

Daf 2b

The Gemara explains why each of the Sages cited his own source and did not accept the sources cited by the others. **All of them**, Rabbi Zeira and Rava, **did not say** that the fact that a *sukka* more than twenty cubits high is unfit is derived from the verse: "So that your future generations will know that I caused the children of Israel to reside in *sukkot* when I took them out of the land of Egypt" ([Leviticus 23:43](#)), as did **Rabba**, because in their opinion **that** verse does not mandate one to be aware that he is sitting in a *sukka*; rather, it mandates **knowledge for future generations** of the exodus from Egypt.

כולהו
כרבה לא
אמרי
הוא
ידיעה
לדורות
היא

Comment/Chiddush

Rashi (Amud a) explains that according to Rabba two things can be learnt from the verse; the simple explanation of the knowledge for future generations and also the fact that higher than twenty cubits is unfit.

Similarly, **they**, Rabba and Rava, **also did not say** that it is derived from the verse: "And there shall be a *sukka* for shade in the daytime from the heat" ([Isaiah 4:6](#)), as did **Rabbi Zeira**, because in their opinion **it is** with regard to the messianic era that this verse is written. It means that God will be a shield and a shelter for the Jewish people; it is not referring to the structure of a *sukka*.

כרבי זירא נמי לא
אמרי ההוא לימות
המשיח הוא
דכתיב

Comment/Chiddush

Rabenu Chananel explains that in the messianic era all Jews will live in calmness and with no fear, so they could theoretically also live in the desert; the only protection needed is a *sukka* protecting them from sun and rain.

The Gemara asks: **And Rabbi Zeira**, how would he respond to this objection? The Gemara answers that Rabbi Zeira could say: If it is **so** that the verse is merely a metaphor, **let the verse say: And there shall be a canopy for shade in the daytime from the heat**, which is the term used in the previous verse. **And what is the meaning of: "And there shall be a *sukka* for shade in the daytime from the heat"?** Learn from it two matters: One is the plain meaning of the verse, that God will be a canopy of glory for the Jewish people, and the second is that the essence of a *sukka* is to have the roofing provide shade.

ור' זירא א"כ
לימא קרא
וחופה תהיה
לצל יומם ומאי
וסוכה תהיה
לצל יומם
שמעת מינה
תרתי

Comment/Chiddush

Rabeinu Chananel explains that canopy is the typical description for a cover protecting form rain and sun and therefore this term should have been used. From the fact the verse uses *sukka* it is obvious that there are two things to be learnt from this verse.

They, Rabba and Rabbi Zeira, **also did not say** that it is derived from the verse: "In *sukkot* shall you reside seven days" ([Leviticus 23:42](#)), as did **Rava**, due to the difficulty raised by **Abaye** with regard to a *sukka* with steel partitions. Since there is a weakness in each of the sources, it is understandable why the other Sages did not accept it.

כרבא נמי
לא אמרי
משום קושיא
דאביי

§ The Gemara asks: **In accordance with whose opinion is that which Rabbi Yoshiya said that Rav said:** The dispute between Rabbi Yehuda and the Rabbis with regard to the fitness of a *sukka* more than twenty cubits high is specifically in a case where the walls of the *sukka* do not reach up to the roofing; however, in a case where the walls of the *sukka* reach up to the roofing, the Rabbis concede that even if the roofing is more than twenty cubits high, it is fit. **In accordance with whose opinion is it?**

כמאן אזלא הא דאמר ר'
יאשיה אמר רב מחלוקת
בשאין דפנות מגיעות לסכך
אבל דפנות מגיעות לסכך
אפילו למעלה מעשרים אמה
כשרה כמאן

It is in accordance with the opinion of **Rabba**, who says that the reason that a *sukka* that high is unfit is because the eye does not automatically catch sight of the roofing. **And since the walls of the *sukka* reach the roofing, the eye catches sight of the roofing**, as the person will follow the

כרבה דאמר משום
דלא שלטא בה
עינא וכיון דדפנות

Daf 2b

walls all the way up to the roofing despite their considerable height. However, if the roofing is not contiguous with the top of the walls, a person does not notice it without a concerted effort.

מגיעות לסכך
משלט שלטא בה
עינא

Comment/Chiddush

Ritva asks on the above explanation (from Rashi) that this should also apply to a beam at an alleyway where there is a wall reaching the beam and therefore should be fit even if higher than twenty cubits. He therefore explains differently that when the walls reach the roofing a person will feel surrounded fully and will automatically feel that there is roofing.

