



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Eruvin, Daf א – Daf ב

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf א--6-----

- **R' Chanin bar Rava in the name of Rav** said, a breach in the side wall of a mavui (when there is 4 tefachim of that side wall which is standing before the place of the breach) is not problematic unless the breach is more than 10 amos. A breach in the front wall of a mavui is problematic if it is even just 4 tefachim.
 - **Q:** Why should the front wall be treated any differently than the side wall (in both cases the breach should be considered another entranceway and the mavui should remain permitted to carry in)?! **A: R' Huna in the name of R' Yehoshua** said, **R' Chanin** is referring to a case where the corner wall is broken down (not the front wall), and this can't be considered an entranceway, because entranceways are not made in corners.
- **R' Huna** says that a breach of 4 tefachim on either wall makes the mavui assur to carry in.
 - **R' Huna** said to **R' Chanan bar Rava**, don't argue with me, because even **Rav** paskened like me when this question came before him in Damcharya. **R' Chanan** answered, **Rav** doesn't really hold like that. He paskened stringently in that case because the people of Damcharya were unlearned and he was trying to prevent them from coming close to desecrating Shabbos.
- **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said that **R' Huna's** view makes sense. We learned that in a case of a bent mavui (an "L" shaped mavui) where both ends open into the reshus harabim, there is a machlokes: **Rav** says that each leg of the "L" is treated as a mavui that is open on both sides to the reshus harabim. Therefore, he would need to put a "tzuras hapesach" on one end of each leg (or just in the middle, for both legs) and put a lechi or korah on the other end. **Shmuel** says each leg is considered to be a mavui that is closed, with only one end being open to the reshus harabim (and a simple lechi or korah at the opening to the reshus harabim will suffice). How large is the width of the mavui at the bend? If it is larger than 10 amos, **Shmuel** would not consider it a closed mavui. It must be that it is less than 10 amos, and still **Rav** considers it to be an open mavui. **Rav** must consider a breach of 4 tefachim as being "open"!
 - **R' Chanan** will say, that case is different because it becomes a public thoroughfare (since it is open on both sides to the reshus harabim) and that is why it is considered problematic if it is even 4 tefachim wide.
 - **Q:** This would mean that **R' Huna** disallows a breach of 4 tefachim even if it **not** a public thoroughfare. This is problematic, because **R' Ami and R' Assi** said earlier that a side wall breached up to 10 amos is not problematic for the mavui if there is a piece of wall 4 tefachim before the breach. According to the answer we just gave, **R' Huna** must be arguing on **R' Ami and R' Assi**?! **A:** In **R' Ami and R' Assi's** case the breached wall had a small piece near the ground still remaining, which prevented the breach from becoming a thoroughfare. In that case even **R' Huna** would agree that a breach up to 10 amos would not be problematic for the mavui.
- A Braisa says: How do we adjust a reshus harabim to permit carrying? The **T"K** says he must make a tzuras hapesach on one end and place a lechi or korah on the opposite end. **Chananya** says it is a machlokes between **B"S and B"H**. **B"S** say each end must be closed off by doors, which must actually be kept closed (except when one is walking through). **B"H** say one end must be closed off by doors and the other end needs either a lechi or a korah.
 - **Q:** We learn from a Braisa that a reshus harabim can only be adjusted with doors on both sides?! How can the previous Braisa say that **B"H** allow adjusting with a door on one end and a lechi or korah on the other end? **A: R' Yehuda** said, the previous Braisa is talking about adjusting a mavui that is open on both ends to the reshus harabim (not a reshus harabim itself).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Rav** paskens like the **T”K**, that a mavui opened at both ends to the reshus harabim needs to be adjusted with a tzuras hapesach on one end and a lechi or korah on the opposite end. **Shmuel** paskens like **Chananya** (according to **B”H**) that it requires doors on one end and a lechi or korah on the opposite end.
- **Q: Do B”H** require the doors to be closed (like **B”S**) or not? **A: R’ Yehuda and R’ Masna** both said in the name of **Shmuel** that the doors need not stay closed.
- They asked **R’ Anan** if the doors must remain closed. He said, go and see the gates of Neharda’ah, which are buried halfway in sand, in an open position, and **Shmuel** never required them to dig them out and close them.
 - **R’ Kahana** said, the gates were partially closed, and maybe that’s why **Shmuel** didn’t protest.
 - **R’ Nachman** required them to dig out the doors. It could be that he doesn’t require them to be closed, but that he does require them to have the *ability* to be closed.
- There was a “ches” shaped mavui in Neharda’ah whose 2 ends opened into the reshus harabim, and the **Rabanan** treated that mavui with the chumros of **Rav** and the chumros of **Shmuel**, and because of that, they required that doors be placed on the two bends (even though neither **Rav** or **Shmuel** would say that doors need to be put there) and a lechi or kora on each end opening to the reshus harabim.
 - The **Rabanan** followed the chumrah of **Rav** that the mavui is considered to be a mavui with 2 ends open to the reshus harabim. Although **Rav** paskened like the **T”K** that no doors are required in the case of an open mavui, the **Rabanan** followed chumrah of **Shmuel**, who (although in this case would hold that the mavui is considered to be a closed mavui) paskens like **Chananya** that in a case of a mavui open at both ends to the reshus harabim, doors are required.

