



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Eruvin, Daf 𐤆 – Daf 𐤆

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

-----Daf 𐤆--90-----

- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked, would the **Rabanan** (who say that each roof is a separate reshus) allow one to carry 2 amos on a roof and 2 amos on a pillar of the same height?
 - **Q: Rabbah** asked, the roof is a karmelis (according the way **Rav** explained the **Rabanan**) and the top of the pillar is a reshus hayachid. It would clearly be assur to transfer from one to the other!? **A: Rami bar Chama** was asking whether one can transfer from the roof of a house to the roof of an un-walled structure. On the one hand, they are both places that are not fit for living, (and are not as distinct as the roof of 2 separate houses) and therefore should be considered a single reshus. On the other hand, maybe they are treated like any other 2 roofs of houses and therefore it would be assur to transfer from one to the next.
- **Q: R' Bibi bar Abaye** asked, would the **Rabanan** (who say that each roof is a separate reshus) allow one to carry 2 amos on a roof and 2 amos in a ruin?
 - **Q: R' Kahana** asked him, aren't you asking the same question as **Rami bar Chama**? **A:** He said, my question is different because a ruin is fit to live in, as opposed to an un-walled structure, which is not.
 - **Q:** If it is fit to live in, the **Rabanan** would *certainly* not allow the transfer of items from one to the other!? **A:** His question was whether it is assur because it is fit to live in, or whether it would be mutar because a ruin has no current residents.
 - The Gemara says **TEIKU**.
- If there are a number of roofs that are on the same level (according to **R' Meir** who treats them as one reshus) or one large roof (even according to the **Rabanan** this is one reshus): **Rav** says one may carry around the entire area, and **Shmuel** says one may only carry within 4 amos.
 - **Q: Rav** said earlier according to the **Rabanan** that one may only carry within 4 amos!? **A:** In that case the walls were not noticeable so he didn't say "gud asik". In this case the walls are visible, so through gud asik he allows carrying throughout the entire roof.
 - **Q: Shmuel** said earlier according to the **Rabanan** that one may carry throughout the roof!? **A:** That case was where the roof was smaller than a beis sasayim. In this case the roof is larger than a beis sasayim and the walls are not considered to "surround it for dwelling purposes", because the walls around the roof were built for purposes of the house, not the roof. Therefore the roof has the status of a karfaf that was not walled for residential purposes, in which case one may only carry within 4 amos.
- With regard to a ship whose area is larger than a beis sasayim: **Rav** says one may carry throughout the entire ship, and **Shmuel** says one may only carry within 4 amos.
 - **Rav** says the walls of the ship act to allow carrying throughout. **Shmuel** says the walls were built to keep out the water (not for residential purposes), therefore carrying is only allowed within 4 amos.
 - **Q: R' Chiya bar Yosef** asked **Shmuel**, who do we pasken like? **A: Shmuel** said we pasken like **Rav**.
 - **R' Gidal in the name of R' Chiya bar Yosef** says that **Rav** would agree, if the ship was turned upside-down (on dry land), one may only carry up to 4 amos on the bottom of this ship (that is now above the ground).
 - **Q:** If it was turned over to live under it, the area on top of the overturned ship should be like any other roof, which **Rav** said one may carry even if larger than a beis sasayim because the walls allow for that!? **A:** The boat was turned over to allow for tarring, so the walls are not considered to be there for residential use.
 - **R' Ashi** says that **Shmuel** said we pasken like **Rav**, not regarding the case of the roof, but rather with regard to the case of the ship. **R' Acha the son of Rava** said that it was said regarding the case of an un-walled, but roofed structure. In that case, **Rav** said we view the roof as extending

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

to the floor from its edge and thus creating walls, therefore one may carry throughout. **Shmuel** said we don't view it that way and therefore carrying is only allowed within 4 amos.

