



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

Succah Daf Gimmel

- **R' Shmuel bar Yitzchak** said, the halacha is that a succah must (at a minimum) be large enough to fit one's head, most of his body, and his table. **R' Abba** asked him, you seem to be following **B"S** (because **B"H** say that one need not have his table in the succah). **R' Shmuel bar Yitzchak** answered, that it is true, he follows **B"S**.
 - **Q: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** asked, who says that **B"S** and **B"H** argue about the minimum size of a succah? Maybe they are arguing regarding a larger succah, and the argument is whether one may eat in the succah when his table is outside the succah. **B"S** say one may not, because that may cause him to eat over his table, which is outside the succah, and **B"H** is not concerned for this and therefore allow it!? **A:** They must argue in regard to the minimum size of a succah as well. There are 2 Braisos that seem to contradict each other. In one Braisa the **Chachomim** (the **T"K**) say that a succah must be large enough to fit one's head, most of his body, and his table. In another Braisa the **Chachomim** say that a succah must only be large enough to fit one's head and most of his body. [In both Braisos, **Rebbi** argues and says that the succah must be a minimum of 4x4 amos]. It must be that the first Braisa follows **B"S** and the second Braisa follows **B"H**, and this proves that they argue with regard to the minimum size of a succah as well.
 - **Mar Zutra** said, a Mishna suggests this as well, because when they argue in the Mishna the terminology used is "kosher" and "passul", which is terminology used to describe the succah itself.
 - **Q:** That Mishna also suggests that they are arguing about a larger succah and whether the person in the succah is yotzeh, because the Mishna says, "if one is sitting in a succah but the table is outside...". If the machlokes in the Mishna was about the minimum size of the succah, it should be written as "a succah that can only hold..."? **A:** They actually argue on both points.
 - **Q:** A Braisa lists a number of halachos that apply to houses, but only when the house is at least 4x4 amos. Must we say that this Braisa only follows the view of **Rebbi**? **A:** The **Rabanan** only say that a succah may be smaller than 4x4 because it is a temporary dwelling place. However, they would agree that a house, which is a permanent dwelling place, must be at least 4x4 amos to be considered a proper house.
 - The Braisa said that a house smaller than 4x4 amos: is not chayuv in mezuzah, or to have a fence around its roof, does not become tamei from nega'im, is not subject to the redemption limitations on houses that are sold in a walled city, and do not allow one who built it to become exempt from the army like someone who built a new house and had not yet lived in it. The reason such a house is not treated like a house for these purposes is because regarding each of these halachos the pasuk says "bayis", and such a small house is not called a "bayis".
 - The Braisa said such a house is not included in an eiruv, or a shituf, and an eiruv may not be left in that house. The reason for this is because such a house is not considered fit to be lived in.

- **Q:** Why may an eiruv not be placed in it, but a shituf may be placed in it? **A:** A shituf may even be left in the chatzer itself, so it can be left in such a house as well.
- The Braisa said such a house is not considered a house which can be used to combine two cities for purposes of techumin. In this way it is even worse than a hut. The reason for this is that a hut is fit for its intended purpose, but a house that small is not fit for its intended purpose (i.e. to be lived in).
- The Braisa said such a house is not split by brothers or partners.
 - **Q:** Does this mean that if a house is at least 4x4 amos it will be divided? We have learned that we don't force a chatzer to be divided unless each partner will end up with a piece that is 4x4 amos!? **A:** The Braisa means that the house is not considered a house for purposes of splitting up a chatzer. A chatzer is divided among brothers or partners, by giving some precedence to the number of houses owned in the chatzer (the amount of precedence is a matter of machlokes). The Braisa teaches that that is only true for houses that are destined to remain. However, a house of this size is destined to be destroyed, and is therefore not given the status of a house for this purpose.