

8 Nissan 5773  
March 19, 2013



Eiruvin Daf 11

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

**Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o"n**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

The *Mishna* had stated: If the *mavoi* has a *tzuras hapesach* (form of a doorway), it does not need to be narrowed even if it is wider than ten *amos*.

The *Gemora* asks: We have found that a *tzuras hapesach*, the shape of a doorway, is effective regarding the width (of an entranceway, even if the entranceway is wider than ten *amos*), and we have found that an *ameltera*, a projection from the *korah* that draws attention to the *korah*, is effective regarding the height (of an entranceway, even if the *korah* is higher than twenty *amos*); what, however, is the law where these are reversed? [Can a *tzuras hapesach* be effective when the *korah* is higher than twenty *amos*, and can an *ameltera* be effective when the entranceway is wider than ten *amos*?]

The *Gemora* resolves this from a *braisa*: A *korah* spanning the entranceway at a height of more than twenty *amos* should be lowered, but if the entranceway had a *tzuras hapesach*, there is no need to lower it.

The *Gemora* asks: What about the effectiveness of an *ameltera* in respect of its width?

The *Gemora* attempts to resolve this from a *braisa*: A *korah* spanning the entranceway at a height of more than twenty *amos* should be lowered, and if the entranceway is wider than ten *amos*, it should be reduced. But if the entranceway had a *tzuras*

*hapesach*, there is no need to lower it, and if it possesses an *ameltera*, it does not need to be reduced.

Now, does this not refer also to the last clause (that an *ameltera* is effective on a *mavoi* where the entranceway is wider than ten *amos*)?

The *Gemora* deflects the proof: No; it may refer only to the first clause (that an *ameltera* is effective on a *mavoi* where the *korah* is higher than twenty *amos*).

Rav Yehudah taught the *Mishna* to Chiya bar Rav in the presence of Rav, as follows: [If the entranceway is wider than ten *amos* and has a *tzuras hapesach*] it is not necessary to reduce its width. Rav said: Teach him (that the correct version is): It is necessary to reduce it.

Rav Yosef said: From the words of our teacher (Rav, who maintains that a *tzuras hapesach* will not be effective on a *mavoi* wider than ten *amos*), we may infer that a courtyard, where the greater part of the walls consists of entranceways and windows, cannot be converted into a permitted domain by the *tzuras hapesach* (which frames the entranceways and windows; this is because the openings exceed the closed portions).

The *Gemora* asks: What is the reason? [How can the rule that a *tzuras hapesach* is ineffective for an entranceway wider than ten *amos* be derived from Rav's ruling?]

The *Gemora* answers: Since a gap wider than ten *amos* causes the prohibition of (*carrying in*) a *mavoi*, and gaps in a wall that are larger than the walled portions causes the prohibition of a courtyard. [*The two may be compared, as follows:*]: Just as a gap that is wider than ten *amos*, which causes the prohibition of (*carrying in*) a *mavoi* cannot be corrected by means of a *tzuras hapesach*, so also a wall where the gaps exceed its walled portions, which causes the prohibition of a courtyard, cannot be corrected by means of a *tzuras hapesach*.

The *Gemora* disagrees: This, however, is not a proper analogy, for a *tzuras hapesach* may well be ineffective in the case of a gap wider than ten *amos*, which causes the prohibition of a *mavoi*, since it cannot effect permissibility in the case of enclosing boards around wells<sup>1</sup>, in accordance with the view of Rabbi Meir; but how could you apply this restriction to the case where the gaps in a wall are larger than its walled portions, though it causes the prohibition of a courtyard, when this was permitted in respect of enclosing boards around wells - in accordance with the opinion of everyone (*including R' Meir*)?

The *Gemora* attempts to provide support (*that a tzuras hapesach is ineffective when the gaps in a wall are larger than its walled portions*) from the following *braisa*: The space enclosed by such walls, which consist mostly of entrances and windows, is permitted (*to carry inside of it*), provided that the walled portions exceed the gaps. The *Gemora* asks: Do you think it can actually mean, “which consist mostly (*of entrances and*

<sup>1</sup> In order to allow one to draw water from a well on Shabbos that is situated in a public domain, one may erect four double-posts, one at each corner of the enclosure. These posts, which are two single posts at right angles, have the appearance of being eight posts. The area is then regarded as a private domain, although the combined length of the boards makes up only a small portion of the entire perimeter of the area.

*windows*)”? [*If so – the gaps exceed the walled portions!?*] Rather, read as follows: The space enclosed by such walls, which consist of many entrances and windows, is permitted (*to carry inside of it*), provided that the walled portions exceed the gaps.

Rav Kahana said: That *braisa* was taught in respect of defective entranceways.

The *Gemora* asks: What are defective openings?

