

Daf 4b

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| If the distance from the edge of the dug-out area to the wall was less than three handbreadths then it is fit , as the edge of the dug-out area is joined to the wall of the <i>sukka</i> based on the principle of <i>lavud</i> . | פחות משלשה טפחים כשרה |
|--|-----------------------|

Comment/Chiddush

Lavud means that a small distance of less than three handbreadths is negligible, and therefore the two wall halves are considered one wall.

| | |
|---|---|
| The Gemara asks: What is different there , in the case of a <i>sukka</i> with a platform in its center, that you said that it is a fit <i>sukka</i> if the wall is at a distance of less than four cubits from the edge of the platform, and what is different here that you said the wall must be at a distance of less than three handbreadths for the <i>sukka</i> to be fit? | מאי שנא התם דאמרת פחות מארבע אמות ומאי שנא הכא דאמרת פחות משלשה טפחים |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| The Gemara answers: There , in the case of the <i>sukka</i> more than twenty cubits high, where there already is a wall , but it is removed from the platform, as long as the wall is at a distance of less than four cubits , it is sufficient to render the <i>sukka</i> fit. Here , where the <i>sukka</i> is less than ten handbreadths high, its wall is not a fit wall. In order to render it a wall by adding the height of the dug-out area, if the distance between them is less than three handbreadths , yes , the dug-out area is considered joined to the wall, as based on the principle of <i>lavud</i> two objects are considered joined if the gap between them is less than three handbreadths; and if not, no , they are not considered joined. | התם דאיתיה לדופן פחות מארבע אמות סגיא הכא לשוויי לדופן פחות משלשה טפחים אין אי לא לא |
|---|--|

Comment/Chiddush

Based on this, if one had a sukkah of ten handbreadths in height, and part of the covering hung down into the sukkah, rendering it unliveable, if one then dug up an area in the middle of if the sukkah – within four cubits from the walls – where the height was ten handbreadths, the sukkah would be kosher. Sfas Emes

| | |
|--|---|
| If a <i>sukka</i> was more than twenty cubits high , and one built a pillar in the <i>sukka</i> , far from the walls, that is ten handbreadths high , and the distance from the top of the column to the roofing was less than twenty cubits, and on the horizontal surface of the column there is a bit more than seven by seven handbreadths, the minimum area required for fitness of a sukkah , Abaye thought to say that this is a fit <i>sukka</i> because of the principle: Extend and raise the partitions of this pillar. Given that the column is at least ten handbreadths high, its four sides are therefore considered partitions, and the <i>halakha</i> is that the legal status of a partition is as if it extends and continues upwards indefinitely. Based on that perspective, the surface of the column is supported by four partitions at least ten handbreadths high that extend upward indefinitely, and from the top of the pillar to the roof is less than twenty cubits; therefore, this squared column forms a fit <i>sukka</i> . | היתה גבוהה מעשרים אמה ובנה בה עמוד שהוא גבוה עשרה טפחים ויש בו הכשר סוכה סבר אביי למימר גוד אסיק מחיצתא |
|--|---|

Comment/Chiddush

Some explain that the halacha considers the walls to rise up over the bottom, and those new walls create the sukkah. The Chazon Ish, however, understands that the bottom walls – in place – can service the area on top, and give it definition as an enclosed place.

| | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Rava said to Abaye: That is not so, since in order to have a fit <i>sukka</i> we require conspicuous partitions, and there are none , as the sides of the column do not actually project above the surface. | א"ל רבא בעינן מחיצות הניכרות וליכא |
|---|------------------------------------|

Comment/Chiddush

Daf 4b

The commentators disagree whether this is a general principle in extending walls upwards, or specifically by Sukka, which is supposed to be house-like, and virtual halachik walls are insufficient.

§ The Sages taught: If one inserted four posts [*kundeisin*] into the floor and placed roofing over them but no walls, Rabbi Ya'akov deems it a fit *sukka* and the Rabbis deem it unfit.

