal Yisroel is able to share a single sukkah and it is known that it is inevitable that there would be some thieves within that group, having access to that sukkah⁴. It is thus evident that the possibility for thieves does not invalidate the sukkah.

(Insight...Continued from page 1)

considered as the full amount) to achieve this amount. Otherwise, he explains, all we would need would be a single solid wall, and we could strategically place a single wide tefach board at each edge, at a point within three tefachim from the corner of the board. Using the rule of לבד and ככולו we would then have the two additional walls for a total of three walls. Nevertheless, we do not utilize this legal mechanism in this case. Accordingly, without the special למשה מסיני הלכה we would not even allow the third wall to be extended and considered as a full wall. ■

A second proof is the opinion of Rabbah who rules that a sukkah built out of well boards is valid. The Gemara Eruvin⁵ writes that well boards may only be used in a place that has many people passing by on their way to Yerushalayim for Yom Tov. Since these sukkahs are constructed by the side of the road at a time that many people are traveling by it is by definition a place that is exposed to thieves and nonetheless, Rabbah rules that the sukkah is valid. This again supports Rema's assertion that exposure to thieves does not invalidate the sukkah. ■

1. מרדכי פרק הישן (אות תש"מ) ומובא דבריו ברמ"א סי' תר"מ סע' ד'
2. שו"ת הרמ"א סי' כ"ט
3. הגמ' לקמן כו' : וז"ל, "כל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות מלמד שכל ישראל ראויים לישב בסוכה אחת"
4. וז"ל הרמ"א בתשובה, "וידוע שבכל ישראל אי אפשר שלא יהיה בהן גנבים ואינה משתמרת מגנבי שיגנבו ממון"
5. גמ' עירובין כ' : וז"ל "א"ר יצחק בר אדא לא הותרו פסי ביראות אלא לעולי רגלים בלבד" ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Love built upon fear

דתנן סוכה שהיא גבוהה למעלה מכ' אמה פסולה

The Arizal taught that the twenty amah maximum height of the space within the sukkah represents two sets of ten sefiros. The lower ten symbolize fear of Hashem, and the higher ten represent love of Hashem. The holy days before Sukkos enable one to come to fear and love of Hashem, each according to his level. Sometimes we see or hear about someone who achieves a profound love and fear of Hashem even though he is still quite young. Love of

Hashem must be built upon the foundation of yiras Shomayim.

Rav Eliezer Eliyahu Friedman, zt"l, was of the first students of Rav Eliezer Gordon, zt"l, when he was the Rosh Yeshiva in Kelm. On one frigid Shabbos night he made his way to the Rosh Yeshiva's weekly shiur at three in the morning. It was so cold outside he could barely breathe. The ground was covered with snow, the night was pitch black, and Rav Friedman was absorbed in his thoughts about the shiur. Suddenly, his reverie was rudely interrupted by the fierce attack of a small and desperately hungry fox. Without warning, it leaped at his throat and tried to tear through his windpipe. Guarding his exposed neck, he tried unsuccessfully to throw the

beast off. The animal bit through his heavy coat, wounding his arms and legs. Rav Friedman then tried to grab a stone off the ground to use as a weapon, but the earth was frozen solid and it wouldn't budge. He struggled right up until the entry of his house, providentially nearby. He knocked on the window and shouted "Help!" As soon as his grandfather emerged, the fox fled.

After getting cleaned up and bathing his wounds, Rav Friedman dressed in fresh Shabbos clothes and ran right out again to the Beis Midrash to hear the shiur! He would say in later years, "My longing to hear my Rebbe's shiur overcame my natural fear of meeting up with the fox again. To miss a shiur was absolutely impossible!" ■

Daf Digest is published by the Chicago Center, under the leadership of

HaRav Yehoshua Eichenstein, shlit"א

HaRav Pinchas Eichenstein, Nasi; HaRav Zalmen L. Eichenstein, Rosh Kollel; Rabbi Tzvi Bider, Executive Director, edited by Rabbi Ben-Zion Rand.

Daf Yomi Digest has been made possible through the generosity of Mr. & Mrs. Dennis Ruben.