



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

### Eirubin Daf Ches

- **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.
  - 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.



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.