-----Daf 7-----

- **Q: How can we follow the chumros of Rav and Shmuel when they argue with each other? A Braisa teaches that one should be consistent in following one shita, and should not look to take the chumros of opposing views!? A: R’ Nachman bar Yitzchok** said, we are truly only following **Rav**, because although **Rav** paskened like the **T”K** (who only requires a tzuras hapesach and a lechi or korah), he held that in practice one should follow **B”H** according to **Chananya** (who require doors on one end and a lechi or korah on the other end).
 - **Q: R’ Ada bar Ahava** said that **Rav** held like, and practiced like, the **T”K**!? **A: R’ Shizbi** said, we only can’t follow the chumros of multiple shitas when the chumros contradict each other in different circumstances. For example, **B”S and B”H** argue with regard to how much of the skeletal structure of the spine and skull must be missing in order for a human skeleton not to be able to give off “tumas ohel”. **B”S** require a larger piece to be missing and **B”H** require a smaller piece. They also argue with regard to how much of the skeletal structure of an animal needs to be missing to render it a “treifah” (can’t live more than 12 months and is assur to eat). They each held like they held before – **B”S** require a larger piece to be missing and **B”H** require a smaller piece. However, here **B”H** is more machmir and before **B”S** was more machmir. In such a case, to follow both chumros is contradictory, and therefore it is not appropriate to do so.
 - **Q: R’ Mesharshiya** asked, we find a Braisa in which **R’ Akiva** followed the chumros of **B”S** and **B”H** by giving ma’aser sheni and ma’aser ani for fruits that he picked on Rosh Chodesh Shevat (according to **B”S** that is the beginning of the next year and according to **B”H** the next year for these purposes does not begin until the 15th of Shevat) and in that way followed 2 contradictory chumros!? **A: R’ Akiva** wanted to follow the view of **B”H**, but he was unsure as to what the view of **B”H** was.
- **R’ Yosef** said in front of **R’ Huna**, that **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, the machlokes between the **T”K** (who says that a mavui open on both sides needs a tzuras hapesach on one end and a lechi or korah on the other end) and **Chananya** (that according to **B”H** one would need to place a door on one end and a lechi or korah on the other end) is only where the mavui is open on both sides to a true reshus harabim. However, if even one side is open to a karmelis, even **Chananya** will say that only a tzuras hapesach on one side and a lechi or korah on the other side is needed. **R’ Yosef** then said in the name of **R’ Yehuda** alone (not in the name of **Rav**), that if the mavui opened on one end to the reshus harabim and on the other end it opened into a backyard that itself

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

opened into a reshus harabim, it is considered to be a closed mavui and only a lechi or korah on the front end is needed.

- **Abaye** said to **R' Yosef**, this last statement of **R' Yehuda** was actually the statement of **Shmuel**, and not **Rav**. It could not have been the statement of **Rav**, because **Rav** says a contradictory halacha elsewhere. **R' Yirmiya bar Abba in the name of Rav** says that if a mavui's back wall was breached in its entirety and resulted in the mavui being open to a chatzer, and that chatzer had its opposite wall breached in its entirety into the reshus harabim (in effect the mavui is now open on both sides to the reshus harabim), it is mutar to carry in the chatzer, but assur to carry in the mavui. According to **R' Yehuda's** statement it should be mutar to carry in the mavui, because why would the halacha of the mavui be different just because it opened up into a chatzer instead of into a backyard? **R' Yosef** said to **Abaye**, I just know an incident that took place where the mavui opened into a backyard that opened into the reshus harabim and **R' Yehuda** allowed carrying in the mavui with a simple lechi or korah on the front end of the mavui. If this can't fit with the view of **Rav**, he must have said it according to the view of **Shmuel**.
 - Based on the way **R' Sheishes** explained the halacha of **Rav**, we need not say that **R' Yehuda's** statement can only be said according to **Shmuel's** view. **R' Sheishes** explained that the reason **Rav** said it is assur to carry in the mavui is not because it is open to the reshus harabim in the back. It is because it is open to the chatzer, with which it did not have an eiruv, and when an area (e.g. a mavui) is opened to a place into which it cannot carry, it becomes assur to carry in the initial area (mavui) itself as well. However, in **R' Yehuda's** case the mavui was opened into a backyard, which has no inhabitants and therefore does not require an eiruv with the mavui to allow carrying from the mavui into the backyard. That is why it remains mutar to carry in the mavui. **Rav** would agree in this case that it would be mutar to carry in the mavui.
 - **Q:** Without having the explanation of **R' Sheishes** (which means that **Rav** and **Shmuel** argue in both cases: whether an eiruv was made between the mavui and the yard, or not), what was the base of the machlokes between **Rav** and **Shmuel**? **A:** In the case where no eiruv was made, they argue whether an entranceway that only looks like one from the outside, but not the inside, is considered a valid entranceway which will separate the mavui from the yard. **Rav** says it is, and that is why carrying in the mavui would be permitted (if not for the fact that the mavui is now open to the reshus harabim on both ends) and **Shmuel** says it is not, and that's why carrying in the mavui is only permitted when it opens into a backyard, not a chatzer. In the case where an eiruv was made, they argue in the halacha of **R' Yosef** who says that it is only permitted to carry in a mavui that opens up into the reshus harabim through a yard where the yard extends on both ends of the opening to the mavui. However, if the opening to the mavui is on the side of the yard, and the wall of the mavui is flush with the wall of the yard, so that when standing in the mavui it seems that it is simply a mavui that opens directly into the reshus harabim on both sides, it is assur to carry in such a mavui. **Shmuel** agrees with **R' Yosef**. **Rav** says that in either case it is assur to carry in that mavui without adjusting it as one must adjust a mavui that is open on both ends to the reshus harabim.