- **Q: Rav** had said that **R' Meir** allows carrying throughout all the adjoining roofs (he treats them as a reshus hayachid). If so, according to **Rav**, **R' Meir** should also allow transfer from a roof to a chatzer (which is also a reshus hayachid)!? **A:** He doesn't allow it because of the gezeirah of **R' Yitzchak bar Avdimi** mentioned on the last Daf.
- **Q: Shmuel** had said that the **Rabanan** treat a roof larger than a beis sasayim like a karmelis. If so, they should allow transfer between it and a karfaf!? **A: Rava bar Ulla** said, they don't allow it as a gezeirah that the roof may be diminished and thereby get the status of a reshus hayachid (from which it would be assur to transfer to a karmelis).
 - **Q:** If so, that concern should be present in every karfaf!? **A:** A regular karfaf has walls, so it is easily discernible if the area has been diminished. A roof has no actual walls, so it is not easily noticeable. Therefore we must be goizer.

-----Daf נ"ט-----91-----

- **R' Yehuda** says, when you look into it, you will realize that:
 - **R' Meir** considers all adjoining roofs to be one reshus, all adjoining chatzeiros to be one reshus, and all adjoining karfifos to be one reshus.
 - The **Chachomim** consider roofs and chatzeiros to be one reshus and karfifos to be one reshus.
 - **R' Shimon** considers roofs, chatzeiros and karfifos to all be one reshus.
- There is a Braisa that supports **Rav** (that the **Rabanan** only allow carrying 4 amos on a roof which is open to other roofs), and there is a Braisa that supports **R' Yehuda** (that **R' Shimon** says roofs, chatzeiros and karfifos are all one reshus).

R' SHIMON OMER, ECHAD GAGIN...

- **Rav** said, we pasken like **R' Shimon**, but only if there was no internal eiruv in the chatzer (so there is no concern that an object from a house would be brought into the chatzer and then transferred to another chatzer or area). **Shmuel** and **R' Yochanan** each say that we pasken like **R' Shimon** even if an internal eiruv was made in the chatzer.
 - **Q: R' Chisda** asked, according to **Shmuel** and **R' Yochanan**, there can be a situation where some items in a chatzer may be transferred to another chatzer and some items in the same chatzer may not be (if they began Shabbos in the house)!? This seems like a very valid reason to be goizer!? **A:** We find a Mishna that shows that **R' Shimon** is not goizer in this way. The Mishna says, if there are 3 chatzeiros adjoining in a row, with each having access to the reshus harabim, and the middle chatzer made an eiruv with each outer chatzer, but the outers did not make an eiruv with each other, **R' Shimon** allows transferring of items between each outer and the middle and he is not goizer that it may lead to transferring items from one outer to the other outer.
 - **Q: R' Sheishes** asked, the Mishna says that **R' Shimon** considers roofs, chatzeiros and karfifos as one reshus only for items that began Shabbos in one of these areas, but not for items that began Shabbos in the house. According to **Rav**, how is it possible that an item in the house made it out to a chatzer (since we are only discussing a case where no internal eiruv was made)!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing items like hats or scarves that were worn out of the house.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that when an eiruv is not made: roofs, chatzeiros, roofed but un-walled structures, and porches are all considered to be one reshus. It seems from the Braisa that if an eiruv was made it would not be considered one reshus!? **A:** This Braisa may be the shita of the **Rabanan** who also say that roofs and chatzeiros would be considered one reshus, but they would argue and say that a gezeirah is needed when an eiruv was made. It makes sense that it follows the **Rabanan**, because it specifically does not group karfaf along with roofs and chatzeiros.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if there are 5 chatzeiros in a row, each having access to the adjoining chatzeiros and with access to the mavoi, and the chatzeiros did not make eiruvim, one may not transfer items between the chatzer and the mavoi. However, items that began Shabbos in a chatzer may be carried within that

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

chatzer, but items in the mavoi would not be so permitted. **R' Shimon** allows transfer between the chatzerios and the mavoi, because he considers a chatzer and a mavoi (along with a roof, karfaf, etc.) to be one reshus. The Braisa is mashma that **R' Shimon** allows this because no eiruv was made!? **A:** The Braisa means that the chatzeiros did not join in to a *joint* eiruv. However, it may be that each individual chatzer made an eiruv.

