

2 Nissan 5773
March 13, 2013



Eiruvin Daf 5

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

There is a dispute regarding a *korah* of a *mavoi* that was above twenty *amos* how deep the *mavoi* must be extended.

The *Mishna* had stated that a *korah* is effective in a *mavoi* only if it is less than twenty *amos* from the ground.

The *Gemora* inquires: If the entranceway was above twenty *amos*, and he wishes to reduce its height (*in order to carry in the mavoi*), how much must he reduce?

The *Gemora* is perplexed: He should reduce it (*through raising the ground underneath the korah*) by whatever (*amount*) is necessary!?

The *Gemora* explains: The question was regarding its width. [*How deep into this mavoi must the raised area extend?*]

Rav Yosef maintains that he must extend the raised area of the *mavoi* at least one *tefach*. Abaye, however, maintains that one must extend the depth of the *mavoi* at least four *tefachim*.

The *Gemora* suggests that they argue regarding the following: Rav Yosef holds that one is allowed to carry under the *korah* (*and therefore only the tefach under the korah needs to be raised, as people carrying under the korah will be aware of the korah and they know not*

to carry in a public domain). Abaye, however, maintained that it is forbidden to carry under the *korah* (*because the inner side of the korah is considered to be walled off, and under the korah constitutes being outside the wall, where one cannot carry; therefore, the elevated area must be four tefachim deep and this will cause people to notice the korah*). (4b - 5a)

There is a dispute if a *korah* functions as a *heker* or as a *mechitzah*.

The *Gemora* then rejects this assumption, and states that even Abaye agrees that one is permitted to carry under the *korah*. Rather, their dispute is regarding the function of the *korah*. Rav Yosef maintains that a *korah* functions as a reminder (*that the mavoi ends at that point and beyond the korah begins the public domain; therefore, the raised area of a tefach under the korah is sufficient to remind people who are carrying under the korah*). Abaye, however, maintains that a *korah* functions as a *mechitzah*, a partition (*and we view the korah as if it descends downward and blocks the mavoi from the public domain; a partition only works when it partitions off an area that is four tefachim by four tefachim, and that is why the raised area of the mavoi must be four tefachim deep*). (5a)

Alternatively, you can say that all agree that a *korah* is required as a reminder; but here they differ on the question whether the reminder below (*at the ground level*) must be of the same dimensions as the one



above (*where it needs to be a tefach wide*). Rav Yosef is of the opinion that we say that a reminder below is provided by the same width as the one above, and Abaye holds that we do not say that a reminder below is provided by the same dimensions as the one above.

And if you prefer you may say that all agree that a reminder below is provided by the same width as the one above, but their point of difference here is the question whether a wider space was required as a preventive measure against the possibility of it becoming eroded. [*If the raised ground were to be allowed to consist of the minimum width of only one tefach, it might in the course of time become narrower to less than a tefach. Rav Yosef holds that this possibility was not provided against while Abaye holds that it was. Therefore, according to Abaye, they required a width of more than a tefach, and since a width above the minimum was required, it was fixed at four tefachim.*] (5a)

There is a dispute regarding a *korah* of a *mavoi* that was lower than ten *tefachim* how far one has to excavate from the ground of the *mavoi* into the *mavoi*.

If the walls of the *mavoi* were lower than ten *tefachim* and one excavated the ground of the entranceway so the height of the *mavoi* is now ten *tefachim*, Rav Yosef maintains that he must excavate the width of the entire entrance and it must be extended four *tefachim*. Abaye, however, maintains that the area must be extended four *amos*. (5a)

There is a distinction between a *mavoi* that was adjusted and then was breached and a *mavoi* that was never properly adjusted.