-----Daf 7--8-----

- **Rabbah** said, when **R' Yosef** says that it is mutar to carry in a mavui that opens into the middle of a backyard, that is only true when the backyard's opening into the reshus harabim is not directly opposite the opening of the mavui. If it is, it is assur to carry there.
- **R' Misharshiya** said, even if the opening is not directly opposite the mavui, it is only mutar to carry in the mavui when the backyard is jointly owned by a number of people. If it is owned by one person, it would be assur to carry in the mavui. The reason is, a single owner may decide to build houses in that yard in a way that would make the mavui wall flush with the new houses and thus make the mavui no longer open up into the middle of the backyard. If it is owned by a number of people we do not have the concern that they will all agree to make that happen.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- We find that a differentiation is made between an area owned by an individual and an area owned by a number of people. **Ravin bar R' Ada in the name of R' Yitchak** said, there was a mavui whose side “walls” were made of a garbage heap 10 tefachim high on one side and the sea (with a 10 tefachim drop) on the other side, and **R' Yehuda** did not disallow carrying there (because there were kosher walls), but he did not allow it either (because he was afraid that the garbage heap may be removed or that the sea may have sand or sediment build up and make the drop less than 10 tefachim). Now, a Mishna says that one may throw garbage from a window onto a garbage heap in the reshus harabim that is 10 tefachim high. We see that we are not concerned that it will be removed?! It must be that **R' Yehuda** was talking about a garbage heap of a single individual, where we are concerned that it will be removed, and the Mishna is discussing the garbage heap of a number of people, where we are not concerned that it will be removed.
 - Some say that the **Rabanan** argued on **R' Yehuda** and prohibited carrying in that mavui out of concern that the “walls” may be changed. Others say that the **Rabanan** allowed it. In either case, **R' Nachman** paskened that it is assur to carry in that mavui.
 - In Sura there were mavuis whose back wall was the sea (with a 10 tefachim drop). **Mareimar** put up a back “wall” made of a net, and did not rely on the 10 tefachim drop, out of concern that the drop would be reduced by sand and sediment.
 - There was a bent (“L” shaped) mavui in Sura where the residents of one mavui put a lechi at the opening and then put a rolled up mat at the bend (and in that way attempted to allow themselves to carry in the mavui). **R' Chisda** told them, this won't work according to any view. According to **Rav**, a tzuras hapesach is needed. According to **Shmuel**, since this rolled up mat can be blown down by the wind it does not have a din of a lechi. If the mat would be nailed into the wall, it would be a good lechi.
- **R' Yirmiya bar Abba in the name of Rav** said, if the back wall of a mavui becomes open in its entirety to a chatzer, and the chatzer itself is open to the reshus harabim, it is mutar to carry in the chatzer, but not in the mavui.
 - **Q: Rabbah bar Ulla** asked **R' Bibi bar Abaye**, this is something we can learn from a Mishna!? The Mishna says that if the wall separating a small chatzer from a large chatzer fell in its entirety, leaving the small chatzer totally open to the large chatzer, it is assur to carry in the small chatzer, but mutar to carry in the large chatzer. This is the same thing as the chatzer and the mavui!? **A:** If we would only have the Mishna, we would think that when the chatzer is open to the reshus harabim it is assur to carry in the large chatzer as well.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that when a chatzer is opened to the reshus harabim on both ends it is still considered to be a reshus hayachid and one may carry in that chatzer on Shabbos. What is **Rav** adding to this case?! **A:** **Rav** is teaching that even if the two opening to the reshus harabim are directly opposite each other, still it is mutar to carry in the chatzer.
 - **Q:** According to **Rabba** who says that when the entrances are directly opposite each other it is assur, what is **Rav** adding? **A:** From the Braisa we would think that it is considered a reshus hayachid l'chumra (he can't transfer from the reshus harabim into that chatzer), but not l'kula (to allow one to carry inside that chatzer). **Rav** teaches that it is even mutar to carry in that chatzer.
- **Abaye** says, a mavui that is like a creature with many legs (a long mavui that has smaller mavuis branching off of it opening on their other ends to a reshus harabim, thus creating a series of bent mavuis) is adjusted by placing a tzuras hapesach at the entrance of the large mavui and placing lechis at the entrance to the reshus harabim of the offshoot mavuis.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, by not requiring that anything be placed at the bends, that means you are following **Shmuel** who says that these mavuis are considered to be closed mavuis. If so, why does the main mavui need a tzuras hapesach? According to **Shmuel** a lechi suffices there as well?! Also, we find that they followed **Rav** in Neharda'ah, so why are you following **Shmuel**?! **A:** Rather, **Rava** therefore says, he must

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

place a tzuras hapesach at each bend and place lechis at each entrance to the reshus harabim in accordance with **Rav**.

