



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Succah Daf Beis

MESECHTA SUCCAH

PEREK SUCCAH -- PEREK RISHON

MISHNA

- A succah whose s'chach is higher than 20 amos is passul, but **R' Yehuda** says it is valid.
- A succah that is not at least 10 tefachim tall, or that does not have at least 3 walls, or one in which there is more sun than shade, is passul.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Regarding the halachos of a mavui, the Mishna says that the korah cannot be higher than 20 amos. The **T"K** there says, if it is higher it should be lowered, and **R' Yehuda** says it need not be lowered. Why does the Mishna there not say "passul", but instead gives the way to fix it, and in our Mishna the **T"K** simply says "passul"? **A:** Succah is D'Oraisa, so it is more befitting to say passul, whereas the halachos of mavui are D'Rabanan and therefore it is more befitting to give the way to fix it. **A2:** Our Mishna gives many different invalidities of the succah, and would therefore have the list the way to address each and every one of them. It is therefore simpler and easier to just say "passul".
- **Q:** How do we know that a succah whose s'chach is higher than 20 amos is passul? **A:** **Rabbah** said, the pasuk says "L'man yeidu doroseichem ki basuccos hoshavti". When the s'chach is higher than 20 amos it is not noticeable, and it is not "known" that one is sitting in a succah. **A2:** **R' Zeira** said, the pasuk says "v'succah tihyeh l'tzeil yomam". When the s'chach is higher than 20 amos, the shade in the succah is created by the walls, not the s'chach.
 - **Q:** **Abaye** asked **R' Zeirah**, if one were to make a succah between two large mountains (where the mountains provide all the shade) it would surely be a valid succah, so why is this different? **A:** **R' Zeira** answered, in the case of the mountains, if the mountains are removed, the s'chach as is would provide the shade. However, if the s'chach is higher than 20 amos, even if the walls are removed, the area under the s'chach would be mostly sunny. Therefore it is passul.**A3:** **Rava** said, the pasuk says, "basuccos teishvu shivas yomim". This teaches that the succah should be a temporary dwelling ("for 7 days"). A wall higher than 20 amos must be properly supported and is therefore considered a permanent structure.
 - **Q:** **Abaye** asked, if someone were to make a succah less than 20 amos, but would use iron walls, are you saying that that would be passul as well!? **A:** **Rava** answered, when less than 20 amos tall, since it *can* be made in a temporary fashion, even if it is made in a permanent fashion, it is valid. When taller than 20 amos, since it must be made in a more permanent fashion, even if it is made in a temporary fashion, it will be passul.
 - The source of **Rabbah** is not used by the others, because they say that pasuk is telling the Yidden to remember the "ananaei kavod" when they sit in the succah. The source of **R' Zeirah** is not used by the others, because they say that pasuk is referring to the times of Moshiach, not a regular succah. The source of **Rava** is not used by the others, because they agree with the question of **Abaye**.
 - **R' Yoshiya** said in the name of **Rav**, the machlokes between the **T"K** and **R' Yehuda** in our Mishna is only where the wall doesn't meet the s'chach. If it does, all would agree it can even be higher than 20 amos. This follows the view of **Rabbah**, because when the

wall meets the s'chach, one's gaze follows the wall up and he notices that he is sitting under s'chach.

- **R' Huna in the name of Rav** said, the machlokes between the **T"K** and **R' Yehuda** in our Mishna is only where the succah is only 4x4 amos. However, if it is more than 4x4, all would agree that the s'chach may be higher than 20 amos. This follows the view of **R' Zeira**, and when the succah is larger than 4x4, the shade inside is from the s'chach, as opposed to from the walls.
- **R' Chanan bar Rabbah in the name of Rav** said, the machlokes between the **T"K** and **R' Yehuda** in our Mishna is only where the succah is only large enough to fit one's head, most of his body, and his table. However, if the succah is larger, the s'chach may even be higher than 20 amos. This statement doesn't fit according to **Rabbah, R' Zeirah, or Rava**.
 - **Q: R' Yoshiya** argues on the others, because they say the machlokes is based on the size of the succah, and he says it has nothing to do with that. However, maybe we can say that **R' Huna** and **R' Chanan bar Rabbah** argue as to the minimum size that a succah may be (and they both agree that if the succah is larger than the minimum size, the s'chach may be higher than 20 amos)? **A:** It may be that they both agree that the minimum size for a succah is for it to be large enough to fit one's head, most of his body, and his table. They argue in the following: **R' Chanan** says once it is larger than that, the **T"K** would agree that the s'chach may be higher than 20 amos, and **R' Huna** says, the **T"K** argues up to the point that the succah is 4x4 amos.
 - **Q:** A Braisa brings the machlokes between the **T"K** and **R' Yehuda** regarding a succah whose s'chach is higher than 20 amos. It then brings the following. **R' Yehuda** said to the **Rabanan** (the **T"K**), it once happened that the Elders visited Queen Hilni on Succos, and she was in a succah whose s'chach was higher than 20 amos, and they said nothing to her. The **Rabanan** responded, that is no proof that s'chach may be higher than 20 amos, because Hilni was a woman, and therefore patur from having to sit in a succah altogether (which is why they didn't correct her succah). **R' Yehuda** then said, Hilni had 7 sons, who presumably were chayuv in succah, and yet the Elders didn't correct her succah! Also, Hilni did everything according to the way the **Chachomim** said things should be done! The Gemara now asks, why did **R' Yehuda** have to give this second reason (i.e. Hilni did all according to the **Chachomim**)? **R' Yehuda** was saying as follows. If you (**Rabanan**) will say that maybe the sons were minors, I will tell you that she had 7 sons, which means that at least some of them were old enough to be chayuv in succah D'Rabanan (they were old enough not to need their mother). If you will say that Hilni didn't follow the D'Rabanan mitzvos, I will tell you that she followed all that the **Chachomim** said to do! Now, according to **R' Yoshiya**, this makes sense, because a queen would probably have a succah whose walls didn't meet its s'chach, for purposes of ventilation. However, according to the others, that the **Rabanan** only argue in a succah of very small size, this would mean that Queen Hilni sat in a tiny succah, which does not seem logical for a queen to have done!? **A: Rabbah bar R' Adda** said, she was sitting in a larger succah that was made up of a number of small rooms (each the size of a minimum succah and therefore judged as if each was a succah on its own).
 - **Q:** It still seems illogical to say that a queen would sit in such small rooms? **A: R' Ashi** said, it was actually a large succah that had some smaller side rooms. The machlokes was, that the **Rabanan** felt that the sons would hang out in the large (and therefore kosher) part of the succah, which is why they did not correct the fact that her room was passul, since, as a woman, she was anyway not chayuv in the mitzvah of succah. **R' Yehuda** held that the sons would hang out with their mother, and still the Elders did not correct her room, which shows that s'chach above 20 amos is valid, even in a succah of minimum size.