The *Gemora* suggests that the dispute between Rav Yosef and Abaye is based on a ruling of Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Assi concerning a *mavoi* that was breached from its side next to its entrance. The *halachah* is that if there is a board four *tefachim* wide between the *korah* and the breach, then one can still carry even if the breach is up to ten *amos*. The *korah* functions as a fourth wall, and allows one to carry within the *mavoi*. If there is no board that is four *tefachim* next to the *korah*, however, then the *korah* of the *mavoi* only allows one to carry when the breach is less than three *tefachim*. The *korah* does not allow one to carry within the *mavoi* when the breach is three or more (*than three*) *tefachim*. Rav Yosef would appear to hold of this ruling (*because Rav Yosef requires that the excavated area of the entrance is four tefachim, and this ruling mandates that the minimum size of the mavoi is four tefachim*). Abaye, however, does not subscribe to this ruling (*because Abaye maintains that the minimum size of the mavoi must be four amos*).

The *Gemora* concludes that even Abaye will agree with the ruling mentioned, because since the ruling refers to a case where the *mavoi* was previously adjusted and the wall was only breached afterward. For this reason, one can carry within the *mavoi* even if the *korah* is now by an entranceway that is only four *tefachim*. In the case when the *korah* is below ten *tefachim*, the *mavoi* was never adjusted correctly, so then Abaye holds that if one excavates four *amos*, then the *korah* is valid, but if the area was not excavated four *amos*, then the *korah* is not valid. (5a)

One cannot carry in a *mavoi* unless there are houses and courtyards that open into the *mavoi*.

Abaye said: From where do I know this (*that the minimum size of a mavoi is four amos*)? For it was taught in a *braisa*: One cannot carry in a *mavoi* that has

been adjusted with a *korah* or a *lechi* unless the *mavoi* has courtyards and houses opening into it. The *mavoi* must function as a thoroughfare for people residing in the *mavoi* in at least two courtyards that contain two houses. Abaye maintains that a *mavoi* cannot be so shallow yet contain two courtyards unless the courtyard that opens into the *mavoi* is a minimum of four *tefachim*. The only way that this could be possible is if the openings for the two courtyards are in the back wall of the *mavoi*, but this cannot be, because Rav Nachman ruled that one can only carry in a *mavoi* adjusted with a *lechi* or a *korah* if the length, i.e. the depth, of the *mavoi* is greater than its width, and there are houses and courtyards that open into the *mavoi*. This scenario would not be possible if the *mavoi* is only four *tefachim* deep. Rav Yosef, however, who maintains that a *mavoi* can be four *tefachim* deep, will explain that a *mavoi* that is four by four *tefachim* can contain two courtyard entrances. This is possible in a case where the two courtyard entrances are open diagonally at the corner, as each courtyard entrance will occupy three *tefachim* of space in one direction and one *tefach* in the other direction. (5a)

A *lechi* that sticks out from the wall of a *mavoi* into the entranceway, if the *lechi* sticks out less than four *amos*, it has the status of a *lechi* and does not require another *lechi* to allow one to carry in the *mavoi*.

Abaye said: From where do I know this (*that the minimum size of a mavoi is four amos*)? For Rami bar Chama said in the name of Rav Huna: If a *lechi* sticks out from a *mavoi* wall into the entranceway of the *mavoi*, and the *lechi* sticks out less than four *amos*, it still retains the status of a *lechi*, and the *mavoi* does not require another *lechi* to allow one to carry in the *mavoi*. If the *lechi* sticks out four or more *amos* into the entranceway, however, then the *lechi* has a status of the *mavoi* and now the *mavoi* will require another