The Gemara asks: **In accordance with whose opinion is that which Rav Huna said that Rav said:** The **dispute** between Rabbi Yehuda and the Rabbis with regard to the fitness of a *sukka* more than twenty cubits high is specifically **in a case where there is not an area of four cubits by four cubits in the *sukka*; however, in a case where there is an area of more than four cubits by four cubits in the *sukka*, the Rabbis concede that even if the roofing is more than twenty cubits high, it is fit. In accordance with whose opinion is it?**

כמאן אזלא הא דאמר רב הונא אמר רב מחלוקת בשאין בה אלא ארבע אמות על ארבע אמות אבל יש בה יותר מארבע אמות על ארבע אמות אפי' למעלה מעשרים אמה כשרה כמאן

It is **in accordance with** the opinion of **Rabbi Zeira, who says that a *sukka* that high is unfit due to the shade** that is provided by the walls and not by the roofing; **and since the *sukka* in this case is spacious** and has a large area, **there is shade from the roofing of the *sukka* and not only from the walls.**

רבי זירא דאמר משום צל הוא וכיון דרויחא איכא צל סוכה

Comment/Chiddush

There are different opinions amongst the early commentaries whether as long as the *sukka* has an area of more than four by four cubits it will be fit even with its roofing being much higher than twenty cubits. Or whether this rule applies always proportional (e.g. for five on five a height of twenty five cubits will be allowed etc.) Some even say that accordingly a small *sukka* that's two by two cubit's will necessitate a height of only ten cubits of the roofing.

The Gemara asks: **In accordance with whose opinion is that which Rav Hanan bar Rabba said that Rav said:** The **dispute** between Rabbi Yehuda and the Rabbis with regard to the fitness of a *sukka* more than twenty cubits high is specifically **in a case where the *sukka* is only large enough to hold one's head, most of his body, and his table, as, if the *sukka* were smaller, it would not qualify as a *sukka*; however, in a case where it is sufficiently large to hold more than one's head, most of his body, and his table, even if it is more than twenty cubits high, it is fit. In accordance with whose opinion is it? It is not in accordance with the opinion of any one of them. This statement cannot be explained according to any of the rationales for the fact that a *sukka* more than twenty cubits high is unfit.**

כמאן אזלא הא דאמר רב חנן בר רבה אמר רב מחלוקת בשאינה מחזקת אלא כדי ראשו ורובו ושולחנו אבל מחזקת יותר מכדי ראשו ורובו ושולחנו אפי' למעלה מעשרים אמה כשרה כמאן דלא כחד

Comment/Chiddush

It seems that we are forced to say that Rav Hanan bar Rabba had another way of explaining the reason of the halakha that the roofing may not exceed twenty cubits, which is not known to us. Tosfos suggests that a *sukka* that is very narrow and higher than twenty cubits is considered a henhouse and cannot be fit as a *sukka*. If it is however a bit wider it will be fit as it is not like a henhouse anymore.

With regard to the three aforementioned *halakhot*, the Gemara notes: **Granted, the statement of Rabbi Yoshiya differs from the statements of Rav Huna and Rav Hanan bar Rabba, as they are providing the measure of the extent of the *sukka* while he is not providing a measure.** In Rabbi Yoshiya's opinion, the *halakha* is based on whether the top of

בשלמא דרבי יאשיה פליגא אדרב הונא ורב חנן בר רבה דאינהו קא יהבי שעורא במשכא

Daf 2b

the walls reach the roofing, which indicates a fundamentally different understanding of the issue of a *sukka* more than twenty cubits high.

ואיהו לא קא יהיב
שעורא במשכא

However, in terms of Rav Huna and Rav Hanan bar Rabba, let us say that it is with regard to the minimum size required for **fitness of a *sukka*** that **they disagree**; as one Sage, Rav Huna, **holds**: The minimum size required for **fitness of a *sukka*** is **four by four cubits**, and the other Sage, Rav Hanan bar Rabba, **holds**: The minimum size required for **fitness of a *sukka*** is **one that holds one's head, and most of his body, and his table**.

אלא רב הונא ורב חנן בר
רבה נימא בהכשר סוכה
קמיפליגי דמר סבר הכשר
סוכה בארבע אמות ומר סבר
הכשר סוכה במחזקת ראשו
ורובו ושולחנו

Comment/Chiddush

Ritva explains that we can say they agree about the statement that Rav said: The disagreement is only regarding a *sukka* with minimum size; bigger than that it is fit even higher than twenty cubits. They now only disagree between them what the minimum size actually is, and therefore how to interpret Rav's statement.

The Gemara rejects this suggestion: **No**, there is no need to explain their dispute that way, as it could be explained that **everyone**, i.e., Rav Huna and Rav Hanan bar Rabba, **agrees** that the minimum size required for **fitness of a *sukka*** is **one that holds one's head, and most of his body, and his table**. And here, it is with regard to this that they **disagree**: One Sage, Rav Hanan bar Rabba, **holds** that Rabbi Yehuda and the Rabbis **disagree** only with regard to a *sukka* more than twenty cubits high in a case where it **holds the person's head, and most of his body, and his table**. However, in a case where it is **larger than one that holds one's head, and most of his body, and his table**, **everyone agrees** that the *sukka* is fit regardless of its height.