- **Q:** The Braisa says that “no eiruv” was made!? **A:** It means that no shituf was made. **A2:** It may mean that no eiruv chatzeiros was made, but **R' Shimon** is saying to the **Rabanan**, agree with me that if no eiruv was made, the different areas should be considered one reshus. The **Rabanan** answer that even in that case it is considered 2 separate reshuyos.
- The Braisa said that carrying within the mavoi is assur.
 - **Q:** This seems to be a proof to **R' Zeira in the name of Rav** who said that one may not carry more than 4 amos in a mavoi which has no shituf? **A:** The Braisa means that it is assur to carry from the chatzer to the mavoi.
 - **Q:** That is what the beginning of the Braisa says!? **A:** The Braisa needed to repeat it a second time so that we shouldn't think that the **Rabanan** only prohibit carrying from the chatzer to the mavoi when an eiruv was made, but if no eiruv was made they agree that transfer of items would be permitted.

-----Daf ד' 92-----

- **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 4th 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 4th 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”.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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 4th 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.

-----Daf ל"ט---93-----

- **Q: Rabbah bar Chanan** said to **Abaye**, we find the concept that a wall can cause an issur, regarding the case of a structure with a roof above half of it. In that case, the Braisa says that one may plant grapes under one of the halves and vegetation under the other half (because we view the end of the roof as if it creates a wall). However, if one would roof the remaining part of the structure, it would be assur to plant in this way. We see that building the roof creates an issur!? **A: Abaye** said, that is a case of removing a wall (by building the roof he removes the halachic wall) and that's why it creates an issur.
- **Q: Rava** sent a question to **Abaye**, we find a Braisa where a wall creates an issur. The Braisa says, one must simply move 4 amos away from planted grapes and is then allowed to plant vegetation. However,

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

if from the grapes to the wall there is less than 12 amos, one may not plant vegetation!?! **A: Abaye** said, the reason for that is not because the wall creates issur. It is because one does not plant within 4 amos to a wall (for fear it will weaken the wall). Therefore, to plant vegetation between grapes and a wall there must be 12 amos (4 amos near the grapes to allow space to service the vines, 4 amos of planting vegetation and 4 amos to leave empty near the wall).

- **R' Yehuda** said, if there are 3 karfafs adjacent to each other (3 people were traveling and enclosed an area around themselves for Shabbos, in which case the halacha is that each area cannot be larger than a beis sasayim for each person unless there are 3 people, which would give them the status of a caravan and would let them enclose as much space as they need), with the outer two larger than the middle (so that the middle is open in its entirety to each outer, but each outer has side walls like the case of the large chatzer adjacent to the small chatzer), and there is only one person in each karfaf, since each outer karfaf is considered to be in the middle karfaf as well (it is its "entranceway"), the middle karfaf is considered as if a caravan is there and may be as large as needed. However, if the middle is larger than the 2 outers, and there is one person in each area, it is not considered as if they are all in the middle karfaf, and therefore each karfaf may only be one beis sasayim.
 - **Q:** What would the halacha be if there were 2 people in the middle karfaf and one in each outer? We can say that because each outer is an extension of the middle one (it is the larger one and the outer is the smaller one), the 2 people from the middle should combine with the one on each side and should be considered a caravan of 3. Or, maybe we say that the 2 middle people should be viewed as going to separate outer karfafs, in which case there are not 3 people together!?! **Q2:** If we say that we view them as going separately, what if each outer karfaf has 2 people and there is one person in the middle karfaf? In this case there are 3 whichever way he goes, so we should consider it a caravan. Or, maybe we say that because we don't know which way he will go, we cannot consider either one to be a caravan of 3!?! **A:** The Gemara says that we pasken leniently with regard to both these questions.
- **R' Chisda** said, if a chatzer is elevated from another chatzer by 5 tefachim, and then a wall of 5 tefachim is added at the edge of that upper chatzer, it does not act as wall of 10 tefachim. To do so, the 10 tefachim must be made of 10 tefachim of elevation or a 10 tefach wall.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, that in the case described by **R' Chisda** the chatzeiros must make separate eiruvim and may not join into one. We see that it is a separation!?! **A: Rava** said, **R' Chisda** would agree that the lower chatzer in this case is viewed as having a full 10-tefach wall on that side, and that is what the Braisa is referring to.
 - **Q:** If so, the lower chatzer should be allowed to only make an eiruv on its own, and the upper chatzer should not even be able to do that (because it should be viewed as being open in its entirety to the lower chatzer)!?! **A: Rabbah bar Ulla** said, the upper chatzer had walls on the side adjacent to the lower chatzer, but had an opening of 10 amos (at the opening there was 5 tefachim of elevation and 5 tefachim of wall). Therefore, it is not considered to be open in its entirety to the lower chatzer.
 - **Q:** The end of the Braisa says that "if it is less than this (10 tefachim high) they must make one joint eiruv". If it had partial walls, it should be able to choose whether to make a separate or joint eiruv!?! **A: Rabbah the son of Rava** said, the case is that the lower chatzer is open in its entirety to the upper chatzer (the lower chatzer is narrower, with its width equal to the opening of the upper chatzer).
 - **Q:** If so, the lower chatzer should only be make a joint eiruv, but the upper chatzer should be allowed to choose between making its own or making a joint eiruv! Why does the Braisa say that a joint eiruv must be made!?! **A:** The Braisa is referring to the lower chatzer.
- **Mareimar** said that an elevation of 5 tefachim plus a wall of 5 tefachim do combine to act as a wall of 10 tefachim.
 - The Gemara paskens like **Mareimar**.
- **Q: R' Hoshaya** asked, if new residents come into a chatzer on Shabbos (e.g. a wall between 2 chatzeiros fell, so the residents of each are now considered as being residents of each other now as well), does carrying become

