

22 Mar-Cheshvan 5781
Nov. 9 2020



Eiruvin Daf 92

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”h

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

Carrying Between Courtyards

Ravina asked Rav Ashi how Rabbi Yochanan could rule like Rabbi Shimon, that all courtyards are considered one domain, even if they made an eruv, since he also says that we rule like any anonymous Mishna, and such a Mishna says that residents of two adjoining courtyards may not pass food between each other over the wall which separates them, implying they are separate domains.

He answered that the Mishna only means they may not bring food from one courtyard into the other’s houses, which are a different domain, even according to Rabbi Shimon.

When he challenged this reading from a braisa of Rabbi Chiya which explains the Mishna to mean that the residents may only eat the food on the wall, but not bring it down, even to the courtyard itself, Rav Ashi responded that if Rebbi didn’t describe the prohibition this way in the Mishna, Rabbi Chiya has no source to explain it this way.

Ruin Between Courtyards

The Gemora cites a dispute about a ruin in between two courtyards, one of which made an eruv.

Rav Huna says that we allocate the ruin to the one which didn’t make the eruv, but not to the one which made the eruv, as they may carry utensils of the house into it.

Chiya bar Rav says (in the name of Rav) that we allocate it to both, and explains that this means we prohibit both to carry into it, to prevent the one which made the eruv from carrying its house utensils into it.

He says that if you would suggest that instead it means that both are allowed to carry, this would be inconsistent with Rav’s statement earlier that we rule like Rabbi Shimon in the case of neighboring courtyards only when neither courtyard made an eruv, but when one made an eruv, we prohibit carrying between them. If Rav allows both courtyards to carry into the ruin, even though one made an eruv, why would he not allow carrying between two courtyards, even when one made an eruv?

The Gemora deflects this proof, as a courtyard is a safer place to put utensils than a ruin, so we are more concerned in that case that they will carry house utensils into the other courtyard.

Another version is that Chiya bar Rav says that it means that both may carry into the ruin. He then asks the question from Rav’s statement about two neighboring courtyards, and answers with the distinction of the safety of the courtyard vs. the ruin.

Large Adjoining Small

The Mishna says that if two roofs adjoin, with one bigger than the other, one may carry in the large one, but not the small one. Similarly, if a large courtyard opens into a smaller one, one may carry in the large one, but not the small one, as the small one is considered the entrance of the large one.

Roofs and Courtyards

The Gemora explains why the Mishna had to teach both the case of roofs and courtyards. According to Rav, who says that a roof is considered enclosed only if its walls are recognizable, the Mishna includes the case of courtyards to teach that the large roof is only permitted when they have recognizable



walls, like a courtyard. According to Shmuel, who says a roof is considered enclosed in any case, the Mishna includes the case of courtyards to teach that the small roof is only prohibited when people walk between them, like people do between courtyards.

Small is Part of Big

Rabbah, Rabbi Zaira, and Rabba bar Rav Chanan were sitting, and Abaye was sitting near them. They said that from the Mishna we can see that we consider the residents of the larger area to also reside in the smaller area, but not vice versa.

They listed the following conclusions, based on this principle:

1. If one planted a vineyard in the large area, he may not plant vegetation in the smaller, as it is an extension of the vineyard. If he did, the vegetation is prohibited, and the vineyard is permitted. If the smaller one has a vineyard, one may plant vegetation in the larger one, as it is considered its own separate domain.
2. If a woman is in the larger area, and her husband places her *get* – *divorce* in the smaller one, she is divorced, as she is considered to be in the smaller one. In the opposite case, she is not divorced, as she is not in the same place as her *get*.
3. If the congregation is in the larger area, and the chazzan is in the smaller, they fulfill their obligation, as he is in the same area as them. In the opposite case, they do not fulfill their obligation, as he is in a separate area.
4. If 9 are in the larger area, and one is in the smaller, they combine to make a minyan, but in the opposite case they don't.
5. If waste is in the larger area, one may not read shma in the smaller area, but if it is in the smaller area, one may read shma in the larger area.

Creating a Prohibition by Adding a Barrier

Abaye challenged their first conclusion, as this would mean that a barrier, i.e., the extension separating the two courtyards, creates a prohibition. Without the barrier, one

can plant vegetation at a distance of 4 amos from a vineyard, but in the case of the courtyards, one may not plant vegetation anywhere in the smaller one, as it is all considered the entrance of the larger one.

Rabbi Zaira told Abaye that this is not unusual, as we find another instance of a barrier creating a prohibition. If one built an inner wall in the larger courtyard, aligning it with the smaller one's wall, one can now not carry in the larger one.

