בשכוני גוואי הואי – I was in the inner apartments.

Overview

The ממרא is discussing the following case. The מחזיק had witnesses that he lived in the house for three years. The מערער claimed that during these three years he – the מערער – lived in an inner apartment. [The גמרא does not clarify what the מערער meant by that 1 .] The ruling was that the מערער had to disprove the claim of the מערער.

עלך 2 עלך (אורה) והואי לי (אורה) – and I had a right of way through you. This right of way disqualifies the מערער did not use his property exclusively; the מערער used it as well; as a pass through. A חוקה established jointly with the מערער is not considered a חוקה.

תוספות qualifies this ruling:

ונראה לי שהיה לו עדים – and it appears to me that this ruling is valid (only) in a case where the מערער had witnesses –

מערער – that the מערער lived in the inner apartments – bowever the witnesses did not know –

מערער **by which way did** the מערער מערער **exit** his apartment. They were not sure if he exited through the apartment of the מחזיק (thereby invalidating the חזקה), or if he used a different exit; not through the apartment of the מחזיק (in which case, the חזקה would be maintained).

now explains the necessity for this requirement:

מערער for if the מערער had no witnesses at all –

דהוה בשכוני גוואי – that he lived in the inner apartments; but rather it is a claim that the מערער is making without supporting evidence, then –

רב נחמן – how could have רב נחמן ruled, saying to the מחזיק – an ruled, saying to the רב נחמן – go verify your consumption; prove that your was not invalidated by the מערער passing through your house –

לידע הזקה לעדי יש להם לעדי - is it indeed a requirement that the witnesses, who testify on the הזקה, should know -

מערער באותו בית – that the מערער was not in the house of the מחזיק

¹ The (שב"ם (ד"ה אנא) ב"ם explains the argument of the מערער to be as follows. I lived in the inner rooms and I would pass through your home (to exit) and I would use, together with you, the outer room, where you lived with my permission. That is why I did not protest ועי' סמ"ע הו"מ סי' ק"מ ס"ק י"ט (See however the אות ד ה).

 $^{^2}$ See הב"ח.

 $^{^3}$ It seems that תוספות disagrees with the רשב"ם (see footnote # 1), and requires only that the מערער claim that he used the מערער house as a pass through. However the מערער need not claim that he used the outer room for his other needs See 'Thinking it over' # 1.

שנים – the entire three years! It does not seem reasonable; for if that indeed were the case, then it would turn out that –

מערער – if the מערער will claim –

בייתי עמך שני ימים – I was with you for two days in your house –

שנים שלימות – and therefore you do not have three complete years of חזקה –

מערער **and the witnesses do not know** for sure whether the מערער was there or not; then it would turn out that the מדויק –

יפסיד - would lose his הזקה and property because the witnesses cannot substantiate that the מערער never trespassed into the domain of the מחזיק. This seems too extreme. Therefore it is more reasonable to assume that the מערער had עדים that he lived in the inner apartments. The only question is how did the מערער exit his apartment; through the house of the מערער or an alternate exit. Therefore since this is a reasonable doubt it is up to the מערער to resolve it; otherwise he has no הזקה. If however the מערער claims that he spent time in the sign house, but has no evidence to support it, the might will be valid.

Summary

A right of way by the מערער through the property of the מחזיק is sufficient to invalidate the חזקה. However there must be at least reasonable doubt that the מערער had this right of way. In our case the מערער needs to prove that he lived in an inner apartment; even though he may not have exited through the siproperty, it casts sufficient doubt on the חזקה proves otherwise.

Thinking it over

- 1. Why should a right of way invalidate a חזקה? Perhaps the מחזיק bought the house with the מערער has a right of way 5 .
- 2. How can תוספות compare a right of way to being in someone's house (for two days!)? A right of way means that you may trespass this property at will; however being in someone's home for a while merely indicates that you were his guest⁶.

-

⁴ See 'Thinking it over # 2.

⁵ See footnote # 3. See (סעי' ב') אות ע"ז אות ע"ז (סעי' ב') רמב"ן וכו' ועי' סו"ד אות ע"ז

⁶ See footnote # 4.