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

prohibited? **A: R' Chisda** said, our Mishna says if the wall between a large and small chatzer fell down, carrying becomes prohibited in the small chatzer. Presumably this is even when the wall fell on Shabbos, and we see that it makes it assur!

- **Rabbah** said, the Mishna may be discussing where the wall fell before Shabbos. **Abaye** said, it is not “may be”, rather the Mishna is *certainly* talking about where the wall fell before Shabbos, because you once asked **R' Huna and R' Yehuda** if the entranceway between 2 chatzeiros became blocked on Shabbos, does the joint eiruv become passul? You were told that since it began Shabbos as kosher, it remains permissible to carry.
- **Rav** says, if a wall between chatzeiros fell down on Shabbos, one may only carry within 4 amos. **Shmuel** says each chatzer may carry within its entire borders.
 - We find **Rav's** shita from a story that happened. **Rav and Shmuel** were sitting in a chatzer and the wall between it and the next chatzer fell down. **Shmuel** instructed that a sheet be hung to separate the chatzeiros (for reasons of privacy). **Rav** turned away because he held it was assur to carry the sheet. **Rav** did not argue outright, because he was in **Shmuel's** town and would not argue with him there, but he turned away so that people would not think that he agreed.

-----Daf ט"ז-----94-----

MISHNA

- If the wall of a chatzer collapsed, opening it to the reshus harabim, **R' Eliezer** says the chatzer gets the status of a reshus harabim, and therefore transferring between it and a reshus hayachid will make one chayuv. The **Chachomim** say that the chatzer gets the status of a karmelis, and transferring between it and another reshus is only assur D'Rabanan.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why does **R' Eliezer** hold that because the chatzer is open to reshus harabim it gets the status of a reshus harabim? **A:** The Mishna is referring to a case where the rabbim is now using the chatzer as a path, and **R' Eliezer** says elsewhere in a Braisa, that such usage gives something the status of a reshus harabim.
 - **Q: R' Eliezer** only said that halacha regarding a case where there was a path that belonged to the rabbim that became “lost”, and they therefore take another path to use. That cannot be the case of the Mishna, because **R' Chanina** says that the machlokes in the Mishna is regarding the *entire* chatzer (not just a path near the actual reshus harabim)!? **A:** We must say that **R' Chanina** meant to say, the machlokes is regarding the area where the wall once stood. **A2:** The machlokes is regarding the area on the side of the reshus harabim that may be privately owned. **R' Eliezer** says that it has the status of a reshus harabim and the **Rabanan** say that it does not.
 - **Q:** Why do they argue in this case in particular? Why don't they argue about any other case of the sides of the reshus harabim? **A:** If they would argue in a typical case, where a wall may be abutting that area and protruding into that area (making its use more difficult), we would say that the **Rabanan** only argue in that case because its use is more difficult. They therefore argue in the Mishna, to show that they argue even in a case where the public's use is not difficult.
 - **Q: R' Eliezer** says his din in the Mishna regarding the *entire* area of the chatzer (“tocha”)!? **A:** He says that because the **Rabanan** say that, but he is referring to the place where the wall once stood.
 - The **Rabanan** use that language because they say to **R' Eliezer**, you agree that the inside of the field has the status of a karmelis, so the place of the wall should be no different! **R' Eliezer** responds that the place of the wall gets the din of a reshus harabim because the rabbim currently walk there.