- **R' Kahana bar Tachlifa in the name of R' Kahana bar Minyumei in the name of R' Kahana bar Malkiyo in the name of R' Kahana the rebbi of Rav** said, if the walls of a mavui at its entrance from the reshus harabim are not the same length, so that (although parallel) one juts out further than the other, if the longer one is less than 4 amos longer than the short one, he can place a korah from the end of one to the end of the other on a diagonal, and can carry in that area of the diagonal. However, if the long wall is 4 amos longer than the short wall, he must place the korah straight across from the end of the short wall to the long wall, with no diagonal. **Rava** says, in either case, it must be placed straight across and no diagonal is allowed.
 - **Rava** explains that he views the purpose of a korah as being a reminder, and a diagonally placed korah does not act as a reminder. **Rava** explains that all the **R' Kahanas** hold that the purpose of a korah is that it acts as a wall. A diagonally placed korah can also act as a wall.
 - **R' Kahana** says, this diagonal korah only works if the diagonal is not more than 10 amos long. If it is, the korah does not help to adjust the mavui, and the korah will therefore have to be placed straight across from the end of the shorter wall.
- **Q:** May one carry underneath the korah? **A: Rav, R' Chiya and R' Yochanan** say that it is mutar. **Shmuel, R' Shimon bar Rebbi and Reish Lakish** say that it is assur.
 - **Q:** Maybe those who say it is mutar say that the purpose of a korah is as a reminder (and under the korah acts as a reminder as well) and those who say it is assur say that the purpose of a korah is to act as a wall, and it is the inner edge that acts as a wall (which is why carrying beyond the inner edge and under the korah is assur)? **A:** It could be that all agree that the purpose of a korah is to act as a reminder. The machlokes is whether the reminder is principally for the people inside the mavui (in which case the inner edge acts as the reminder and carrying beyond that and under the korah is prohibited) or whether the reminder is principally for the people outside the mavui (in which case the outside edge is the reminder and carrying under the korah would be permitted). **A2:** It could be that all agree that the purpose of the korah is to serve as a wall. The machlokes is whether the inside edge acts as the wall or whether the outside edge acts as the wall.
- **R' Chisda** said, all agree that one may not carry along the width of a lechi.
- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked **R' Chisda**, what is the halacha if one puts pegs on the outside of the mavui wall (facing the reshus harabim) and places the korah on those pegs so that the inside edge of the korah is flush against the outside of the wall? **A: R' Chisda** said, according to the one who says that it is assur to carry under a normal korah (because we view the inside edge as forming a wall), this korah will be good, because the inside edge forms a wall that is attached to the wall. According to those who say that one may carry under a typical korah (because we view the outside edge as forming a wall) this korah is no good (the wall being formed is detached from the side walls). **Rava** says, even according to the one who says carrying under a typical korah is assur, this korah will be no good. A korah must be on top of the mavui wall, and this is not on top of the wall.
 - **Q: R' Adda bar Masna** asks on **Rava** from a Braisa that says, a korah that is pulled away from the wall or is hanging within the walls, if it is within 3 tefachim it is considered a good korah. If it is more, it is not. Presumably, “pulled away” means that it is on pegs away from the wall and “hanging” means that it is within airspace of the walls but not touching them. This contradicts **Rava** who said that even if the korah is flush against the wall it is not good?! **A:** Both those terms refer to a korah within the airspace of the walls. One refers to where the korah does not touch either wall and one refers to where the korah touches one of the walls. We would think that we only say “lavud” on one side, but not on both, that’s why the Braisa had to teach us both cases. **A2: R' Ashi** says the Braisa refers to one case – where the korah sits on bent brackets that have it suspended above and within the walls of the mavui (less than 3 tefachim above and less than 3 tefachim away from the walls). We would think that we either say “lavud” or “chavot” (which says that we view the korah as being lowered and set into the open place), but can’t say both in one set of circumstances. The Braisa teaches us that we can say both together.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Zakai** taught in front of **R' Yochanan**, the area under the korah and the area along the width of the lechi is considered to be a karmelis (and is therefore assur to carry in). **R' Yochanan** said, "Go teach that outside" (i.e. that is not a proper teaching).
 - **Abaye** said, **R' Yochanan** must be arguing regarding carrying under the korah (and says that it is permitted), but he agrees that carrying along the width of the lechi is assur. **Rava** said, **R' Yochanan** even permits carrying in that case as well.
 - **Rava** says, I can prove my view, because **R' Dimi** said in the name of **R' Yochanan** that an area between the reshus harabim and reshus hayachid that is less than 4 square tefachim is considered insignificant and can be used by the people of the reshus hayachid and of the reshus harabim (as long as they don't use that place as a method of transferring between the reshus hayachid and the reshus harabim). The area opposite the lechi is similarly insignificant and is therefore also permitted to carry in.
 - **Abaye** says, in that case **R' Yochanan** was talking about an area that was 3 tefachim high, and that's why it was permitted.
 - **Abaye** says, I can prove my view, because **R' Chama bar Gurya** said in the name of **Rav**, the area within the entranceway (if there is a 4th wall and those walls are thick) needs a lechi to permit carrying there. This is true even if the area is less than 4 square tefachim. We see that although the walls themselves are lechis, one cannot carry alongside them. Presumably **R' Yochanan** would not argue.
 - **Rava** says, the reason it is assur to carry there is because the entranceway in that case opened up into a karmelis, and not a reshus harabim. When this area is between a reshus hayachid and a reshus harabim, it is considered insignificant and becomes batul. However, when it is bordered by a karmelis, it doesn't become batul, but is rather "strengthened" by the adjoining karmelis and becomes assur to carry in as well.
 - **Q: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** asked **Rava**, we find that **Rabbah bar bar Channa** said in the name of **R' Yochanan**, if one sets up a series of lechis along the mavui wall, each lechi between 3 and 4 tefachim apart from the next, he will be subject to the machlokes between **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** and the **Rabanan** (**R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says lavud applies to things less than 4 tefachim apart and the **Rabanan** say it only applies to things less than 3 tefachim apart). **R' Huna** explains, according to **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**, all the lechis become one lechi (via lavud) and he can only carry up until the innermost lechi. According to the **Rabanan** they are separate lechis and one can carry up until the inner edge of the outermost lechi. In either case, we see that one cannot carry opposite the lechi!? **A: Rava** would say, that case is discussing where the mavui opens into a karmelis, not a reshus harabim, and therefore it is assur to carry opposite the lechi. **A2: R' Ashi** says, **Rabbah bar bar Channa** was discussing a case where the series of lechis stretched out for 4 amos. According to **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** who says these lechis are joined through lavud, it becomes a wall of 4 amos which is considered to be a mavui by itself, which would need another lechi to allow carrying in it.
 - **Q: According to R' Ashi**, presumably the outermost lechi stuck out into the reshus harabim (that's how most people did it). If so, although it is not noticeable when standing inside the mavui, since it is noticeable when standing out in the reshus harabim, that should be a lechi and even **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** should allow carrying along the series of lechis?! **A: This** is all being said according to **R' Yochanan**, and he holds that a lechi which is not noticeable inside the mavui is not effective as a lechi.
- A lechi that is only visible from within the mavui is an effective lechi. A lechi that is only visible from outside is subject to a machlokes between **R' Chiya** and **R' Shimon bar Rebbi**. One says it is effective, the other says it is not.
 - We can bring a proof that **R' Chiya** is the one who said it is effective, because **R' Chiya** taught a Braisa that said it is effective.
 - **Rabbah bar R' Huna** says such a lechi is effective.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: Rabbah** asks, a Mishna says that when the wall between a large and small chatzer falls down leaving the small chatzer open in its entirety to the large chatzer, it is mutar to carry in the large chatzer (because the remaining walls in its width beyond where the wall fell down serve as lechis to make the wall that fell down considered to be an entranceway), but it is assur to carry in the small chatzer, because it is open in its entirety to the large chatzer. Why aren't the side walls of the large chatzer (that used to be flush with the wall that fell down) considered lechis that are visible only from the outside, and they should be lechis which should permit carrying in the small chatzer!? **A: R' Zeira** says, the case being discussed is where the side walls of the small chatzer protrude into the large chatzer, and therefore the walls of the large chatzer cannot act as lechis.
 - **Q:** Why don't we say those protruding walls are part of the large chatzer's walls via lavud and then say that the walls are lechis!? You can't answer that there is more than 3 tefachim between the protruding wall and the large chatzer's wall, because **R' Ada bar Avimi** said that we are even discussing a case where the large chatzer was 11 amos wide and the small chatzer was 10 amos wide. That leaves less than 3 tefachim on each side (which should therefore have lavud applied to them)!? **A: Ravina** said, the smaller chatzer is not centered in the larger chatzer, so one side is 2 tefachim away and one is 4 tefachim (which is too far for lavud to apply).
 - **Q:** We should at least say lavud on that one side, which would mean there is one lechi, which should be enough to allow carrying in the small chatzer!? **A:** The Mishna follows **Rebbi** who says that a chatzer needs two lechis to permit carrying.

