**BACKGROUND**

Evened the doorposts — Partitions. The illustration depicts a portico that has doorposts. The doorposts, which support the roof, are in each corner, while the existing partitions are on the outer sides of the doorposts (A). If a second set of partitions were to be constructed on the inside of the doorposts (B), the doorposts would no longer be considered valid partitions.

A house, half of which is roofed — The structure has a roof covering half of its area, underneath which vines have been planted. In the other, unroofed section, other crops are planted. In accordance with the principle: The edge of the roof descends and seals, it is as though the two sections of the house.

A portico that has doorposts — According to Rashi, he maintains that the doorposts are regarded as removed only if there is a double partition completely obscuring them on all sides.

A portico that has doorposts — Partitions opposite the smaller courtyard. In the image, the partition that separates the smaller courtyard from the larger one is fully breached, while the larger protrudes to the sides of the smaller one. If, however, one were to build partitions opposite the smaller courtyard, as portrayed here by the translucent partitions, the two courtyards would be considered entirely merged, and it would be prohibited to carry in both. This constitutes a partition that renders it prohibited to carry, according to Abaye.

Partition opposite the smaller courtyard

If one placed roofing on top of a portico that has doorposts, i.e., a portico with two parallel walls that are valid for a sukkah, as well as posts in the corners supporting the portico and protruding like doorposts, which are considered as sealing the other two sides of the portico, it is a valid sukkah. However, if he evened the doorposts by constructing walls adjacent to the existing walls, obscuring the posts so that they do not protrude, the sukkah is invalid. This teaching indicates that the creation of a partition can cause prohibition.

Abaye said to him: In my opinion, with regard to that case of a portico, the sukkah is valid. However, even according to your opinion, this is another instance of the removal of partitions. Evening the doorposts does not render the sukkah invalid through the establishment of new partitions, but because it negates the original partitions of the sukka.

Rabba bar Rav Hanan said to Abaye: And didn’t we find that a partition causes prohibition? But wasn’t it taught in a baraita: With regard to a house, half of which is roofed and half unroofed, if there are vines here, under the roofed section of the house, it is permitted to sow crops there, in the open section. The reason is that it is as though the edge of the roof descends to the ground and forms a partition between the two sections of the house.

**NOTES**

If one placed roofing atop a portico with doorposts, the sukka is valid whether the doorposts are visible from the inside or from the outside. This halakha is in accordance with the Rambam’s ruling, not with Rashi’s interpretation. Some authorities dispute this halakha, claiming that one may not build a sukka in this manner ab initio (Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 630:8, and in the comment of the Rema).

A house, half of which is roofed — The Gemara states that it is permitted to sow, this does not mean that the vines here, under the roofed section of the house, are considered its entrance, as in some cases the situation reveals that at least two fundamental principles are at issue. Rashi, who addresses this difficulty, as well as Abaye, said to him: In my opinion, with regard to that case of a portico, the sukka is valid. However, even according to your opinion, this is another instance of the removal of partitions. Evening the doorposts does not render the sukka invalid through the establishment of new partitions, but because it negates the original partitions of the sukka.

Rabba bar Rav Hanan said to Abaye: And didn’t we find that a partition causes prohibition? But wasn’t it taught in a baraita: With regard to a house, half of which is roofed and half unroofed, if there are vines here, under the roofed section of the house, it is permitted to sow crops there, in the open section. The reason is that it is as though the edge of the roof descends to the ground and forms a partition between the two sections of the house.

**HALAKHA**

**BACKGROUND**

Evened the doorposts — The illustration depicts a portico that has doorposts. The doorposts, which support the roof, are in each corner, while the existing partitions are on the outer sides of the doorposts (A). A second set of partitions were to be constructed on the inside of the doorposts (B), the doorposts would no longer be considered valid partitions.

A house, half of which is roofed — The structure has a roof covering half of its area, underneath which vines have been planted. In the other, unroofed section, other crops are planted. In accordance with the principle: The edge of the roof descends and seals, it is as though the two sections of the structure are separated by a full-fledged partition. However, if a roof was subsequently erected over the unroofed side of the building, the entire area would be considered a single room, and the other crops would be prohibited.

Structure with a roof covering half of its area
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**Amud a**

If one placed roofing on top of a portico that has doorposts, i.e., a portico with two parallel walls that are valid for a sukkah, as well as posts in the corners supporting the portico and protruding like doorposts, which are considered as sealing the other two sides of the portico, it is a valid sukkah. However, if he evened the doorposts by constructing walls adjacent to the existing walls, obscuring the posts so that they do not protrude, the sukkah is invalid. This teaching indicates that the creation of a partition can cause prohibition.

