



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

Succah Daf Tes

MISHNA

- **B"S** say that an "old succah" is passul. **B"H** say that it is valid.
 - A succah is considered to be "old" if it was built more than 30 days before Succos. However, if it was built for the purpose of the mitzvah of succah, even **B"S** agree that it is valid even if built before those 30 days.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What is the reasoning of **B"S**? **A:** The pasuk says "Chag hasuccos", which he darshens to mean that the succah has to be built for the sake of the Yom Tov of Succos.
 - **B"H** darshen this pasuk like **R' Sheishes**, that the pasuk teaches "Chag hasuccos LaShem" – the wood of the succah is assur to be used for any other purpose for all 7 days of Succos.
 - **Q:** **B"S** also need the pasuk to teach this!? **A:** The reasoning for his shita is from the pasuk "chag hasuccos ta'aseh lecha shivas yamim". He darshens this to teach that the succah must be built for the chag.
 - **B"H** use this pasuk to teach that one may build a succah on Chol Hamoed. **B"S** don't need the pasuk to teach that, because they hold like **R' Eliezer**, that one may not build a succah on Chol Hamoed.
- **Q:** According to **B"H**, who say that a succah need not be made for the sake of Succos, other mitzvos shouldn't have to be made for their sake either. However, that would mean that **Rav** and **Shmuel** argue on them, because they hold that the strings of tzitzis on the garment must be placed there for the sake of the mitzvah!? **A:** Tzitzis are different, because the pasuk says "gedilim ta'aseh **lach**", which means they must be made for the sake of the mitzvah.
 - **Q:** The pasuk regarding succah also says "Chag hasuccos ta'aseh **lecha**"!? **A:** That pasuk teaches that a stolen succah is passul.
 - **Q:** Maybe the pasuk by tzitzis is also teaching that stolen tzitzis are passul!? **A:** There is another pasuk regarding tzitzis which says "v'asu **lahem**", which means are passul if they are stolen.

MISHNA

- If one builds a succah under a tree, it is as if it was built inside a house (and is therefore passul).
- If one succah is built on top of another succah, the upper succah is valid and the bottom one is passul. **R' Yehuda** says, if no one is living in the upper succah, the bottom one is valid.

GEMARA

- **Rava** said, a succah built under a tree is only passul if the branches of the tree provide more shade than sunlight (it protects most of the succah from the sun). However, if it does not do so, the succah will be valid. We can learn this from the Mishna, which compares this case to a succah built in a house. This comparison was made to teach that just like a house provides shade for most of the succah built inside it, so too, the tree only makes it passul if it provides shade for most of the succah built under it.
 - **Q:** Why is that so? The passul s'chach should be considered as combining with the valid s'chach and the succah should therefore be passul!? **A:** **R' Pappa** said, the Mishna is

talking about where the person lowered the branches and mixed it with the s'chach, in which case the passul s'chach becomes batul in the majority of valid s'chach.

- **Q:** That case is obvious!? **A:** We would think that we would be goizer in the case where they are lowered to guard one from thinking that it is valid even when they are not lowered.
 - **Q:** A Braisa already teaches that we are not goizer in this case!? **A:** We would have thought the Braisa only allows it b'dieved. The Mishna teaches that it is allowed even l'chatchila.

SUCCAH AHL GABEI SUCCAH...

- A Braisa says, the pasuk of “basuccos teishvu” teaches that one must sit in a succah, but not in a succah that is under another succah, or under a tree, or inside a house.
 - **Q:** The word “basuccos” (written in the plural) suggests that one may sit in a succah beneath another succah!? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, the word is written without a “vuv”, thus suggesting the singular rather than the plural.
- **R' Yirmiya** said, regarding a succah built underneath another succah, there are times: when both are valid, when both are passul, when the lower one is valid but the upper one is passul, and when the lower one is passul and the upper one is valid.
 - If the s'chach of the lower succah would allow more sun than shade to pass through, but the s'chach of the upper one would not, and the s'chach of the upper one is within 20 amos to the ground, both succos are valid.
 - If the s'chach of both succos are enough to shade most of the succah from the sun, and the upper s'chach is above 20 amos, both succos are passul.
 - If the s'chach of the lower succah is sufficient, but of the upper succah it is not, and the upper s'chach is within 20 amos (so the s'chach is not passul on its face), the lower succah is valid and the upper one is passul.
 - If both sets of s'chach are sufficient, and are within 20 amos, the upper succah is valid and the lower one is passul.
 - **Q:** All these cases seem to be obvious!? **A:** The third case was necessary to be taught, and it teaches that we are not goizer in that case for a case where the s'chach of the upper succah is more than 20 amos high (in which case the lower succah would be passul as well).