-----Daf 7-----10-----

- **Q:** The explanation of the Mishna with the small chatzer and large chatzer makes more sense if a lechi only visible on the outside is *not* considered a lechi. If that is the case, the Mishna does not have to be qualified in so many ways (we said the Mishna must be discussing where the small chatzer's walls protrude into the large chatzer, and the small chatzer is not centered in the large chatzer). Rather we can say that the small chatzer's walls do not protrude, and the small chatzer is centered. We can simply say that the Mishna follows **Rebbi** (who says that a chatzer needs 2 lechis to allow carrying therein) who himself follows **R' Yosef** (who says that the lechi must be a minimum of 3 tefachim wide). That's why the Mishna says the large chatzer must be an amah larger than the small chatzer (not because that makes a difference for the small chatzer, because that chatzer is anyway assur to carry in, because the lechi which is only visible on the outside is not a valid lechi), because that is the only way that the large chatzer will have lechis that are at least 3 tefachim wide each, and that is the only way we can have a case where it is mutar to carry in the large chatzer, but assur to carry in the small chatzer. However, if we say that **Rebbi** does not hold like **R' Yosef**, and that we need to qualify the Mishna like we said originally (last Daf), there is no reason to say that the large chatzer need be an amah larger than the small chatzer! To make the large chatzer mutar, we can have lechis that are a tefach each, and to make the small chatzer assur, the difference can be a lot more than one amah as well!? **A:** From here we have a proof that the Mishna holds a lechi that is only visible from the outside is NOT considered a valid lechi.
- **R' Yosef** said, I did not hear this psak of **R' Huna** that a lechi visible only from the outside *is* a valid lechi. **Abaye** said to **R' Yosef**, you actually told us this psak of **R' Huna**, with regard to the following. **Rami bar Abba in the name of R' Huna** said, if a lechi is attached to the wall of a mavui in a way that it is simply an extension of the wall and protrudes into the reshus harabim, if it is less than 4 amos, it is considered a good lechi and one may carry in the mavui up until the inside edge of that lechi. If it is more than 4 amos it loses its status as a lechi (it is considered a mavui wall) and one may not carry in the entire mavui until a valid lechi is put in place. **Abaye** told **R' Yosef**, you told us that we can learn 3 things from this statement of **R' Huna**: 1) From the fact that he can only carry up until the inner edge of the lechi we see that one may not carry opposite the width of the lechi; 2) We see that the minimum measurement of a mavui is 4 amos (once the "lechi" reaches 4 amos it is considered a mavui wall); 3) We see that a lechi which is only visible from the outside *is* considered to be a lechi.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The Gemara paskens that a lechi which is only visible from the outside *is* considered to be a lechi.
V'HARACHAV MEI'ESER YIMA'ET
- **Abaye** said, a Braisa says: if an entrance is wider than 10 amos it must be made smaller, but **R' Yehuda** says it need not be made smaller.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Yehuda**, how wide can the entrance be? **A:** **R' Achai** thought to say in front of **R' Yosef** that it may be up to 13 and one third amos wide, based on a kal v'chomer from the case of a well in the reshus harabim. [A well 10 tefachim deep is a reshus hayachid, and therefore one cannot draw water from there into the reshus harabim. The **Rabanan** were meikel and allowed one to place corner pieces 13 and one third amos apart, and in that way to create "halachic walls" which allow one to draw water there]. If in the case of the well, where there is more open space than wall, the **Rabanan** allowed an opening of 13 and 1/3 amos, certainly in the case of a mavui, which is closed on 3 sides, the **Rabanan** would allow the 4th side to have an opening of 13 and 1/3 amos.
 - Maybe a mavui's opening can be even wider than that allowed for in the case of a well, because a mavui has physical walls and is in that way better than the case of the well?!
 - Maybe since we are meikel by the case of a well (to allow more open space than actual walls), we are meikel to allow such a wide opening. However, by a mavui, maybe we would not be as meikel and only a maximum of 10 amos would be allowed?!
- **Levi** taught a Braisa that says, if one has a mavui entrance that is 20 amos wide, he can stick a pole at the mid-point (thereby making it two entrances of 10 amos each) and that suffices. **Levi** said, we do not pasken like this Braisa.
 - **Q:** What can one do to decrease the width of the opening? **A:** **Shmuel in the name of Levi** says, he can take a board that is 10 tefachim high and 4 amos long, and he can place that at the mid-point of the entrance with the length parallel to the 2 mavui walls. A wall this size makes the area on either side of it into a separate mavui. **A2:** One can do similar to what **R' Yehuda** suggested to be done for an entrance that is 15 amos wide. There he said to take a board that is 3 amos wide and place it 2 amos away from one side wall. It results in there being 2 amos of empty space, 3 amos of a wall (and in effect closes up those 5 amos) and leaves the remaining 10 amos open (which is allowed). [For a case where the entrance is 20 amos, he would take a board of 6 amos and place it 4 amos away from one side wall].
 - **Q:** Why didn't **R' Yehuda** suggest that one place a board an amah and a half wide next to the mavui wall, leave a space of 2 amos, and then place another board 1.5 amos wide. In that 5 amah section (1.5+2+1.5) there is more wall than empty space and it should be effective?! It must be that this would not be effective, because the empty space is more than each board individually, and we see from here that in such a case we do not say that the empty space becomes batul to the walled space when the walled space is combined of two walls on each side of the empty space!? **A:** It could be that when the walled areas together are more than the empty spaces it is effective (even when each wall individually is less than the empty space). This case is different because on each side of the wall there is a space larger than the wall (2 amos on one side and 10 amos on the other side) and that is why it would be ineffective.
 - **Q:** Why didn't **R' Yehuda** suggest that one place a board an amah wide next to the mavui wall, leave a space of 1 amah, and then place another board 1 amah wide, leave a space of 1 amah, and then place another board 1 amah wide? In that way the empty spaces are not larger than the boards! It must be that the empty space being equal in size to the board is also not good enough!? **A:** Typically it would be enough. The problem is that the last board has 10 amos of empty space next to it, and the amah of empty space on the other side combines with the 10 amos of empty space to be mevatal that board.
 - **Q:** Why didn't **R' Yehuda** suggest that he leaves an amah space next to the mavui wall, then places a board which is 1.5 amos wide, leaves another space of an amah, and places another board of 1.5 amos wide. In this way the board is larger than the space next to it!? **A:** He could have suggested this, it is just more complicated than placing the one board of 3 amos, so he gave that suggestion instead.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Why aren't we concerned that people will use the small, 2 amah entranceway and stop using the larger, 10 amah entranceway (that will be problematic, because the smaller entranceway has no lechi)?! **A: R' Ada bar Masna** said, people will not use a smaller entranceway when they have the option of a larger entranceway.
 - **Q:** We see that **R' Ami** and **R' Assi** were concerned for this possibility?! **A:** In their case, using the smaller entrance provided a shortcut. That is a cause for concern that people will use the smaller entrance and not the larger one.
- A Mishna says, a portable commode (made of two straps and a space in between them) combines to reach the minimum of a tefach to act as an "ohel" over a meis.
 - **Q:** How large can the space in middle be with it still being able to combine to the size of a tefach? **A: R' Dimi** said the 2 straps can be 2 finger widths each, and the space in middle can be 2 finger widths. **Ravin** said each strap can be 1.5 finger widths and the space can be 1 finger width.
 - **Abaye** asked **R' Dimi**, do you argue with **Ravin**? **R' Dimi** said, we do not argue, we just refer to different size fingers. **Abaye** said, you surely argue, because you said the empty space can be larger than the straps and **Ravin** said the empty space cannot be larger than the straps! **R' Dimi** said, we don't argue about that. If anything, we argue whether the space can be the same size as the straps surrounding it. I (**R' Dimi**) say that it can be the same size and **Ravin** says that it must be smaller than the straps.