Abaye said to him: In my opinion, with regard to that case of a portico, the sukkah is valid. However, even according to your opinion, this is another instance of the removal of partitions. Evening the doorposts does not render the sukkah invalid through the establishment of new partitions, but because it negates the original partitions of the sukka.

Rabba bar Rav Hanan said to Abaye: And didn’t we find that a partition causes prohibition? But wasn’t it taught in a baraita: With regard to a house, half of which is roofed and half unroofed, if there are vines here, under the roofed section of the house, it is permitted to sow crops there, in the open section. The reason is that it is as though the edge of the roof descends to the ground and forms a partition between the two sections of the house.

**NOTES**

If one placed roofing atop a portico with doorposts, the sukka is valid whether the doorposts are visible from the inside or from the outside. This halakha is in accordance with the Rambam’s ruling, not with Rashi’s interpretation. Some authorities dispute this halakha, claiming that one may not build a sukka in this manner ab initio (Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 630:8, and in the comment of the Rema).

**HALAKHA**

A house, half of which is roofed — The Gemara states that it is permitted to sow, this does not mean that the vines here, under the roofed section of the house, are considered its entrance, as in some cases the situation reveals that at least two fundamental principles are at issue. Rashi, who addresses this difficulty, as well as Abaye, said to him: In my opinion, with regard to that case of a portico, the sukka is valid. However, even according to your opinion, this is another instance of the removal of partitions. Evening the doorposts does not render the sukka invalid through the establishment of new partitions, but because it negates the original partitions of the sukka.

Rabba bar Rav Hanan said to Abaye: And didn’t we find that a partition causes prohibition? But wasn’t it taught in a baraita: With regard to a house, half of which is roofed and half unroofed, if there are vines here, under the roofed section of the house, it is permitted to sow crops there, in the open section. The reason is that it is as though the edge of the roof descends to the ground and forms a partition between the two sections of the house.

**NOTES**

If one placed roofing on top of a portico that has doorposts, i.e., a portico with two parallel walls that are valid for a sukkah, as well as posts in the corners supporting the portico and protruding like doorposts, which are considered as sealing the other two sides of the portico, it is a valid sukkah. However, if he evened the doorposts by constructing walls adjacent to the existing walls, obscuring the posts so that they do not protrude, the sukkah is invalid. This teaching indicates that the creation of a partition can cause prohibition.

Abaye said to him: In my opinion, with regard to that case of a portico, the sukkah is valid. However, even according to your opinion, this is another instance of the removal of partitions. Evening the doorposts does not render the sukkah invalid through the establishment of new partitions, but because it negates the original partitions of the sukka.

Rabba bar Rav Hanan said to Abaye: And didn’t we find that a partition causes prohibition? But wasn’t it taught in a baraita: With regard to a house, half of which is roofed and half unroofed, if there are vines here, under the roofed section of the house, it is permitted to sow crops there, in the open section. The reason is that it is as though the edge of the roof descends to the ground and forms a partition between the two sections of the house.
The partitions of a vineyard as a leniency and as a stringency – 

HALAKHA

If a full-handed partition, ten handbreadths high, separates a vineyard from the adjacent land, it is permitted to sow other crops on the other side. If there is a gap of less than twelve cubits between the vineyard and the partition, which is the measure of the perimeter of a vineyard, it is prohibited to sow there (Rambam Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhot Kilayim 7:11).

A clearing in a vineyard – 

TRANSLATION

They cannot easily be sown – אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁרָאֵל לִפְרֹשׁ. This area is generally left unsown, either because the plow would loosen the earth, or because the crops themselves would undermine the fence and ruin it (Rashash).

NOTES

The mishna explains: And what is a clearing in a vineyard? It is referring to a vineyard whose middle section was laid bare of vines. If there are not sixteen cubits across in the clearing, one may not bring foreign seeds and sow them there, due to the Torah prohibition against sowing other crops in a vineyard (Deuteronomy 22:9). If there were sixteen cubits across in the clearing, one provides the vineyard with its requisite work area, i.e., four cubits along either side of the vines are left unsown to facilitate cultivation of the vines, and he sows the rest of the cleared area with foreign crops.

The mishna continues: What is the perimeter of a vineyard? It is the vacant area between the vineyard and the fence surrounding it. If there are not twelve cubits in that area, one may not bring foreign seeds and sow there. If there are twelve cubits in that area, he provides the vineyard with its requisite work area, four cubits, and he sows the rest. However, were the vineyard not surrounded by a fence, all he would need to do is distance himself four cubits from the last vine. It is clear from this halakha that the partition causes prohibition.