The *Gemora* answers: This is an argument between Rechumei and Rav Yosef. One says that this refers to



an entranceway with no doorposts. [This is made by removing bricks from a wall. This diagram is courtesy of Rabbi Shlomo Francis, author

of the book, *The Laws of an Eruv*. (Reproduction is prohibited.) It can be purchased using the following link:

<http://www.israelbookshoppublications.com/store/pc/viewPrd.asp?idproduct=769>.] One says that this refers to doorposts with no beam overhead.

The *Gemora* notes: Rabbi Yochanan also holds the same view as Rav (*that a tzuras hapesach is ineffective for an entranceway wider than ten amos*), for Ravin the son of Rav Adda stated in the name of Rabbi Yitzchak: It once happened that a man of the valley of Beis Chorsan drove four poles (*into the ground*) in the four corners of his field and stretched across them a vine (*creating a tzuras hapesach*), and when the case was submitted to the Sages, they allowed him its use in respect of *kilayim*. [*They regarded the doorway shaped structures as valid partitions which enable the owner to grow vines on one side though other plants were grown in close proximity of the other. In the absence of a partition, it is necessary, in accordance with the laws of kilayim, to leave a certain distance*

between a vineyard and other plants.] And in connection with this statement, Rish Lakish remarked: As they allowed him its use in respect of *kilayim*, so have they allowed it to him in respect of the *Shabbos* (to carry objects within the space enclosed, the poles and vines being treated as valid doorways, creating a private domain), but Rabbi Yochanan said: Only in respect of *kilayim* did they allow him its use; they did not allow it in respect of the *Shabbos*.

Now, the *Gemora* analyzes, what are the circumstances of the case? If it be suggested that it is one where the vines were attached from the sides of the poles (and not from the tops); surely it could be



objected that Rav Chisda ruled that a *tzuras hapesach* that was made (with the crossbar attached) from the side is of no validity (so how could Rish Lakish have ruled that it is effective in respect of the *Shabbos*)? [This diagram is courtesy of Rabbi Shlomo Francis, author of the book, *The Laws of an Eruv*. (Reproduction is prohibited.)] Consequently, it must be a case where the vines were placed on top of the poles. Now, how far were the poles from each other? If you would think that they are less than ten *amos* apart, the difficulty arises: would Rabbi Yochanan in such a case have said that in respect of the *Shabbos* there is no validity? Must it not be referring to a case where the distance was greater than ten *amos* (proving that R' Yochanan maintains that a *tzuras hapesach* is not effective for a gap of more than ten *amos*)?

The *Gemora* rejects the proof: No; the distance in fact could be within that of ten *amos*, and the vines were attached from the side, but the principle on which they disagree is the ruling of Rav Chisda.

A contradiction, however, was pointed out between two rulings of Rabbi Yochanan as well as between two

rulings of Rish Lakish. For Rish Lakish stated in the name of Rabbi Yehudah the son of Rabbi Chanina: A plait (of vines trained on poles) is a valid partition in respect of *kilayim*, but not in respect of the *Shabbos*; and Rabbi Yochanan stated: Just as it has no validity regarding partitions in connection with the *Shabbos*, so too, it has no validity in respect of partitions in connection with *kilayim*.

The *Gemora* notes: One might well concede that there is really no contradiction between the two rulings of Rish Lakish, since the former might be his own while the latter might be that of his teacher, but do not the two rulings of Rabbi Yochanan represent a contradiction?

The *Gemora* notes further that if you were to concede that there the vines were placed on the tops of the poles while here the plait was trained on the sides, all would be well. If, however, you maintain that in both cases the vines were attached on the side, what can be said?

The *Gemora* answers: The fact is that it may be maintained that both cases refer to vines attached on the side, but there the distance between the poles was within that of ten *amos*, while here it exceeded that of ten *amos*.

The *Gemora* asks: But from where is it derived that we draw a distinction between distances of ten, and more than ten *amos*?

The *Gemora* answers: It is from that which Rabbi Yochanan said to Rish Lakish: Did it not so happen that Rabbi Yehoshua went to Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri to study the Torah, and though he was well versed in the laws of *kilayim*, on finding that the teacher was sitting among the trees, he stretched a vine from one tree to



another and said to him: My teacher, if vines were growing on one side of the *tzuras hapesach*, would it be permitted to plant other crops on the other side? Rabbi Yochanan told him: If the distance between the trees is within that of ten *amos* it is permitted, but if it exceeds ten *amos* it is forbidden.

Now, what were the circumstances of the case? If you think that the vine was placed on the tops of the trees, why was it ruled that if it exceeds ten *amos* it is forbidden, seeing that it was taught in a *braisa*: If forked poles were there (*in the ground*) and a plait of vines was made above them it is permitted- even if the distance between the poles exceeded that of ten *amos*? Must it not consequently be referring to a case where the vine was attached on the side; and yet he told him that if the distance between the trees is within that of ten *amos* it is permitted, but if it exceeds ten *amos* it is forbidden. This indeed proves it.

