

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The size of empty space or invalid סכך necessary to disqualify a sukkah (cont.)

The Gemara continues to challenge Shmuel's opinion that invalid סכך disqualifies a sukkah in the middle at a width of four tefachim.

2) Empty space

Abaye ruled, regarding a large sukkah, that if three tefachim of empty space was reduced with valid or invalid סכך the sukkah is valid but if the sukkah was small, only valid סכך effectively reduces the empty space but invalid סכך is ineffective at reducing the empty space.

The Gemara explains that Abaye's ruling applies to empty space on the side, i.e. between the סכך and the wall, but if the space is in the middle it is subject to a dispute between R' Acha and Ravina who dispute whether the principle of lavud applies in the middle of the sukkah.

The rationale behind each opinion is explained.

R' Yehudah bar Ilai taught that a house whose roof was breached can place סכך on the opening and it is a valid sukkah.

R' Yishmael the son of R' Yosi qualified this ruling, in the name of his father, that it applies only if there are less than four amos from the wall to the סכך.

A similar exchange is recorded concerning the consumption of avruma fish, with R' Yishmael the son of R' Yosi limiting the ruling to a particular location.

The Gemara notes another example of a fish that is permitted in some locations and not others but Ravina adds that the distinction no longer applies.

3) Making a sukkah beyond an awning

A sukkah made beyond an awning with pillars is valid but if it does not have pillars it is subject to a dispute between Abaye and Rava.

Abaye explains why he maintains the sukkah is valid and Rava explains why he maintains that the sukkah is invalid.

The Gemara suggests associating this dispute with a dispute between Rav and Shmuel concerning an awning in an open field.

The Gemara rejects the suggestion and instead submits that all opinions would agree that according to Shmuel the sukkah is invalid, and the dispute revolves around Rav's opinion. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

The rule of לבוד regarding walls and along the סכך

אמר אביי: אויר שלשה בסוכה גדולה ומיעוט...היו מיעוט...והני מילין מן הצד אבל באמצע פליגי בה רב אחא ורבינא. חד אמר יש לבוד באמצע...

Tosafos points out that the only time we find a dispute regarding applying the concept of לבוד is at the סכך level. However, along the wall everyone agrees that we can bridge a linear distance of up to three tefachim using לבוד. A wall can be comprised of sticks which are less than three tefachim away from each other, whether at the top of the wall, at the bottom, or in the middle. For סכך, however, we find here an opinion that לבוד can only be utilized at the side, but not in the middle.

ר' argues with Tosafos. He notes that the reason for the opinion which disallows לבוד for סכך is that the source for לבוד is due to a Halachah l'Moshe MiSinai, where we find: —מחיצין— גוד אסיק לבוד ודופן עקומה. We see that לבוד is only used in terms of a wall, and not in general.

Therefore, if there is a space of more than three tefachim between the סכך and the wall, we can add any material, even that which is סכך פסול to minimize the void to less than three tefachim. If the filler is placed near the סכך, the sukkah is kosher, as the area between the סכך is less than three tefachim along the side. However, if the filler is placed adjacent to the wall, the sukkah is פסול. Although we could say דופן עקומה this would require two steps. First, the material along the side of the roof would have to be considered as part of the wall (דופן עקומה). Secondly, we would have to now use לבוד in the middle. This is the case where we do not use two Halachos l'Moshe MiSinai simultaneously to consider a sukkah as being kosher. ■

Daf DIAGRAM

The area labeled א is open space at the top of the wall. We would have to use the concept of לבוד to close the gap and consider the



wall as reaching the roof. The area labeled ב is disqualified סכך which is less than four amos. This can be used using דופן עקומה. See Distinctive Insight (Sukkah 17 and 18), where the opinion of ר' is that we cannot use two Halachos l'Moshe MiSinai simultaneously to consider this sukkah kosher. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated

לזכר נשמת

הרב הקדוש רבי אלימלך

בן הרב הקדוש רבי אליעזר ליפמאן זצלה"ה מליזענסק

HALACHAH Highlight

Bamboo poles

אבל באמצע פליגי בה רב אחא ורבינא... וחד אמר אין לבוד באמצע

But [regarding a gap] in the middle there is a dispute between R' Acha and Ravina... And one maintains that lavud does not apply in the middle.