Rather, the objection was not raised from there because there, isn’t this the reason that the partition is not considered to cause prohibition? It is because the entire area of four cubits alongside a vineyard is considered the vineyard’s work area, and is therefore an actual part of it. Likewise, with regard to the four cubits alongside the fence surrounding the vineyard, since they cannot easily be sown due to the wall, he renounces ownership over the area. With regard to the space in between, if it is four cubits, it is deemed significant in its own right, and if not, it is not significant and is nullified relative to the rest, and it is prohibited to sow there. A similar reasoning applies to the baraita. The stringency is not due to the fact that the partition causes prohibition, but because the partition impedes cultivation of the vineyard.
Three enclosures in a row, with the middle one fully open into the outer two, which extend beyond it.

The middle enclosure protruded – אַכְסַדְרָר שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָרְצִימִין: Here the middle enclosure extends beyond the two outer ones, which open into it.

Three enclosures in a row are considered a single domain. This halakha is in effect only if the middle enclosure is narrower than the outer enclosures and its opening into those enclosures is less than ten cubits. 

The middle enclosure protrudes – אַכְסַדְרָר שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָרְצִימִין: If the middle enclosure is wider than the others, and the other two are fully breached into it, the residents of the outer enclosures are each provided an area of two beit se'a (Shulḥan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 360:3).

Two in one of the enclosures – אַכְסַדְרָר שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָרְצִימִין: If there were two people: in one of these enclosures, and a single person or two people in the middle one, whether they were all situated in the middle one or one of the outer ones, they are considered like members of a caravan, and are provided with all the space they require in the middle enclosure (Magen Avraham, Shulḥan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 360:3).

Outer enclosures extending beyond the inner one

The middle enclosure protruded – אַכְסַדְרָר שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָרְצִימִין: If there were two people in one of these enclosures, and in the other, unroofed section, other crops are planted. In accordance with the principle: The edge of the roof descends and seals, the plow would loosen the earth, or because the unroofed side the building, the entire area would be considered a single room, and the other crops would be prohibited.

And if you say that there may exit to here, in which case there would be no more than two people in each enclosure, they are provided with only two beit se'a per person.

Based on these assumptions, a dilemma was raised before the Sages: If there is one person in this outer enclosure, and one person in the other outer enclosure, and two people in the middle enclosure, what is the halakha? Is the ruling that if the pair exit to here, one of the outer enclosures, they are three people in one place, and if they exit to there, the other outer enclosure, they are three people in one place, and three people are considered a caravan and provided with all the space they require, as stated above? Or perhaps, as one may exit to here and the other may exit to there, in which case there would be no more than two people in each enclosure, they are provided with only two beit se’a per person.

These dilemmas were essentially left unresolved, but the halakha is that these dilemmas are decided leniently, and they are provided with all the space they require in these cases.

Perhaps one may exit to here – אַכְסַדְרָר שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָרְצִימִין: This is a distinct possibility, because it stands to reason that they would each seek a larger area in which to live. Therefore, they are each likely to move in different directions.

But the halakha is that these dilemmas are decided leniently – אַכְסַדְרָר שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָרְצִימִין: The later commentators are puzzled by this statement: As these dilemmas involve a rabbinic prohibition, the halakha would be lenient in any case. One explanation is that according to the Rambam’s principle that in cases where the Gemara presents two alternatives, introducing the second with the phrase: if you wish, say instead, the halakha is in accordance with the latter opinion, the first case should be prohibited. Therefore, it was necessary to specify that the ruling is lenient in all these cases, even the first one (see Beit Yitzchak; Rashash).
An embankment, a height disparity between two surfaces of five handbreadths, and an additional partition of five handbreadths do not join together to form a partition of ten handbreadths, the minimum height for a partition to enclose a private domain. It is regarded as a partition of ten handbreadths only if the barrier is composed entirely of the embankment or if it is composed entirely of a partition.

The Gemara raises an objection from a baraita: If there were two courtyards, one above the other, and the upper one was ten handbreadths higher than the lower one, or if it had an embankment of five handbreadths and a partition of five handbreadths, the two courtyards are considered separate domains and they establish two eiruvin, one for each courtyard, and they do not establish one eiruv. If the height disparity was less than ten handbreadths, the two areas are considered a single domain, and they establish one eiruv and they do not establish two eiruvin.

Rav said: Rav Hisda concedes that an embankment and a partition combine with regard to the lower courtyard, since it faces a wall of ten, i.e., there is a full partition of ten handbreadths before its residents. The Gemara raises a difficulty: If so, according to this reasoning, the residents of the lower courtyard, from whose perspective there is a valid partition, should establish two eiruvin, i.e., an independent eiruv, and do not establish one eiruv together with the upper courtyard, while the residents of the upper courtyard establish neither one eiruv nor two. The residents of the upper courtyard neither establish an eiruv on their own, as it is breached into the lower one, nor can they establish an eiruv together with the lower courtyard, because the latter is separated from it.

