



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

Eiruvin Daf Zayin

- **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 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.