

## Daf 26a

In the name of Rabbi Sheila they said: A groom is exempt from the mitzva of *Shema*, but the groomsmen and all the members of the wedding party are obligated.

משום רבי שילא אמרו חתן פטור והשושבינין וכל בני החופה חייבין

Comment/Chiddush

Rabbi Sheila does not free one who is involved in a mitzva, hence the others are required. A groom, however, is considered unable to compose himself for saying the Shma.

§ It is taught in a *baraita*: Rabbi Ḥananya ben Akavya said: With regard to scribes of Torah scrolls, phylacteries, and *mezuzot*, they themselves, and the merchants who sell them, and the merchants who purchase them from the first merchants and sell them to others, and all who are engaged in the labor of Heaven, which comes to include the sellers of the sky-blue dye for ritual fringes, are all exempt from the mitzva of reciting *Shema* and from prayer and from donning phylacteries and from all mitzvot that are mentioned in the Torah while they are engaged in that labor. This statement comes to fulfill the statement of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, as Rabbi Yosei HaGelili would say: One who is engaged in a mitzva is exempt from another mitzva.

תניא א"ר חנניא בן עקביא כותבי ספרים תפילין ומזוזות הן ותגריהן ותגריהן וכל העוסקין במלאכת שמים לאתויי מוכרי תכלת פטורין מק"ש ומן התפלה ומן התפילין ומכל מצות האמורות בתורה לקיים דברי ר' יוסי הגלילי שהיה רבי יוסי הגלילי אומר העוסק במצוה פטור מן המצוה

Comment/Chiddush

The Magen Avraham proposes that this refers only to those whose primary consideration is that people have these items. One who is simply doing business, by contrast, is not considered involved in a mitzva.

The Sages taught in a *baraita*: Travelers who travel during the day are exempt from the mitzva of *sukka* during the day and are obligated at night. Travelers by night are exempt from the mitzva of *sukka* at night and obligated during the day. Travelers both during the day and at night are exempt from the mitzva of *sukka* both during the day and at night. Those who travel for a matter of mitzva are exempt both during the day and at night, because they are preoccupied with the mitzva, even if they are not traveling at night, as in this recurring incident involving Rav Ḥisda and Rabba bar Rav Huna. The Gemara relates: When they would enter the house of the Exilarch on the Shabbat of the Festival to hear his Festival homily, they would sleep on the bank of the Sura River and not in a *sukka*. They said in explanation: We are ones on the path to perform a mitzva and are exempt from the mitzva of *sukka*.

ת"ר הולכי דרכים ביום פטורין מן הסוכה ביום וחייבין בלילה הולכי דרכים בלילה פטורין מן הסוכה בלילה וחייבין ביום הולכי דרכים ביום ובלילה פטורין מן הסוכה בין ביום ובין בלילה הולכין לדבר מצוה פטורין בין ביום ובין בלילה כי הא דרב חסדא ורבה בר רב הונא כי הוו עיילי בשבתא דרגלא לבי ריש גלותא הוו גבו ארקתא דסורא אמרי אנן שלוחי מצוה אנן ופטורין

Comment/Chiddush

Wayfarers who rest at night are only required in a *sukka* if they sleep in a city. Tosfos. It would seem that they need not trouble themselves to go and build a *sukka* on their own.

The Sages taught in a *baraita*: Guardians of the city who guard during the day are exempt from the mitzva of *sukka* during the day and are obligated at night. Guardians of the city at night are exempt from the mitzva of *sukka* at night and are obligated during the day. Those who guard the city both during the day and at night are exempt from the mitzva of *sukka* both during the day and at night.

ת"ר שומרי העיר ביום פטורין מן הסוכה ביום וחייבין בלילה שומרי העיר בלילה פטורין מן הסוכה בלילה וחייבין ביום שומרי העיר בין ביום ובין בלילה פטורים מן הסוכה בין ביום ובין בלילה

Guardians of gardens and orchards are exempt from *sukka* both during the day and at night. The Gemara asks: And let them establish a *sukka* there in the garden and reside there. Why are they exempt from the mitzva of *sukka*? Abaye said: The reason for the exemption is the verse: "In *sukkot* shall you reside" (Leviticus 23:42), which the Sages interpreted to mean: Reside as you dwell in your permanent home. Since preparing a *sukka* that is a fully equipped dwelling in the orchard far from his house would involve considerable exertion, the mitzva does not apply to him

שומרי גנות ופרדסים פטורין בין ביום ובין בלילה וליעבדי סוכה התם וליתבו אביי אמר תשבו כעין תדורו

## Daf 26a

## Comment/Chiddush

The inference from this is that ideally one should move much of his major furniture into the sukka; its now his home!