MISHNA

- A chatzer that became open to the reshus harabim on Shabbos, on two sides of the chatzer, or a house that became open on Shabbos, on 2 sides, or a mavoi whose korah or lechi was removed on Shabbos, **R' Yehuda**

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

says, all remain mutar to carry on this Shabbos, but become assur to carry on any future Shabbos (unless the problem is fixed). **R' Yose** says, if it is not mutar on a future Shabbos, it is not mutar on this Shabbos either.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How large is this opening? If it is 10 amos or less, then it should be considered as an entrance on each side!? If the opening is more than 10 amos, even if only on one side it would be assur to carry in the chatzer!? **A: Rav** said, the Mishna is discussing an opening of 10 amos or less, but it is at the corner of the chatzer. This can't be considered an entrance, because people don't make entrances at corners.

V'CHEIN BAYIS SHENIFRATZ MISHTEI RUCHOSAV

- **Q:** Why is it that if the opening was on only one side of the house we would view the roof as creating a wall from its edge, but now that it is 2 sides we don't say that!? **A:** The **Yeshiva of Rav in the name of Rav** said, the opening was at a corner (so it can't be considered an entrance) and the roof is slanted (in which case we don't say that we view the edge of the roof as creating a wall).
- **Shmuel** says that the case of the chatzer in the Mishna is referring to openings larger than 10 amos.
 - **Q:** Even an opening of such size on one side of the chatzer would prohibit carrying, so why does the Mishna refer to a case where there are openings on two sides!? **A:** Since regarding a house we must say it was opened on 2 sides, we say so regarding a chatzer as well.
 - **Q:** Why by a house do we say that we view the edge of the roof as creating a wall when there is an opening on one side but not when there is an opening on 2 sides!? **Q2: Shmuel** himself does not even agree to the concept of viewing the roof as creating a wall?! **A: Shmuel** only doesn't say this concept when it must be applied to all 4 walls of a structure, but agrees to it when it is being used to create 3 walls or less. Also, **Shmuel** will say that the Mishna is referring to where the opening was at the corner of the house and that a 4 tefachim wide chunk of the roof broke off as well. Because it is so wide, to close these openings we would have to use the concept of the roof creating a wall at 4 places (at the 2 sides missing parallel to the length and at the 2 sides parallel to the width). According to **Shmuel**, we do not say this concept when we must say it for 4 walls.
- **Shmuel** doesn't agree to **Rav's** explanation of the Mishna, because the Mishna does not say that we are dealing with a slanted roof. **Rav** doesn't say like **Shmuel's** interpretation, because **Rav** does say the concept of the roof creating a wall even when it must be said for 4 walls.
 - We find this machlokes regarding a roofed structure without walls in an open field. **Rav** says one may carry anywhere under the roof because we view the roof as creating 4 walls, and **Shmuel** says one may only carry up to 4 amos in that area, because we don't say that concept when it must be applied to all 4 walls.
 - **Some say** that if the openings of this structure are less than 10 amos, all agree that carrying is allowed throughout. They only argue when the openings are more than 10 amos. **Others say** that when the openings are more than 10 amos all agree that carrying would not be permitted. The machlokes is where the openings are less than 10 amos.
 - Regarding a roofed structure with no walls, if one puts s'chach on boards placed within 3 tefachim to each other, it is a kosher succah. If there are no boards so placed, **Abaye** says it is a kosher succah (we say the concept that the roof (beams holding the s'chach) creates all 4 walls) and **Rava** says it is passul (we don't say this concept).
 - **Q:** Should we say that **Abaye** must hold like **Rav**, and **Rava** must hold like **Shmuel**? **A:** According to **Shmuel** the succah would clearly be passul in this case. According to **Rav**, it could be that he would agree with **Abaye**, because the roof creates all 4 walls. However, it could also be that he would agree with **Rava**, because these conceptual walls were "created" before it was decided to be used for a succah, and a succah which has conceptual walls is only kosher if the "walls" were "created" for the purpose of making a succah.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 73--95-----