ת"ר נעץ ארבעה קונדיסין וסיכך על גבן ר' יעקב מכשיר וחכמים פוסלין

Rav Huna said: The dispute between the Rabbis and Rabbi Ya'akov is in a case where the four posts are aligned **on the edge of the roof**, directly above the exterior walls of a house, as **Rabbi Ya'akov holds** that we say the principle: **Extend and raise the partitions**. Since the exterior walls of the house are full-fledged partitions, they are considered as extending upward indefinitely, constituting the walls of the *sukka*. **And the Rabbis hold** that **we do not say** the principle: **Extend and raise the partitions**. **However**, if the posts are placed **in the center of the roof**, then the walls of the house are irrelevant and **everyone agrees** that it is an unfit *sukka*. **And Rav Nahman said:** The dispute is in the case of a *sukka* in the center of the roof, as according to Rabbi Ya'akov, if the posts themselves are one handbreadth wide, they serve as the partitions, while the Rabbis hold that it is not a fit *sukka* until it has two complete walls and a partial third wall.

אמר רב הונא מחלוקת על שפת הגג דר' יעקב סבר אמרינן גוד אסיק מחיצתא ורבנן סברי לא אמרינן גוד אסיק מחיצתא אבל באמצע הגג דברי הכל פסולה ורב נחמן אמר באמצע הגג מחלוקת

A dilemma was raised before the Sages: Is Rav Nahman saying that only if the *sukka* is in the center of the roof there is a dispute between Rabbi Ya'akov and the Rabbis, but if it is at the edge of the roof everyone agrees that it is fit? Or perhaps he is saying that there is a dispute both in this case and in that case? No resolution was found, so the dilemma shall stand unresolved.

איבעיא להו באמצע הגג מחלוקת אבל על שפת הגג דברי הכל כשרה או דלמא בין בזו ובין בזו מחלוקת תיקו

The Gemara raises an objection from another *baraita*: If one drove four posts into the ground and placed roofing over them, Rabbi Ya'akov deems it fit and the Rabbis deem it unfit.

מיתיבי נעץ ד' קונדיסין בארץ וסיכך על גבן ר' יעקב מכשיר וחכמים פוסלין

But isn't the legal status of the ground like that of the center of the roof, as it is not surrounded by partitions that extend upward, and nevertheless **Rabbi Ya'akov deems it fit**? This is a **conclusive refutation** of the opinion of **Rav Huna**, who said that everyone agrees that a *sukka* in the center of the roof is unfit. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, it is a **conclusive refutation** of Rav Huna's opinion.

והא ארץ דכאמצע הגג דמי וקא מכשיר רבי יעקב תיובתא דרב הונא תיובתא

And furthermore, there is an additional refutation of the opinion of Rav Huna. It is apparent from this *baraita* that they disagree with regard to the case of posts inserted in the center of the roof; however, in the case of the posts inserted on the edge of the roof everyone agrees that it is fit. Let us say, then, that this is a **conclusive refutation** of the opinion of **Rav Huna** on two counts. First, with regard to his statement that everyone agrees in the case of a *sukka* in the center of the roof that

ועוד באמצע הוא דפליגי אבל על שפת הגג דברי הכל כשרה לימא תיהו תיובתיה

Daf 4b

it is unfit, while the *baraita* cites a dispute on the matter; second, with regard to his statement that there is a dispute in the case of a *sukka* on the edge of the roof, while the *baraita* indicates that everyone agrees that it is fit.

דרב הונא
בתרתי

The Gemara rejects this: **Rav Huna** could have **said to you** that there is no proof from the *baraita* with regard to the second matter, as it is possible that **they disagree** in the case of a *sukka* in **the center of the roof** and that **the same is true** in the case of a *sukka* **on the edge of the roof**. **And** the fact that they specifically **dispute** the case of a *sukka* in the **center of the roof** is to **convey to you** the far-reaching nature of the opinion of **Rabbi Ya'akov, who deems the *sukka* fit even in the center of the roof**.

