



Overview

Halacha Highlight

Siman 631 Seif 6:

Reeds that extend behind the sukkah, for example, the reeds of the schach extend behind the middle wall and that area contains the minimum size of a sukkah, has more shade than sun and has three walls, is valid even though the middle wall was constructed for the primary sukkah rather than for that area.

- ❖ Later authorities agree that even if the middle wall is valid due to lavud that there is a valid sukkah. (M.B. 14)

Siman 631 Seif 7:

If the reeds protrude from the schach to the open side and one of the walls extends with them the sukkah is valid. Even though one of the side walls is longer than seven tefachim and we should say that he revealed his intent to build longer walls on both sides and now the wall that extends with the reeds is not part of the sukkah but stands by itself and it turns out that there is only one wall, the sukkah is valid.

Siman 631 Seif 8:

If one used poles that are invalid schach that are not four tefachim and combined do not occupy a space of four tefachim and between the poles one left space the width of the poles and placed there valid schach the sukkah is invalid since it is impossible to calculate that the entire space should be filled by valid schach and it turns out that there is more invalid schach than valid schach. If one extended the valid schach onto the invalid schach or if the invalid schach was placed שתי and the valid schach was placed ערב or vice versa the sukkah is valid since the entire space could be filled with valid schach. (This leniency applies for a large sukkah but regarding a small sukkah the poles must be less than three tefachim in one spot.)

The back of the sukkah

Shulchan Aruch Siman 631 Seif 6

קנים היוצאים לאחורי הסוכה

Reeds that extend behind the sukkah

The Gemara in Sukkah 19a addressed the case of פסל היוצא מן הסוכה and rules that it has the same status as the sukkah itself. According to Ulla, the case refers to where the schach extends beyond the middle wall and since that area has three walls and encompasses a minimum area of seven by seven tefachim it is a valid sukkah. The Gemara goes on to explain that the reason it was necessary to teach that the "back of the sukkah" is a valid sukkah is that one might have thought that since the wall was constructed for the inside of the sukkah rather than the back of the sukkah it would not be considered a valid sukkah.

Aruch HaShulchan (סעי' ט') wonders why it was necessary to teach that the wall that was constructed for the inside of the sukkah is valid for the back of the sukkah as well. Since when is it necessary for the walls of the sukkah to be constructed for the sake of the sukkah? The halacha is that even if the schach was not placed on the walls for the sake of the mitzvah the sukkah is valid, so certainly when the walls were not constructed for the sake of the mitzvah the sukkah should be valid. He answers that the intent is that since the middle wall was not constructed for the sake of the back sukkah one might think that the schach is invalid since it was probably not placed there for the sake of producing shade. For this reason it was necessary to teach that the schach in this case remains valid. He then references Tosafos (סוכה י"ט. ד"ה לבראי) who writes that in some versions when the Gemara explains the novelty of its ruling it actually references the schach explicitly. This reading supports Aruch HaShulchan's explanation.

- ❖ We maintain in siman 632:1 that invalid schach invalidates a sukkah with three tefachim. (M.B. 21)