It was stated above: Rav Chisda ruled that a *tzuras hapesach* that was made (*with the crossbar attached*) from the side is of no validity. And Rav Chisda further ruled: The *tzuras hapesach* of which they spoke must be sufficiently strong to support a door (*made of the lightest material*) - even if only a door of straw.

Rish Lakish said in the name of Rabbi Yannai: The *tzuras hapesach* must have a mark for a hinge (*so it appears like the frame of a door*). The *Gemora* asks: What does this mean? Rav Avya said: This means the socket in the doorpost on which the hinge turns.

Rav Acha the son of Rav Avya met the students of Rav Ashi. He asked them: Did the master say anything in respect of a *tzuras hapesach*? They replied to him: He said nothing at all about it.

It was taught in a *braisa*: The *tzuras hapesach* of which they spoke must have a pole on either side and one pole above.

The *Gemora* inquires: Must the sideposts touch (*the crossbar*) or not?

Rav Nachman replied: They do not need to touch it, and Rav Sheishes replied: They must touch it.

Rav Nachman went and gave a practical decision in the house of the Exilarch in agreement with his traditional ruling. Rav Sheishes said to his attendant, Rav Gada: Go pull them out and throw them away (*for they are not valid*). He accordingly went there, pulled them out and threw them away. He was found, however, by the people of the Exilarch's household and they imprisoned him. Rav Sheishes went and stood at the door of his prison and called out to him: Gada, come out, and he safely came out (*to Rav Sheishes*).

Rav Sheishes met Rabbah bar Shmuel and asked him: Has the master taught anything about a *tzuras hapesach*? The other replied: Yes; we have learned in a *braisa*: An archway – Rabbi Meir said is subject to the obligation of a *mezuzah*, but the Sages exempt it. They agree, however, that if the sides of the archway are ten *tefachim* high before they curve inward, the archway will require a *mezuzah* (*because we can ignore the curved part, and the vertical sides that are ten tefachim can be used as sideposts*). [By the fact that we see that the stones above the arch are regarded as the lintel of the doorway, even though the sideposts do not actually touch it, for the arch separates the two, it emerges that a *tzuras hapesach* is valid even if the sideposts do not actually touch the crossbar.]

And Abaye stated: All agree that if the archway was ten *tefachim* high but its legs were less than three



(*tefachim in height before the gap between them is less than four tefachim*), or even if the legs were three (*tefachim high*) but its total height was less than ten *tefachim*, the doorway is not valid at all. They only differ where (*the height of*) its lower section was three *tefachim* (*before the gap between them is less than four tefachim*), its total height was ten *tefachim* but the width was less than four *tefachim* (*along the arch's minimum height of ten tefachim*), but its walls are wide enough for the arch to be carved into to form an entranceway of a width of four *tefachim*. Rabbi Meir is of the opinion that we (*imaginarily*) carve it out to complete it, while the Rabbis maintain that we do not carve it out to complete it.

He (*Rav Sheishes*) said to him (*Rabbah bar Shmuel*): If you meet the people of the Exilarch's house, do not tell them anything whatever of the *braisa* about the arched doorway (*for it refutes my view that the sideposts must touch the crossbar*). (10b – 11b)

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

The *Gemora* states two conditions for the poles of a *tzuras hapesach*. One is that they must be strong enough to theoretically hold up a flimsy door, even if it is only made of straw. Additionally, it must be thick enough to theoretically have a hinge on it to hold a door.

After stating these statements, the *Gemora* says that Rav Acha found the students of Rav Ashi. He asked them if their teacher had said anything about *tzuras hapesach*, and they replied he had said nothing. The *Gemora* apparently understands that this is referring somehow to the previous discussion, as it ends up abruptly.

The Meiri quotes the Gedolei ha'Mechabrim as stating that this is referring to the last statement of the *Gemora*. The students of Rav Ashi meant that he did not hold that the poles must be thick enough to theoretically have a hinge. This is why the Gedolei ha'Mechabrim do not codify this requirement regarding the poles of a *tzuras hapesach*.

The Meiri quotes Tosfos as being unsure if the students of Rav Ashi were referring to the first law, that the poles be strong enough to hold up a flimsy door, or to the second law regarding being thick enough to have a hinge. They therefore rule that both are required due to us being unsure which is not required.

The Meiri continues that the Gedolei ha'Dor hold that he clearly asked about both, and the response was that Rav Ashi did not hold either condition was required. This is why they hold that neither of these conditions are needed at the conclusion of our *Gemora*. The Meiri says that some say that this is clearly indicated by the next *Gemora* that says a *tzuras hapesach* can be composed of two reeds, and a reed on top of it. However, he still concludes that it is appropriate to be stringent regarding both conditions.