-----Daf י"א-----11-----

IHM YESH LO TZURAS HAPESACH...EINO TZARICH LIMA'ET

- **Q:** We find that a tzuras hapesach helps to remedy an entrance that is too wide and a conspicuous top helps to remedy an entrance that is too tall. Will each one help for the other case as well? **A:** A Braisa says that an entrance of a mavui that is higher than 20 amos must be decreased, but if it has a tzuras hapesach it need not be decreased.
 - **Q:** We see that a tzuras hapesach helps for the height issue. Will a conspicuous top help for a width issue? **A:** A Braisa says, if an entrance is higher than 20 amos it must be decreased, and if it is wider than 10 amos it must be decreased. However, if it has a tzuras hapesach it need not be decreased and if it has a conspicuous top it need not be decreased. Presumably these remedies are applicable to the last case of the Braisa and we see that a conspicuous top helps to remedy an entrance which is more than 10 amos wide.
 - It could be that the remedy was only said in regard to the case of excessive height, not with regard to one of excessive width.
 - **R' Yehuda** taught to **Chiya bar Rav** that if there is a tzuras hapesach, an entrance that is wider than 10 amos need not be decreased (like our version of our Mishna). **Rav** said, the proper teaching is that the tzuras hapesach does NOT help.
 - **R' Yosef** says, based on what **Rav** said, a chatzer whose "walls" are made mostly of windows and entranceways (i.e. they are empty spaces with a tzuras hapesach around each) will not become valid just because of the tzuras hapesach that each window and entranceway has. Just like we find that having a tzuras hapesach does not remedy the issue of having an entranceway wider than 10 amos by a mavui, so too having a tzuras hapesach will not remedy the issue of having more empty space than actual wall by a chatzer.
 - **Q:** Maybe having a tzuras hapesach doesn't help to remedy an entranceway that is wider than 10 amos because we never find anywhere that an entranceway of that size is allowed (even by the case of a well according to **R' Meir**). However, having more empty space than wall, which is allowed in the case of a well in the reshus harabim, maybe having a tzuras hapesach will help for that situation!?
 - A Braisa seems to say that an area surrounded with more empty space than walls is not remedied by having a tzuras hapesach. **R' Kahana** said, no proof can be brought from there because the Braisa is talking about a case where the tzuras hapesach didn't have a

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

normal frame (either the “door posts” were not straight but were made of bricks that were protruding, or they did not have a top to the “door frame”). However, a good tzuras hapesach may be able to remedy a situation where there is more empty space than walls.