lechi to allow one to carry in the *mavoi*. [Tosfos explains: If a *lechi* functions as a *heker*, reminding people not to carry in the public domain, then if the board can function as the wall of a *mavoi*, people will not view the board as a *lechi* and the board will not serve as a reminder. If a *lechi* functions as a *mechitzah*, a partition, however, then even a board that is wide enough to be the wall of a *mavoi* functions as a partition to the entranceway of the *mavoi*. Nonetheless, even according to the opinion that a *lechi* functions as a *mechitzah*, if the *lechi* is four *amos*, it is disqualified, because besides functioning as a *mechitzah*, the *lechi* should also function as a reminder. If a *lechi* was intentionally placed at the entranceway, then even a *lechi* that is four *amos* long or more is considered a qualified *lechi*, as a board placed at the entranceway to function as a *lechi* becomes known to all, and the *lechi* thus functions as a reminder for people.] Abaye proves from this ruling that since a *lechi* of four *amos* is considered like the wall of a *mavoi*, it is evident that the minimum size of a *mavoi* is four *amos*. Rav Yosef, however, maintains that a board retains its status of a *lechi* until the board is four *amos* long. With regard to an area being *mavoi* that is adjustable with a *lechi* or *korah*, however, even if the area is only four *tefachim* deep it can be a *mavoi*. (5a)

It was stated above: Rami bar Chama said in the name of Rav Huna: A *lechi* that sticks out from the entranceway of the *mavoi* – if it is less than four *amos*, it still retains the status of a *lechi*, and the *mavoi* does not require another *lechi* to allow one to carry in the *mavoi*. If the *lechi* sticks out four or more *amos* into the entranceway, however, then the *lechi* has a status of the *mavoi* and now the *mavoi* will require another *lechi* to allow one to carry in the *mavoi*.



The *Gemora* asks: When adding the additional *lechi*, where does he erect it? If he attaches it to the existing projection, wouldn't he be merely adding to it?

Rav Pappa maintains that he stands the *lechi* on the other side of the entranceway to the *mavoi*, so it will not be construed as a part of the original *lechi*. Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua disagrees and maintains that the additional *lechi* can be erected next to the original four-*amah* board. In order that one should not confuse the additional *lechi* as being part of the original board, he fashions the additional *lechi* either taller or shorter than the original board. By being taller or shorter, the additional *lechi* is now distinct from the original board. (5a – 5b)

Rav Huna son of Rabbi Yehoshua stated: This (*that a four-amah lechi is ruled to be invalid*) has been said only in respect of an entranceway (*to a mavoi*) that was no less than eight *amos* in width, but where the entranceway is seven *amos* wide, then carrying in the *mavoi* is permitted, because the walled portions are longer than the breaches (*and thus is regarded as closed*).

This ruling is inferred through a *kal vachomer* from (*the law relating to*) a courtyard: If a courtyard, in which the carrying of objects cannot be rendered permissible by means of a *lechi* or *korah*, is nevertheless deemed fit (*for carrying*) where its walled portions are longer than its breaches, how much more then should a *mavoi*, where carrying may be rendered permissible by means of a *lechi* or *korah*, be deemed fit when the walled portion (*across its entranceway*) is longer than the breach.

The *Gemora* asks: But isn't a courtyard, however, different (*from a mavoi*), since a gap of ten *amos* is also

allowed in it? Then how can one apply (*this ruling*) to a *mavoi* where only a gap of four *amos* is allowed?

The *Gemora* answers: Rav Huna son of Rabbi Yehoshua holds the opinion that in a *mavoi*, also a gap of ten *amos* is allowed.

The *Gemora* asks: But whose view has been under discussion? It is that of Rav Huna, and he, surely, is of the opinion that only a gap of four *amos* is allowed in a *mavoi*?

The *Gemora* answers: Rav Huna son of Rabbi Yehoshua was stating his own view.

Rav Ashi said: It may be maintained that even where the entranceway (*to a mavoi*) was eight *amos* wide, no *lechi* is required, since whatever your consideration might be (*the permission to carry in this mavoi cannot be effected*): for if the walled portion is larger (*than the breached section*), it would be permitted by reason of the fact that the walled portion (*across its entranceway*) is longer than the breach; and if the breached section is larger, then the projection should be regarded as a *lechi*. What else can you say? That both (*the walled portion and the breach*) might be exactly alike; but such an assumption would amount to an uncertainty in respect of a Rabbinical requirement, and in any uncertainty appertaining to a Rabbinical requirement, the more lenient course is followed. (5b)