Abaye said this is not a similar instance, since the prohibition is due to the effective removal of the original outer walls, not the new walls per se.

Rava cited to Abaye another instance of a barrier which creates a prohibition. If one had a sukkah with two parallel walls and a beam in the third direction, it is valid. If he then added a wall flush with the beam, it is invalid, as the beam cannot act as the third wall. Abaye told Rava that according to him, this is also valid, as the roof beam is considered a wall. Even according to Rava, who says that it's invalid, this is really because the new wall effectively removed the existing wall, and not because of the wall itself.

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Making a Minyan in an Apartment

The Minchas Yitzchak (IV, 9) was once addressed for advice about how to arrange a minyan in a two room residential apartment that was converted into a shul. The interior walls of the apartment were knocked down, and it was converted into one large room. In our sugya, we learn that when a smaller courtyard opens into a larger courtyard, a person standing in the larger area can see the "shoulders" of the walls between the two, whereas a person standing in the smaller courtyard sees no separation at all between the courtyards. Therefore, the larger courtyard can consider itself "separated" from the smaller courtyard, and need not include the smaller in its eiruv. However, the smaller courtyard cannot consider itself separated from the larger, and it must include the larger in its eiruv.



The Gemara proceeds to apply this same principle to other halachos. For example, if two different species of plants are planted on either side of the dividing line between the courtyards, the plants in the larger courtyard are not considered *kilayim*, but the plants in the smaller courtyard are.

If a *minyan* of ten people are divided between the two courtyards, they can combine to form a *minyan* only if the majority are found in the larger courtyard. The majority can “draw” the minority towards them, so to speak, to be considered as if they are located together, only if the majority are located in the larger area.

Most Poskim understood the case in the Gemara to fit the example explained above, where the larger room is considered the primary area. If the majority of the *minyan* are there, they can draw the rest of the people from the smaller room into the *minyan* (Shulchan Aruch O.C. 55:16-17).

The Shulchan Aruch HaRav (ibid 20), however, offers a unique opinion, which does not appear in any of the other Poskim. He explains that the minority in the smaller room can only be drawn after the majority if the walls of the smaller room extend into the larger. According to this opinion, if the rooms are situated according to the first explanation, the two groups cannot combine to form a *minyan* since the shoulders visible from the larger room divided the rooms in two.

The question posed to the Minchas Yitzchak involved an apartment whose two rooms were situated similar to the first explanation. Ostensibly, according to the Shulchan Aruch HaRav, there must be an entire *minyan* of ten people in the larger room. Even according to the other Poskim, care must be taken to maintain a majority of a *minyan* in the larger room.

He answered by explaining that our Gemara discusses a case of two different courtyards with two different functions, that one wishes to combine to form a *minyan* or an *eiruv*. In such a case, the shoulders of the wall separate the two. However, in the case of a one-room apartment designated for use as a

shul, the group of people combine to form a *minyan*, regardless of the shape of the room.

When a chazzan davens from a raised platform: As a proof for this conclusion, the Minchas Yitzchak cites a teshuva in which the Rashba rules that a chazan may daven from a raised platform, even if the platform is ten *tefachim* high and four *tefachim* wide. Although its dimensions would render it into a “room” unto itself, it is still not considered a separate room, since it is not designated for any purpose other than to serve the main shul room (Teshuvos HaRashba I, 96; Shulchan Aruch O.C. 55:19). The same is true of a single shul room, even if it is shaped like two attached rooms. Therefore, even if the majority are found in the smaller area, they still combine to form a *minyan*. Furthermore, even according to the Shulchan Aruch HaRav, the two areas can combine, since they are in fact only one oddly shaped room.

DAILY MASHAL

Communal Prayer

When ten people gather together in shul to daven, but each one davens for his own personal needs, this cannot truly be considered *tefillah b'tzibur* – communal prayer. The main purpose of gathering together in prayer, is that we should unite our prayers for a common goal. The *minyan* must stand together to daven for Hashem’s sake, and pray that He may soon reveal His kingdom in the world.

The *shaliach tzibur* is the conduit through which these prayers for Hashem’s sake ascend and are accepted in Heaven. This is as Shlomo HaMelech prayed, when he inaugurated the *Beis HaMikdash*: “You shall hear from the Heavens” (Melachim I 8:32). Heavens in Hebrew is *Shomayim*, which is the Gematria of *shat’z - shaliach tzibur*. Through the intermediary of the *shaliach tzibur*, our prayers for Hashem’s kingdom ascend (Kozhntzer Maggid, Avodas Yisrael – Likutim).