



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

### Eiruv Daf Tzaddik Beis

- **Q: Ravina** said to **R' Ashi**, did **R' Yochanan** say that **R' Shimon** allowed transfer between adjoining chatzeiros even when the chatzeiros made internal eiruv? We know that **R' Yochanan** paskens like anonymous Mishnayos, and we had an anonymous Mishna which said that fruit on top of a 4 tefach thick wall separating 2 chatzeiros may not be carried into the chatzer, which seems to argue on **R' Shimon!**? **A:** The Mishna means that the fruit may not be brought into the houses, but it may be brought into the chatzer.
  - **Q: R' Chiya** taught a Braisa that the fruit may not even be brought down into the chatzer!? **A:** The Mishna didn't say that, so we should not follow that Braisa.
- If there are 2 chatzeiros with a ruin in between them, one of the chatzeiros having made an internal eiruv and the other had not, **R' Huna** says, the chatzer that did not make the eiruv is given the rights to use the ruin (they can transfer between chatzer and ruin because they did not make an internal eiruv, but the other chatzer, which did, cannot because of the gezeirah). **Chiya bar Rav** says, rights to the ruin are given to both chatzeiros, and therefore both chatzeiros may not carry into the ruin (because of the concern that one may end up carrying from the chatzer with the eiruv to the ruin and from there to the other chatzer).
  - **Chiya bar Rav** says, don't think that **Rav** meant to give rights to both chatzeiros and thereby allow both to carry there, because in a case with 2 chatzeiros without a ruin, where one chatzer made an eiruv and the other didn't, **Rav** does not allow the people of the chatzer with the eiruv to carry into the chatzer without the eiruv, so he would not allow both to use the ruin either.
    - The Gemara says, it could be that **Rav** is less concerned in the case with the ruin, because people don't typically bring items there (because it is unguarded). Therefore he may allow both chatzeiros to use it.
  - **Another version** has **Chiya bar Rav** saying that **Rav** allowed use of the ruin to both chatzeiros. He then explains that this is different than a similar case of 2 chatzeiros without the ruin in between, because people do not typically bring items out into a ruin.

### MISHNA

- If a large roof adjoins a small roof (so that the large roof is fully enclosed through gud asik by walls on 3 sides, and on the 4<sup>th</sup> side where it adjoins the small roof, it has walls at the places where it is larger than the smaller roof, but the smaller roof is totally open to the large roof on its 4<sup>th</sup> side), one may carry on the large roof, but not on the small roof.
- Similarly, if this same setup exists with two chatzeiros, the same halacha would apply: one may carry in the large chatzer, but not the small one, because the small one is considered to be a mere "entrance to the big chatzer".

### GEMARA

- **Q:** Why does the Mishna need to tell us both these (seemingly identical) cases? **A:** According to **Rav** who does not say gud asik to walls that are covered, the comparison teaches that just as by a chatzer the walls are visible, so too by roofs, the only time carrying would be permitted, even on the large roof, is only if the walls are not covered by the roof so that we can say gud asik. According to **Shmuel** the comparison teaches that just like by chatzer, if there is a lot of traffic over a wall it loses its status as a wall, the same is true to saying gud asik on a wall which is walked upon by many people (like the wall in between these 2 roofs).
- **Rabbah, R' Zeirah and Rabbah bar R' Chanan** were sitting together, and **Abaye** was sitting nearby. The 3 were talking and said, (since the small chatzer is considered the "entrance to the big chatzer") the small chatzer is considered part of the large chatzer, but the large chatzer is

not considered to be part of the small chatzer (the wall acts as a one way separation). The practical implications of this can be illustrated with some examples:

- If one plants grapes in the large chatzer, he may not plant vegetation in the small chatzer (that would be like planting it in the chatzer with the grapes and would be a kilayim problem). On the other hand, if grapes were planted in the small chatzer, one may plant vegetation in the large chatzer, because from the perspective of the small chatzer, they are considered to be totally separate areas.
- If a woman owns both chatzeiros and she is standing in the large chatzer when her “get” is placed into the small chatzer, it is considered as if it was received by her and she is divorced. On the other hand, if she is standing in the small chatzer and the “get” is placed in the large chatzer, it is considered as if the “get” has not yet reached her and she is therefore not divorced.
- If a minyan is in the large chatzer and the shaliach tzibbur is in the small chatzer, the minyan can be yotze with his brachos. On the other hand, in the reverse case they cannot be yotze with his brachos.
- If 9 people are in the large chatzer and one person is in the small chatzer, they can be combined for a minyan. If the case is reversed, they may not be combined.
- If there is excrement in the large chatzer, one may not say Shema in the small chatzer. If it is in the small chatzer, he may say Shema in the large chatzer.
- **Abaye** said to them, this can't be right, that a wall should make it worse than if no wall was there. If the wall was considered no wall at all one can move 4 amos away from the grapes and plant. Now, because you consider the wall as a wall for that direction, this can't be done!
  - **Q: R' Zeira** said we do find a concept where a wall can make it worse. In a case where the larger chatzer would build walls that would make it even in width to the small chatzer, thereby removing its partial 4<sup>th</sup> wall, it would become assur to carry in that chatzer as well! **A: Abaye** said, that case is actually considered to be removing the original walls and that's why it can make it assur. However, we don't find a case of adding a wall that would make it assur.
  - **Q: Rava** said, we do find such a concept, when one places “s'chach” on top of a structure with 2 full walls, and small partial walls on the 2 remaining sides. If one were to build walls parallel to the 2 full walls, in a way that would make those 2 walls look thicker, but would take away the side walls, it would become a passul succah! **A: Abaye** answered, first of all, I would still consider it to be a kosher succah (because we view the edge of the roof as creating a wall), but in any case this “creating” a wall is actually “removing” the old wall and that's why it has this effect. We don't find this when simply adding a wall.