אמר לך רב הונא פליגי
באמצע הגג והוא הדין על
שפת הגג והאי דקמיפילגי
באמצע הגג להודיעך כחו
דר' יעקב דאפילו באמצע
הגג נמי מכשיר

Comment/Chiddush

And we discuss the extent of the opinion of Rabbi Ya'akov over the opposing one, because he permits using posts, and the position of one who permits is always stronger than that of one who forbids, which may be based on being stringent because of lack of knowledge.

The Sages taught: If one inserted four posts into the ground and placed a roof over them, **Rabbi Ya'akov says:** One considers whether the posts are wide enough that **if they were grooved and split**, forming a piece of wood with two segments at a right angle, **and they have a handbreadth to here**, in this direction, **and a handbreadth to there**, in that direction, then they **are considered a double post [deyumad]**. With regard to certain *halakhot*, the status of a double post positioned at a corner is that of two full-fledged partitions. **And if not**, if after splitting them they are narrower than that, **they are not considered a double post, as Rabbi Ya'akov would say:** The minimum measure of **double posts of a *sukka*** to be considered full-fledged partitions is one **handbreadth**. **And the Rabbis say:** The *sukka* is fit **only if it has two** full-fledged partitions **in the standard sense**, completely closing each of those two sides, **and a third wall**, which, based on a *halakha* transmitted to Moses from Sinai, measures **even a handbreadth**.

ת"ר נעץ ארבעה
קונדיסין בארץ וסיכך
על גבן ר' יעקב אומר
רואין כל שאילו יחקקו
ויחלקו ויש בהן טפח
לכאן וטפח לכאן נידונין
משום דיומד ואם לאו
אין נידונין משום דיומד
שהיה רבי יעקב אומר
דיומדי סוכה טפח
וחכמים אומרים עד
שיהו שתיים כהלכתן
ושלישית אפילו טפח:

Comment/Chiddush

This considering of a post as a stand-in for a wall, especially by *sukka* where the *sukka* needs to be at least seven handbreadths wide, is truly surprising. Some explain that Rabbi Ya'akov leaned this from the law that the third wall may be a single handbreadth, and he understands that the Torah approves of single handbreadth walls for *sukka*.

§ The mishna continues: A *sukka* that is not even **ten handbreadths high** is unfit. The Gemara asks: **From where do we derive this *halakha*?**

ושאינה גבוהה עשרה
טפחים: מנלן

Comment/Chiddush

Do we need a source? Is a *sukka* of less than ten handbreadths liveable?? Some explain that the *sukka* may be high as a man, but the walls need to be ten handbreadths. This needs a source. Similarly, if one carved out a hole in the middle of his nine handbreadth *sukka* to make it liveable, what is the source that more is needed? Chazon Ish

It was stated that **Rav, and Rabbi Ḥanina, and Rabbi Yoḥanan, and Rav Ḥaviva** taught the matter below.

אתמר רב ורבי חנינא ורבי יוחנן ורב חביבא
מתנו

Daf 4b

As an aside, the Gemara notes: **Throughout the entire order of *Mo'ed*, wherever this second pair of Sages is mentioned, there are some *amora'im* who replace Rabbi Yoḥanan and do so by inserting Rabbi Yonatan in his place.**

בכולה סדר מועד כל כי
האי זוגא חלופי רבי יוחנן
ומעיילי רבי יונתן

And this is what they taught: The **Ark** of the Covenant was itself **nine** handbreadths high, as it is stated explicitly in the Torah that it was one and a half cubits high and the cubit used to measure Temple vessels consisted of six handbreadths. **And the Ark cover was one handbreadth thick. There is a total height of ten handbreadths here. And it is written: "I will meet with you there and I will speak with you from above the Ark cover" (Exodus 25:22),**

ארון תשעה וכפורת
טפח הרי כאן עשרה
וכתיב (שמות כה,
כב) ונועדתי לך שם
ודברתי אתך מעל
הכפורת