לא דכולי עלמא
הכשר סוכה ראשו
ורובו ושולחנו והכא
בהא קמיפליגי דמר
סבר במחזקת ראשו
ורובו ושולחנו פליגי
אבל יותר מראשו
ורובו ושולחנו ד"ה
כשרה

And one Sage, Rav Huna, **holds** that it is with regard to a *sukka* that ranges in size from one that **holds one's head, and most of his body, and his table up to one that is four by four cubits** that **they disagree**; however, if the *sukka* is **more than four by four cubits**, **everyone agrees** that it is fit.

ומר סבר מראשו ורובו
ושולחנו עד ד' אמות פליגי
אבל יותר מד' אמות דברי
הכל כשרה

The Gemara **raises an objection** from a *baraita*: **A *sukka* that is more than twenty cubits high is unfit**. Rabbi Yehuda deems a *sukka* fit even if it is **up to forty or fifty cubits high**.

מיתיבי סוכה שהיא גבוהה למעלה
מעשרים אמה פסולה ורבי יהודה מכשיר
עד ארבעים וחמשים אמה

Comment/Chiddush

Tosfos and the early commentaries point out that even more than forty or fifty cubits is fit and the *baraita* only uses this expression as it is a way people express themselves.

Rabbi Yehuda said: There was an incident involving Queen Helene in Lod where her *sukka* was more than twenty cubits high, and the Elders were entering and exiting the *sukka* and did not say anything to her about the *sukka* not being fit. The Rabbis said to him: Is there **proof from there?** She was, after all, a woman and therefore **exempt from the mitzva of *sukka***. Consequently, the fact that her *sukka* was not fit did not warrant a comment from the Elders. Rabbi Yehuda said to them in response: **Didn't she have seven sons** and therefore require a fit *sukka*? **And furthermore, she performed all of her actions only in accordance with the directives of the Sages**.

אמר רבי יהודה מעשה בהילני
המלכה בלוד שהיתה סוכתה
גבוהה מעשרים אמה והיו
זקנים נכנסין ויוצאין לשם ולא
אמרו לה דבר אמרו לו משם
ראייה אשה היתה ופטורה מן
הסוכה אמר להן והלא שבעה
בנים הוּוּ לה ועוד כל מעשיה
לא עשתה אלא על פי חכמים

Comment/Chiddush

Daf 2b

According to Rashi (Babba Basra 11a) Queen Helene was descended of the royal Chashmona'im family. Others however say from the midrash that she was a convert.

Before analyzing the objection being raised from the *baraita*, the Gemara seeks to understand its content. **Why do I need Rabbi Yehuda to teach: And furthermore, she performed all of her actions only in accordance with the directives of the Sages?** His first contention was sufficient.

למה לי למיתני ועוד
כל מעשיה לא עשתה
אלא על פי חכמים

The Gemara answers that **this is what Rabbi Yehuda is saying to them: If you say that Helene's sons were minor sons and minors are exempt from the mitzva of *sukka***, and that is why the Elders said nothing; **since they were seven sons, then it is not possible that there was not at least one among them who no longer needed his mother to look after him.** The *halakha* is that a minor who no longer needs his mother has reached the age of training and is required to fulfill the mitzva of *sukka* by rabbinic law. Even if she gave birth to them in consecutive years, the oldest would be seven years old, and at that age a child does not need his mother to constantly look after him.

הכי קאמר להו כי
תאמרו בנים קטנים
היו וקטנים פטורין
מן הסוכה כיון
דשבעה הו א'
אפשר דלא הו בהו
חד שאינו צריך
לאמו

Comment/Chiddush

The Gemara later (28b) analyses the exact definition of a minor not needing his mother. According to the Gemara Eiruvim (82) a child above the age of six is for sure considered that he does not need his mother.

And if you say that a child who no longer needs his mother is obligated in the mitzva of *sukka* only by rabbinic law, and Queen Helene did not observe rabbinic law, come and hear that which Rabbi Yehuda said: And furthermore, she performed all of her actions only in accordance with the directives of the Sages.

וכי תימרו קטן שאינו צריך לאמו
מדרבנן הוא דמיחייב ואיהי בדרבנן
לא משגחה ת"ש ועוד כל מעשיה
לא עשתה אלא ע"פ חכמים

Comment/Chiddush

From the fact the Gemara brings a proof from Queen Helene, it seems that a mother is also obligated in the obligation of *Chinuch*. This contradicts the Gemara in Nazir (29a) that only fathers are obligated, and not mothers. There are various answers. Some say that indeed the two sources are in dispute.

Commented [U1]: translate

The Gemara explores the statements of the *amora'im* who quoted Rav in light of this *baraita*. **Granted, according to the one, Rabbi Yoshiya, who said that it is specifically in a case where the walls of the *sukka* do not reach up to the roofing that there is a dispute between Rabbi Yehuda and the Rabbis, the *baraita* can be explained as dealing with a *sukka* of that type, as it is customary for a queen to reside in a *sukka* in which the walls do not reach up to the roofing,**

בשלמא למ"ד בשאין
דפנות מגיעות לסכך
מחלוקת דרכה של
מלכה לישב בסוכה
שאין דפנות מגיעות
לסכך