**Rava said: A breach summons the thief.** If the guardian builds a *sukka*, thieves will know where the guardian is located in the field and they will enter the field elsewhere. The exemption of the watchman from the mitzva of *sukka* prevents that situation. The Gemara asks: **What is the practical difference between the two reasons given?** The Gemara answers: **There is a difference between them in a case where he is guarding a pile of fruit**, which can be guarded from inside the *sukka*; therefore, according to Rava, in that case the guard would be obligated in the mitzva of *sukka*. However, since the *sukka* in the orchard is not like a fully equipped home, in Abaye's opinion he would still be exempt in that case.

רבא אמר  
פרצה קוראה  
לגנב מאי  
ביניהו איכא  
ביניהו דקא  
מנטר כריא  
דפירי:

## Comment/Chiddush

Is the possibility of monetary loss the exemption from *sukka*? No, it would rather seem that in this case, as one makes no provision for shelter the entire year, for fear of financial loss, so too is one exempt from doing so on Sukkos.

§ It is stated in the mishna: The **ill and their caretakers** are exempt from the mitzva of *sukka*. **The Sages taught** in a *baraita*: The **ill person that they said** is exempt from *sukka* is not only **an ill person whose condition is critical, but even an ill person whose condition is not critical**, and **even one who feels pain in his eyes, and even one who feels pain in his head**. **Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said: One time I felt pain in my eyes in Caesarea, and the esteemed Rabbi Yosei ben Halafta permitted me and my attendant to sleep outside the sukka.**

חולים ומשמשיהם: תנו רבנן  
חולה שאמרו לא חולה שיש בו  
סכנה אלא אפילו חולה שאין בו  
סכנה אפי' חש בעיניו ואפילו חש  
בראשו ארשב"ג פעם אחת חשתי  
בעיני בקיסרי והתיר ר' יוסי בריבי  
לישן אני ומשמשי חוץ לסוכה

## Comment/Chiddush

Magen Avraham rules that someone who caused his own sickness is not exempt from *sukka*, for he caused it himself.

The Gemara relates a similar tale: **Rav permitted Rav Aḥa Bardela to sleep beneath a canopy in the sukka due to the biting flies [baki]**. He permitted this although the canopy was more than ten handbreadths high and in sleeping beneath it he did not fulfill his obligation. **Rava permitted Rabbi Aḥa bar Adda to sleep outside the sukka due to the foul odor of the earth [gargishta] floor of the sukka.**

רב שרא לרב אחא ברדלא  
למגנא בבילתא בסוכה משום  
בקי רבא שרא ליה לרבי אחא  
בר אדא למגנא בר ממטללתא  
משום סירחא דגרגישתא

## Comment/Chiddush

This is a second level of discomfort that the Gemara permits sleeping outside the *sukka*, but it would appear that eating, which is shorter and more incumbent upon one, would be required. Rosh. Others permit eating outside too.

The Gemara comments: **Rava conforms to his line of reasoning, as Rava said: One who suffers in the sukka is exempt from the mitzva of sukka.** The Gemara asks: **But didn't we learn in the mishna that the ill and their caretakers are exempt from the mitzva of sukka?** By inference, with regard to **an ill person, yes**, he is exempt; with regard to **one who suffers, no**, he is not exempt. The Sages say: With regard to **an ill person, he and his caretakers are exempt**; however, with regard to **one who merely suffers in the sukka, he is exempt but his caretakers are not.**

רבא לטעמיה דאמר רבא  
מצטער פטור מן הסוכה והא  
אנן תנן חולין ומשמשיהם  
פטורים מן הסוכה חולה אין  
מצטער לא אמרי חולה הוא  
ומשמשיו פטורים מצטער הוא  
פטור משמשיו לא

## Comment/Chiddush

The difference being that a sick man's helpers are doing a mitzva, and therefore exempt, but not a mere sufferer's.

§ The mishna continues: **One may eat and drink in the framework of a casual meal outside the sukka.** The Gemara asks: **And how much food is considered a casual**

אוכלים אכילת עראי חוץ לסוכה  
וכמה אכילת עראי אמר רב יוסף

## Daf 26a

meal? Rav Yosef said: It is two or three egg-bulks of bread. Abaye said to him: But often, doesn't a person suffice with that measure of food, and then its legal status is that of a formal meal? Rather, Abaye said: A casual meal is like the measure that a student of the academy of Rav tastes and then enters the study hall to hear the lecture.

תרתי או תלת ביעי א"ל אביי והא זימנין סגיאין סגי ליה לאיניש בהכי והוה ליה סעודת קבע אלא אמר אביי כדטעים בר בי רב ועייל לכלה

## Comment/Chiddush

Tosfos says this is the size of an egg. The Rambam says that its close to an egg, perhaps more, perhaps less. It may depend on the person eating it, and more importantly, why he eats it- is it to satiate himself, or to stave off hunger?