R' YOSE OMER IHM MUTARIN

- **Q:** Is **R' Yose** coming to be machmir (that it is assur on this Shabbos as well) or meikel (that it is mutar even on future Shabbosos)? **A: R' Sheishes and R' Yochanan** each say that he is being machmir. A Braisa says so as well.
- **R' Chiya bar Yosef** says we pasken like **R' Yose**, and **Shmuel** says we pasken like **R' Yehuda**.
 - **Q: Rav Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said that we pasken like **R' Yehuda** regarding eiruv, but not regarding issues concerning a wall (and our Mishna is discussing issues regarding the wall)!? **A: R' Anan** said, in our Mishna **Shmuel** paskens like **R' Yehuda**, because the case of the Mishna is where the chatzer opens up to a karmelis. Therefore he is meikel. Where **Shmuel** does not pasken like **R' Yehuda** is where the chatzer opens to a reshus harabim.

MISHNA

- If one builds a second floor connecting 2 houses on opposite sides of the reshus harabim, or if there is a bridge over a road, **R' Yehuda** said one may carry in the reshus harabim beneath these overpasses. The **Chachomim** said it is assur.
- **R' Yehuda** also said, one may make an eiruv for an open mavoi (it has 2 opposite walls and is open at both ends). The **Chachomim** said it is assur.

GEMARA

- **Rabbah** said, the reason **R' Yehuda** permits carrying underneath the overpass is because he views the sides of the “roof” as creating walls and thereby enclosing the area on all 4 sides.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** allows carrying in the area of the reshus harabim in between 2 houses (owned by the same person) by simply placing a lechi or a korah at each end of one of the houses. There is no roof above this reshus harabim, so we see that **R' Yehuda's** reason for allowing this is because he says that 2 walls are enough to enclose an area, not because of the creation of conceptual walls!? **A: Rabbah** said, that Braisa does prove that he holds that 2 walls are enough. However, that cannot be proven from our Mishna, because it may be that he allows it because of the conceptual walls.
 - **R' Ashi** said, our Mishna is even mashma that **R' Yehuda's** reason is not because 2 walls are enough. The Mishna says that **R' Yehuda** “also” says that an open mavoi can be adjusted. If the first part of the Mishna was based on 2 walls being enough, then this second case is exactly the same reasoning as the first! If, however, the first part is based on the creation of conceptual walls, that would be the reason to say that he “also” says this second case which clearly relies on 2 walls being sufficient.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK KOL GAGOS!!!

PEREK HAMOTZEI TEFILLIN -- PEREK ASIRI

MISHNA

- If one finds tefillin in an open area (where they can get destroyed) on Shabbos, he can put on one pair at a time and wear them in to a more safe area. **R' Gamliel** says he may wear in 2 pairs at a time.
 - This is only allowed for tefillin that we can tell have been used (the straps were formed into the knots of tefillin). However, if they are not, we may not carry them in, because they may simply be a “kemaya”, for which one may not violate Shabbos to try and protect.
 - If he found a bunch of pairs of tefillin tied in pairs, or bundles, he may not carry them in but must wait by them till after Shabbos and carry them in then. If it is dangerous to stay with them, he should cover them and leave them. **R' Shimon** says he should give it to his friend standing nearby, who should give it to another, and via this human assembly line he should bring it to a protected area. One may pass a baby in this way too, even if he needs 100 people to reach the safe area.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yehuda** says one may transfer a barrel in this manner as well, even beyond the techum. The **Chachomim** said, the barrel may not be moved beyond the techum of its owner.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Our Mishna, which only allows wearing one pair of tefillin at a time in order to save it, does not follow **R' Meir**, because regarding saving clothing from a fire on Shabbos, **R' Meir** allows putting on many layers of clothing at a time!? **A:** The **Rabanan** allowed saving items on Shabbos in the way in which they are worn during the week. Clothing is at times worn in layers, therefore it may be saved in layers as well. Tefillin is only worn one pair at a time, so it may be saved only in that way as well.