Rav Moshe Isserles¹ rules that one is not permitted to eat or sleep beneath a gap in the סכך, even one that is less than three tefachim wide if it extends the entire length of the sukkah. The basis for this ruling, explains Rav Eliyahu of Vilna², is our Gemara, which records an opinion that does not apply the principle of lavud in the middle of the סכך. Accordingly, one could ask why it is permitted to use bamboo poles for סכך. As close as one places the poles, inevitably, there will be a gap that will run the entire length of the sukkah. It should therefore, be prohibited to eat or sleep anywhere in the sukkah. Rav Moshe Shternbuch³, in fact, writes that one who is careful to place some of the bamboo poles perpendicular to the others, to create a break in the air space, will be blessed.

Two reasons are given to explain why this is not an issue. One explanation⁴ is that even according to Rav Isserles a gap becomes an issue only if it is at least a tefach wide. The reason is that a tefach is a significant size space. Less than a tefach, on the other hand, does not even appear as open space. The sec-

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why does invalid סכך not effectively reduce an open space in a small sukkah?
2. Is tum'ah able to project through a skylight?
3. What protection do scales provide a fish?
4. Explain: פי תקרה יורד וסותם.

ond reason⁵ is that one could rely on the lenient opinion of Rabbeinu Nissim⁶ who holds that only a gap large enough to contain a person's head and majority of his body presents a problem. Although Rema cites this opinion⁷, one does not have to be strict since it would involve following two strict opinions. ■

1. שו"ע או"ח סי' תרל"ב סע' ב' כתב וז"ל, "אור, בין בגדולה בין בקטנה שויס, דבין באמצע בין מן הצד בגג"ט פסולה, בפחות מג' כשרה, ומצטרף להשלים הסוכה ואין ישנים תחתיו." וע"ז הוסיף הרמ"א וכתב, "ודוקא שהולך על פני כל הסוכה"
2. ביאור הגר"א שם ד"ה ודוקא
3. מועדים וזמנים ח"ו סי' ע"א
4. ע' ערוה"ש סי' תרל"ב סע' ה' ושו"ת שארית ישראל או"ח סי' כ"ח
5. שו"ת שלמת חיים סי' רמ"ג-רמ"ה ושו"ת שארית ישראל שם
6. ר"ן ט. ד"ה גרסי'
7. רמ"א שם ע"ש ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Repenting for Bittul Mitzvas Asei

אוריר שלשה בסוכה גדולה ומיעטו

We see on today's daf that addition of סכך posul can reduce empty airspace enough to validate a formerly invalid sukkah. The Mekor Chaim, זת"ל, explains that סכך posul represents actual sins, while airspace represents a lost mitzvah opportunity. Sometimes the effect of a ביטול מצות עשה can be even worse than that of a sin. While sincere repentance transforms negative into positive connection with Hashem, it is far more difficult to regret sins of omission.

The Shem MiShmuel, זת"ל, explains that the power of repenting out of love

for Hashem stems from the sense of loss. When we see how far a sin has taken us from Hashem, we become filled with the desire to return to Him. Since the sin was the catalyst for this longing, it reverts to merit. But this is hardly the case with a sin of omission. Human nature is such that when we fail to do something good we often feel that a resolution to do better next time is sufficient. But this repentance does not have the power to cleanse us completely, as if we were newly born. True repentance of a ביטול מצות עשה would have a transformative effect on our behavior.

A group of bochurim from the yeshiva in Volozhin were once eating together and speaking in learning, when one of them demonstrated a sore lack of basic knowledge during the course of conversation. Although the other boys

glossed over his blunder, the young man felt ashamed that his inadequate learning was so obvious. Distraught, he rushed away from the table, neglecting to bentsch in his haste to return to the beis medrash. The boy turned over a new leaf from that day, and immersed himself in diligent study that would more than compensate for his early omissions.

Within several years, he became one of the most accomplished scholars in Volozhin. Rav Chaim of Volozhin, זת"ל, commented on this well-known anecdote:

"Although the bochur was certainly obligated to bentsch, it was for the best that he forgot. If he had taken the time to bentsch, he might well have lost his resolve to do a complete teshuvah for his earlier bittul Torah!" ■