- We find that **R’ Yochanan** also holds like **Rav**. There was a case where someone stuck 4 poles in the ground and draped a vine from pole to pole creating a square (each pair of poles became a tzuras hapesach). **Reish Lakish** said those are good walls for kilayim (one can plant one species within the square and another one right outside the square) and for Shabbos. **R’ Yochanan** said it is good for kilayim, but not good for Shabbos.
 - This can’t be talking that the vines were hung from the side of the poles, because **R’ Chisda** says that a tzuras hapesach that is made from the side of the poles is no good. It must be that the vines were hung across the top of the poles. If it is less than 10 amos wide, why would **R’ Yochanan** say that it is not good for Shabbos? It must be that it is more than 10 amos apart and that is why **R’ Yochanan** said it is no good!
 - The Gemara asys, it could be that we are talking about where he hung the vines around the sides of the poles, and the machlokes between **Reish Lakish** and **R’ Yochanan** is whether we pasken like **R’ Chisda** or not.
 - **Q: Reish Lakish** says elsewhere in the name of **R’ Yehuda the son of R’ Chanina** that the vine hung over the poles makes a good tzuras hapesach for kilayim, but not for Shabbos!? **R’ Yochanan** says elsewhere that just like this is not a good tzuras hapesach for Shabbos, it is also not good for kilayim!? **A:** Over here **Reish Lakish** is quoting the shita of **R’ Yehuda the son of R’ Chanina**, which is different than his own shita (which is that it is good even for Shabbos). **R’ Yochanan** is not self-contradictory, because in both places he is talking about where the vine is hung on the side of the poles. In that case it will be a good tzuras hapesach for kilayim only when it is less than 10 amos apart (in the first case we brought down), but not when it is more than 10 amos apart (which is what this 2nd case is talking about).
 - We find that **R’ Yochanan ben Nuri** made this distinction to **R’ Yehoshua** regarding a tzuras hapesach for kilayim purposes.
- **R’ Chisda** said, a tzuras hapesach where the horizontal crossbeam is at the sides of the poles instead of on top of the poles is not good for Shabbos purposes. Also, a tzuras hapesach must be strong enough to hold a door, even if only a door of straw.
 - **Reish Lakish in the name of R’ Yannai** said, a tzuras hapesach needs to look like a hinge is there. **R’ Avya** explains that to mean that it needs a pivot hole for the peg of the door to be inserted into.
- A Braisa says that a tzuras hapesach consists of two vertical poles and a horizontal pole going across the top of those poles.
 - **Q:** Does the crossbeam have to actually touch the vertical poles or not? **A: R’ Nachman** says it does not have to touch. **R’ Sheishes** says that it does have to touch.
 - **R’ Nachman** constructed a tzuras hapesach according to his shita for the Reish Galusa. **R’ Sheishes** sent his attendant to take down the crossbeam. The Reish Galusa imprisoned the attendant until **R’ Sheishes** got him released.
 - **R’ Sheishes** asked **Rabbah bar Shmuel** if he taught any Braisos about tzuras hapesach. **Rabbah bar Shmuel** answered, a Braisa says that **R’ Meir** says an archway must have a mezuzah affixed to it and the **Chachomim** say it does not need one. They both agree that if the walls of the archway are 10 tefachim high before they begin sloping inward to less than 4 tefachim, that it is chayuv to have a mezuzah. We view the row of stones on top of the archway as being the crossbeam to the 2 vertical walls, even though they don’t actually touch each other. This is a proof to **R’ Nachman**. **R’ Sheishes** told **Rabbah bar Shmuel**, do not tell the Reish Galusa this proof from the Braisa.
 - **Abaye** explains that **R’ Meir** and the **Chachomim** only argue in a case where the side walls are 4 tefachim apart up to a point of 3 tefachim high, the arch itself is at least 10 tefachim high, and

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

there is solid wall next to the arch that one can conceivably carve out in a way that would allow the archway to be 4 tefachim wide, up to a height of 10 tefachim. In that case, **R' Meir** says we view the archway as carved out and therefore require a mezuzah to be affixed to it. The **Chachomim** say we do not view it so and therefore no mezuzah is required.

MISHNA

- **B" S** say that a mavui entrance is adjusted with a lechi **and** a korah. **B" H** say it only needs a lechi **or** a korah. **R' Eliezer** says it needs two lechis.
- A talmid in the name of **R' Yishmael** said to **R' Akiva**, **B" S** and **B" H** only argue regarding a mavui entrance that is between 4 amos and 10 amos wide. However, they agree that if it is less than 4 amos wide, it only needs a lechi **or** a korah. **R' Akiva** said, they argue in both circumstances.

GEMARA

- **Q:** This Mishna does not follow the **T" K** or **Chananya** (who require more than a lechi and korah for an "open" mavui)?! **A:** **R' Yehuda** said, our Mishna is discussing a "closed" mavui.
- **Q:** From the fact that **B" S** require a lechi **and** a korah it would seem that they require there to be a 4th wall to create a reshus hayachid D'Oraisa? **A:** D'Oraisa it is a reshus hayachid (l'chumrah) with just 3 walls. To be meikel and allow one to carry inside, we require a 4th wall (or at least a lechi **and** a korah).
- **Q:** From the fact that **B" H** only allow adjusting one side of the mavui in this way (but not 2 sides), it must be that they hold 3 walls are required to make a reshus hayachid D'Oraisa? **A:** D'Oraisa it is a reshus hayachid with just 2 walls. To be meikel and allow one to carry inside, we require a 3rd wall.