R' GAMLIEL OMER SHNAYIM SHNAYIM

- **Q:** If **R' Gamliel** holds that wearing the tefillin is allowed, because the mitzvah of tefillin can be performed on Shabbos, then he should only be allowed to wear one pair!? If he holds that there is no mitzvah of tefillin on Shabbos and he is allowed to wear them only in to save them, he should be allowed to wear even more than 2 pairs!? **A:** He holds there is no mitzvah of tefillin on Shabbos, but the **Rabanan** only allowed one to save them by wearing them in the normal manner. Since there is enough room on the head for 2 pairs of tefillin (as **R' Shmuel bar R' Yitzchak** says), 2 pairs may be worn.
 - **Q:** Why can 2 pairs be worn on the arm? **A:** If a person needs to remove his head tefillin to save them from degradation he sometimes ties it around his arm (as **R' Huna** said), therefore it is considered normal to wear 2 pairs on the arm as well.
 - **Q:** That doesn't mean it may be so worn in instances other than risk of degradation!? **A:** Just as there is place for 2 pairs on the head, there is also place for 2 pairs on the arm.
 - The Yeshiva of **Menasheh** taught a Braisa that the arm tefillin must be worn on the biceps and the head tefillin must be worn on the "kadmah", which the Yeshiva of **R' Yannai** explained to mean, on the place of a baby's soft spot.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that the **T"K** of our Mishna does not hold of **R' Shmuel bar R' Yitzchak** and therefore says that only one pair of tefillin may be worn, and **R' Gamliel** does hold of him, and therefore says that 2 pairs may be worn? **A:** All hold of him. However, the **T"K** says that one may wear the tefillin on Shabbos because he is performing a mitzvah by doing so. Therefore, only one pair (which is how the mitzvah is performed) may be worn. **R' Gamliel** says that a mitzvah is not performed by wearing tefillin on Shabbos. The reason they may be worn is because it is considered a "tachshit". Based on that reasoning, even 2 pairs may be worn. **A2:** All agree that the mitzvah of tefillin may be performed on Shabbos, and that tefillin can be considered a tachshit. The **T"K** holds that one performs a mitzvah without specific intention to do so. Therefore, if he wears 2 pairs of tefillin (when the Torah says to only wear one) he transgresses the aveirah of "bal tosef", which is why he may not wear more than one pair. **R' Gamliel** says that one must specifically intend to perform a mitzvah. Therefore, when he wears 2 pairs without intention to do the mitzvah, the tefillin are considered a tachshit, which is why it is mutar. **A3:** All agree that no specific intention is needed to perform a mitzvah, but they argue whether one transgresses "bal tosef" without specific intent. The **T"K** says that he does (and he therefore cannot wear 2 pairs), and **R' Gamliel** says that he does not (and he therefore may wear 2 pairs). **A4:** All agree that no specific intent would be needed to perform a mitzvah or to transgress "bal tosef" if we say that Shabbos is the proper time for the mitzvah of tefillin. The Mishna is saying that according to the view that Shabbos is not the proper time for tefillin, the **T"K** says that no specific intent is required to transgress "bal tosef" and **R' Gamliel** says that specific intent is needed.
 - **Q:** According to the last answer, the rescuer should not even be allowed to wear one pair of tefillin on Shabbos, because that itself is "bal tosef"!? Also, if one were to sleep in the succah on Shmini Atzeres, he should get malkus!? **A:** We must use one of the previous answers.

-----Daf 13---96-----

- **Q:** Who is the Tanna who says that there is a mitzvah of Tefillin on Shabbos?