The Sages taught in a *baraita*: One may eat a casual meal outside the *sukka*, but one may not take even a brief nap outside the *sukka*. The Gemara asks: What is the reason for this distinction? After all, sleeping in the *sukka* is an obligation just as eating in the *sukka* is an obligation. Rav Ashi said: It is prohibited to nap outside the *sukka* due to a decree lest he fall into a deep sleep.

ת"ר אוכלין אכילת עראי חוץ לסוכה ואין ישנים שינת עראי חוץ לסוכה מ"ט אמר רב אשי גזרה שמא ירדם

## Comment/Chiddush

One controls his eating that he should not eat a full meal, but one cannot control sleep, once he has begun snoozing.

Abaye said to him: But with regard to that *halakha* which is taught in a *baraita*: A person may take a brief nap while donning phylacteries but substantial sleep is not permitted. Let us be concerned in that case as well lest he fall into a deep sleep. Rav Yosef, son of Rav Illai, said: There is no concern with regard to phylacteries, as it is a case where one assigns responsibility for ensuring that his sleep will not be prolonged to others.

א"ל אביי אלא הא דתניא ישן אדם שינת עראי בתפילין אבל לא שינת קבע ליחוש שמא ירדם אמר רב יוסף בריה דרב עילאי במוסר שינתו לאחרים

## Comment/Chiddush

According to this, a person may sleep outside of a *sukka* too, if he appoints a watcher. And so too in the next piece.

Rav Mesharshiyya strongly objects to Abaye's statement: Your guarantor, who ensures that you do not sleep too long, requires a guarantor to ensure that he does not do the same. Rather, Rabba bar bar Hana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: We are dealing with a case where he places his head between his knees, a position that does not lend itself to deep sleep. Rava said: Neither with regard to *sukka* nor with regard to phylacteries is there concern lest he fall into a deep sleep. Taking a brief nap outside the *sukka* is prohibited because there is no concept of substantial duration with regard to sleep, i.e., there is no halakhic difference between a brief nap and a longer-lasting sleep. Depending on circumstances, sleep of any duration can be considered substantial and is therefore prohibited outside a *sukka*.

מתקיף ליה רב משרשיא ערביך ערבא צריך אלא אמר רבה בר בר חנה א"ר יוחנן במניח ראשו בין ברכיו עסקינן רבא אמר אין קבע לשינה

## Comment/Chiddush

Since when do we suspect a fully awake man to fall asleep?? Why does the guarantor need a guarantor? Here there was excessive worry – perhaps he will sleep deeply, and perhaps then he will pass gas. If we are so worried, we can worry about a fully awake man falling asleep too, for here we are clearly taking no chances whatsoever. Aruch Laner

The Gemara comments that it is taught in one *baraita*: A person may take a brief nap with phylacteries, but substantial sleep is not permitted. And it was taught in another *baraita*: Both substantial sleep and a brief nap are permitted. And it was taught in another *baraita*: Neither substantial sleep nor a brief nap is permitted. The Gemara explains that this is not difficult: This *baraita*, where it is taught that even a brief nap is prohibited, is in a case where one holds the phylacteries in his hands. It is prohibited to sleep at all lest he drop them. That *baraita*, where it was taught that a brief nap is permitted, is in a case where the phylacteries are placed on his

תני חדא ישן אדם בתפילין שינת עראי אבל לא שינת קבע ותניא אידך בין קבע בין עראי ותניא אידך לא קבע ולא עראי לא קשיא הא דנקיט להו

## Daf 26a

**head.** There is no concern during a brief nap lest he break wind or experience a seminal emission. During deep sleep, that is a concern. **That** third *baraita*, where it was taught that even substantial sleep is permitted with phylacteries, is in a case **where he** removes the phylacteries and **spreads a cloth over** them and sleeps alongside them.

בידיה הא דמנחי  
ברישיה הא דפריס  
סודרא עלויה

Comment/Chiddush

And this teaches that we are not concerned that in his deep sleep he may roll over onto the phylacteries.

The Gemara asks: **And how much is the duration of a brief nap? Rami bar Yehezkel taught:** It is **equivalent** to the time required for **walking one hundred cubits**. The Gemara comments: **That is also taught** in a *baraita*: **One who sleeps with phylacteries and experiences a seminal emission grips the strap** of the phylacteries to remove them

וכמה שינת עראי תני רמי בר  
יחזקאל כדי הילוך מאה אמה  
תניא נמי הכי הישן בתפילין  
ורואה קרי אוחז ברצועה

Comment/Chiddush

Some say this is about fifty four seconds – Mishna Berura