-----Daf ג'---12-----

R' ELIEZER OMER LICHAYIN

- **Q:** Does **R' Eliezer** require 2 lechis and a korah or just 2 lechis? **A:** A Braisa brings a story where **R' Eliezer** told his talmid, **R' Yose ben Preida**, to add a second lechi to his mavui entrance. **R' Yose ben Preida** asked, do I really have to close up the entrance? From the fact that he asked that, it must mean that **R' Eliezer** told him to make it into 2 lechis and a korah!
 - The Gemara says, it could be that he meant to ask – do I have to close it up with 2 lechis? There is no proof that he was requiring a korah as well.
 - The Braisa just quoted, continued and said that **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, **B" S** and **B" H** agree that a mavui entrance less than 4 amos wide does not need any adjustment made to it.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna quoted **R' Yishmael** who said that **B" S** and **B" H** agree that such a mavui only needs a lechi or a korah, but it does need something!? **A:** **R' Ashi** said, **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** means that all agree that such a mavui does not need a lechi **and** a korah like **B" S** normally says, or 2 lechis like **R' Eliezer** says, rather it only needs a lechi **or** a korah.
 - **Q:** How small of a mavui entrance still needs an adjustment? **A:** **R' Achlai** or **R' Yechiel** said, if it is even only 4 tefachim wide it needs an adjustment. Anything less does not need.
- **R' Sheishes in the name of R' Yirmiya bar Abba in the name of Rav** says, the **Chachomim (Rebbi)** agree with **R' Eliezer** that 2 lechis are needed to adjust the entrance of a chatzer. **R' Nachman** says we pasken like **R' Eliezer** when dealing with the entrance of a chatzer (although the **Rabanan** who argue on **Rebbi** in the Braisa would disagree).
- **R' Assi said in the name of R' Yochanan**, a chatzer needs two lechis.
 - **Q:** **R' Zeira** asked, you said that **R' Yochanan** says a chatzer's lechi must be at least 4 tefachim wide. That would mean that **R' Yochanan** would require 2 lechis of 4 tefachim each for a chatzer. That can't be because we learned a Braisa previously that said that if a small chatzer opened in its entirety to the large chatzer, one may carry in the large chatzer because it has lechis on either side of the small chatzer. **R' Ada bar Avimi** explained that the large chatzer need be only 1 amah (6 tefachim) larger than the small chatzer. That would mean that each lechi is only 3 tefachim, not 4!? **A:** **R' Zeira** explained, if there is only one lechi, it must be 4 tefachim. If there are 2 lechis they can even be a minimal amount. The Braisa of

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

R' Ada bar Avimi follows **Rebbi** who says a chatzer needs 2 lechis, and **Rebbi** follows **R' Yose** who says each lechi must be 3 tefachim.

- **R' Yosef in the name of R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** says that a chatzer only needs one lechi.
 - **Abaye** asked, **Shmuel** told **R' Chananya bar Shila** that he should not permit carrying in a chatzer unless most of the 4th side is enclosed by a wall or there are 2 lechis!? **R' Yosef** replied, I know that **Shmuel** permitted the people of a chatzer that had an inlet of the sea in it, to draw water from it even though there was only one lechi! **Abaye** said, the **Rabanan** are always meikel when it comes to accessing water on Shabbos (like we find that they allow drawing water from a river using “suspended walls”).
 - **Q: Abaye’s question still remains?! A: R' Pappa and R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** explained, if there is only one lechi, it must be 4 tefachim. If there are 2 lechis they can even be a minimal amount.
 - **Q: R' Pappa** asked, if so, why did **Shmuel** say that most of the 4th side needs be enclosed? We just said that a lechi of 4 tefachim is sufficient!? We can’t answer that he was discussing an entrance of 7 tefachim (so 4 tefachin is “most”), because for an entrance of that size, a lechi of 3+ would make the entrance less than 4 tefachim, which **R' Achlai or R' Yechiel** said doesn’t need an adjustment! **A: Shmuel** was discussing a chatzer and **R' Achlai or R' Yechiel** was discussing a mavui. **A2:** This din of **R' Achlai or R' Yechiel** is actually a machlokes, and so **Shmuel** paskened l’chumra and required most of the side to be enclosed.
- A Braisa says if an inlet of the sea goes into a chatzer (with the wall on that side being partially breached), one may not draw water from it on Shabbos unless there is a partition in the breach that is at least 10 tefachim tall. This is only necessary if the breach is more than 10 amos wide.
 - **Q:** It seems that he would be allowed to carry in that chatzer (“he may not draw water”). Why is he allowed to? The wall is open to a place into which he may not carry!? **A:** The breached wall still exists, submerged in the water, to a height of 10 tefachim. Therefore he may carry in the chatzer.
- **R' Yehuda** said, if “shituf muvaos” was not done to a mavui, but one puts up a lechi, one who transfers from the reshus harabim into it is chayuv D’Oraisa (a lechi acts as a wall). If one only put a korah he is not chayuv D’Oraisa (a korah is only a reminder).
 - **Q: R' Sheishes** asked, it seems that if “shituf” was done, even a korah would make the mavui into a reshus hayachid. “Shituf” does not affect the classification of the reshus!? **A: R' Yehuda** meant as follows. If one erects a lechi in a mavui which is not fit for “shituf”, because it only has 2 walls, it becomes a reshus hayachid (because the lechi becomes the 3rd wall). If one erects a korah it is not a reshus hayachid (because a korah is only a reminder).
 - **Rabbah** also says that a lechi acts as a wall and a korah acts as a reminder. **Rava** says both are only reminders.
 - **Q: R' Yaakov bar Abba** asked, a Braisa says if one throws an item into a mavui that has a lechi he is chayuv. If it doesn’t have a lechi he is patur!? This is problematic according to **Rava**? **A:** The Braisa means, if it only needs a lechi (i.e. it already has 3 walls) he is chayuv. If it needs more than that (i.e. if it is open on both sides so it needs a lechi and a tzuras hapesach) he is patur even if he had erected a lechi.
 - **Q: R' Yehuda** allows using 2 houses (one on each side of the reshus harabim) as walls, which, if a lechi is placed at either side, forms the area in between them into a reshus hayachid. We see that he holds that a lechi creates a wall!? This is problematic according to **Rava**!? **A: R' Yehuda** holds that D’Oraisa even 2 walls create a reshus hayachid.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, a mavui that is square cannot be adjusted with a lechi of a minimum width. It needs a lechi of 4 tefachim (because it is truly a chatzer, not a mavui). **R' Chiya bar Ashi in the name of Rav** said, a mavui that is square may not be adjusted with a korah (because it is truly a chatzer, not a mavui).
- **R' Nachman** said: what are the characteristics that a mavui must have to be adjusted with a lechi or korah? 1) Its length must be greater than its width, 2) it must have multiple chatzeiros open up to it, with each chatzer having

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

multiple houses opening up into it. What are the characteristics of a chatzer that may not be adjusted with a lechi or korah? A chatzer that is anything but one with its length greater than its width.

- **Q:** How much greater does the length have to be? **A: Shmuel** thought to say that it must be twice the width, but **Rav** told him that his uncle **R' Chiya** said, even if it is only greater by a minute amount, it is considered to be a mavui.