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **A:** Maybe it is **R' Akiva**, who says that a word (“miyamim”) in the parsha of tefillin, which seems to limit the mitzvah of tefillin as not applying on Shabbos, actually refers to the mitzvah of korbos Pesach. Therefore, he presumably says that the mitzvah of tefillin exists on Shabbos as well.
 - **Q:** That parsha referred to above says “v’shamarta”, which means that the mitzvah it discusses is a lav. Based on the above, this would mean that **R' Akiva** holds that there is a lav associated with korbos Pesach, which would go against a Mishna!? **A:** It could be that “v’shamarta”, when said in conjunction with an asei, does not create a lav, but rather stresses the asei.
 - **Q:** A Braisa clearly says that **R' Akiva** says that there is no mitzvah of tefillin on Shabbos!?
- **A:** Maybe it is the **R' Nosson** of a Braisa who says that one may wear tefillin at night. Since he says that there is a mitzvah of tefillin at night, he would likely hold that there is a mitzvah of tefillin on Shabbos as well.
 - **Q:** Maybe he holds that there is a mitzvah of tefillin at night, but not on Shabbos. In fact, we find that **R' Akiva** holds that way.
- **A:** Maybe it is the **Tanna** of a Braisa that says that the **Rabanan** did not stop Michal (Dovid’s wife) from putting on tefillin or Yona’s wife from being “oleh regel”. The Tanna must have said this because he held that tefillin is not a “mitzvas asei shehazman grama”, which would mean that it applies on Shabbos as well!
 - **Q:** Maybe the Tanna says it is a “mitzvas asei shehazman grama”, but allows women to wear tefillin as an option (just as **R' Yose** allows women the option to do semicha on a korbos), not as an obligation!? This would make sense based on the next part of the Braisa which says that they allowed a woman to be “oleh regel”. That is clearly a “mitzvas asei shehazman grama”, so she certainly would not be obligated to do so. It must mean that they allowed her the option. The same thing must be said about their allowing her to wear tefillin.
- **A:** Maybe it is **R' Meir and R' Yehuda** from a Braisa in which they both say that a woman may wear tefillin on Shabbos to carry it to a protected place. It must be that they say that tefillin is not a “mitzvas asei shehazman grama”, which is why a woman can perform the mitzvah and is considered to be wearing it, and not considered to be carrying!
 - **Q:** Maybe they hold that it is a “mitzvas asei shehazman grama”, but they give a woman an option (like **R' Yose**) of wearing tefillin, which would still be enough of a reason to consider them to be wearing the tefillin and not carrying them!? **A:** We find that **R' Meir and R' Yehuda** don’t agree with **R' Yose**, so they can’t be said to hold like him.
- **R' Elazar** said, if one finds wool that is dyed with “ticheiles” (which is how tzitzis are made, but to be kosher for tzitzis it must have been done with the intent to be used for tzitzis), if the wool is in strips, we assume it was done for some other purpose and may not be used for tzitzis. If it is found in threads, it may be used for tzitzis.
 - **Q:** Even when found in threads, why don’t we assume it was made for another purpose? **A:** He means that it was found in spun threads.
 - **Q:** Even if spun, it could be that it was spun to use as the hem of a garment!? **A:** He found them in small pieces suitable for tzitzis, but not suitable for another purpose. We are not concerned that this was made for a purpose other than tzitzis, was then cut, and will later be reattached for use on a garment, because a person would not go through all that bother.
 - **Q: Rava** asks, our Mishna says that “new” tefillin may not be worn to safety on Shabbos, because we are concerned that it may have been made as a “kemaya”. We have this concern even though it is a huge bother to create a kemaya in this way. If so, why are we not similarly concerned with regard to the small, spun threads, just because it is a bother to go through this process!?
 - **R' Zeira** told his son **Ahava** to teach a Braisa that allows cut threads dyed with ticheiles that one found in the marketplace to be used for tzitzis. **Rava** said, the Mishna is concerned that one may go through the bothersome process (described above), and therefore, the Braisa may not be relied upon.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Rava** said, whether we are concerned that one would go through a bothersome process like this, is actually a machlokes Tanaaim. We find that **R' Meir** in a Braisa allows one to wear even “new” tefillin to safety on Shabbos, and **R' Yehuda** does not.