Rabba bar Ulla said: The baraita is referring to a case where the upper courtyard had full-fledged ten-handbreadth-high walls that protruded on both sides of the section of the partition that was merely five handbreadths high, a protrusion that extended up to ten cubits. In this case, the upper courtyard is properly enclosed by a partition ten handbreadths high, while the section that is only five handbreadths high is deemed an entrance. Consequently, even the residents of the upper courtyard can establish an eiruv on their own. But the two courtyards cannot be merged by a single eiruv, because the lower courtyard is enclosed by a partition from which there is no entrance to the upper courtyard.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: If so, say the latter clause of that same baraita: If the height disparity was less than ten handbreadths, they are considered a single domain, and the residents therefore establish one eiruv, but they do not establish two eiruvin. According to the explanation suggested above, that there is a partition ten handbreadths high between the courtyards with an entrance of sorts between them, if they wish, they establish one eiruv, and if they wish, they establish two eiruvin. That is the halakha in a case of two courtyards with an entrance between them.

Rabba, son of Rava, said: The baraita refers to a case where the lower courtyard was fully breached into the upper one, i.e., the gap in the wall spanned the entire width of the lower courtyard. In that case, the residents of the lower courtyard establish a joint eiruv with the upper courtyard; however, they may not establish an eiruv of their own, in accordance with the mishna in which we learned that if a large courtyard is breached into a smaller one, it is permitted for the residents of the large courtyard to carry, but it is prohibited for the residents of the small one to do so.
The Gemara raises a difficulty: If so, the halakha should be that the residents of the lower courtyard establish one eiruv together with the upper one, but they do not establish two eiruvin, i.e., the residents cannot establish an independent eiruv for their courtyard. However, with regard to the upper one, if its residents wish, they establish one eiruv together with the lower courtyard, and if they wish, they establish two eiruvin. The residents of the upper courtyard can establish an independent eiruv for their courtyard, as the larger courtyard renders it prohibited for the residents of the smaller courtyard to carry, but not vice versa.

The Gemara answers: Yes, it is indeed so; that is the halakha. And when the baraita teaches: If the height disparity was less than ten handbreadths, the residents establish one eiruv, but they do not establish two eiruvin, this statement is not referring to both courtyards, but only to the lower one.

The Gemara concludes: The halakha is that an embankment of five handbreadths and a partition of ten handbreadths combine to form an effective partition of ten handbreadths.

Rav Hoshaya raised a dilemma: What is the ruling with regard to residents who arrive on Shabbat, i.e., who join the residents of a courtyard on Shabbat, e.g., if the wall between two courtyards collapsed on Shabbat so that new residents arrive in one courtyard from the other. Had these people arrived before Shabbat they would have rendered it prohibited for the residents to carry in the courtyard unless they participated with the original residents in their eiruv. Do these residents render it prohibited for the original residents to carry in the courtyard, even if they arrive on Shabbat itself?

Rav Hida said: Come and hear a resolution to the dilemma from the mishna: With regard to a large courtyard that was breached into a small courtyard, it is permitted for the residents of the large courtyard to carry, but it is prohibited for the residents of the small one to do so. It is permitted to carry in the large courtyard because the breach is regarded like the entrance of the large courtyard. Apparently, even if the breach occurred on Shabbat, it is prohibited for the residents of the small courtyard to carry. Rabba said: Say that the mishna is dealing with a case where it was breached while it was still day, i.e., on Friday. However, there is no prohibition if the breach occurred on Shabbat itself.

Abaye said to him: The Master should not state: Say, indicating that it is possible to explain the mishna in this manner. Rather, the mishna is certainly referring to a case where the courtyard was breached while it was still day. As Master, you are the one who said: I raised a dilemma before Rav Huna, and I raised a dilemma before Rav Yehuda: If one established an eiruv to join one courtyard to another via a certain opening, and that opening was sealed on Shabbat, or if one established an eiruv via a certain window, and that window was sealed on Shabbat, what is the halakha? May one continue to rely on this eiruv and carry from one courtyard to the other via other entrances? And he said to me: Once it was permitted to carry from courtyard to courtyard at the onset of Shabbat, it was permitted and remains so until the conclusion of Shabbat. According to this principle, if a breach that adds residents occurs on Shabbat, the breach does not render prohibited activities that were permitted when Shabbat began.

It is stated that amora’im disagreed: With regard to a wall between two courtyards, whose residents did not establish a joint eiruv, that collapsed on Shabbat, Rav said: One may carry in the joint courtyard only within four cubits, as carrying in each courtyard is prohibited due to the other, because they did not establish an eiruv together. Rav does not accept the principle that an activity that was permitted at the start of Shabbat remains permitted until the conclusion of Shabbat.

And Shmuel said: