



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Eruvin, Daf כ – Daf ה

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H v'l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf כ-----2-----

MESECHTA ERUVIN

PEREK MAVUI SHEHU GAVO'AH -- PEREK RISHON

MISHNA

- If a "korah" (beam) was placed higher than 20 amos off the ground at the entrance of a mavui, it must be lowered to be effective. **R' Yehuda** says it need not be lowered.
- A mavui entrance that is wider than 10 amos must be made narrower. If the opening has a "tzuras hapesach" (a lechi on each side and a beam going across the top), then the entrance can be larger than 10 amos (and one would still be allowed to carry in it if all other requirements are met).

GEMARA

- A Mishna says, a succah that is higher than 20 amos is pasul. **R' Yehuda** says it is kosher.
 - **Q:** Why by succah does the Mishna say it is "pasul" and by mavui the Mishna gives the "fix" ("it must be lowered") rather than say it is pasul? **A1:** Succah is a D'Oraisa and mavui is D'Rabanan. **A2:** The Mishna regarding succah lists other ways a succah becomes pasul (each of which would have to be fixed in its own way), so it says pasul so that it can list all these psulim together, rather than list each "fix".
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** says, the **Rabanan (T"K)** in our Mishna learn that a korah of a mavui may be at a maximum height of 20 amos from the entrance of the Heichal of the Beis Hamikdash (which was 20 amos tall and 10 amos wide), and **R' Yehuda** learns from the entrance to the Ulam of the Beis Hamikdash (which was 40 amos tall and 20 amos wide) that it may even be higher than 20 amos.
 - The pasuk regarding the Mishkan says "pesach Ohel Moed". The **Rabanan** say this calls the opening to the Heichal an "entranceway", and **R' Yehuda** says this pasuk refers to the opening of the Ulam as well, and we therefore see that an opening which is 40 amos high and 20 amos wide is also called an "entranceway".
 - Another pasuk says "Ehl pesach Ulam habayis", which teaches that the opening of the Ulam is called an entranceway. The **Rabanan** say that the pasuk is talking about the "Bayis" that opens to the Ulam, not the opening of the Ulam itself.
 - **Q:** The first pasuk was stated with regard to the Mishkan, not the Heichal or the Ulam of the Beis Hamikdash. How can we use that pasuk to show that either opening is considered to be an "entranceway" and thereby serve as a basis for the halachos of mavui?! **A:** We find that the Mishkan is referred to as the "Mikdash", and that the Mikdash is referred to as the "Mishkan". Therefore, although the pasuk says "Ohel Moed" it can actually be referring to the Beis Hamikdash. (We also find halachos that applied to the Beis Hamikdash and were learned from psukim written regarding the Mishkan. It must be that the Mikdash was referred to as Mishkan as well).
 - We find the Mikdash referred to as Mishkan in the pasuk "v'nasati Mishkani b'sochichem", ("and I will put My Mishkan among you") which was said when the Mishkan was already standing and therefore did not refer to the Mishkan, but rather to the Mikdash. We find the Mishkan called Mikdash when the pasuk says regarding the Mishkan, "v'asu li Mikdash v'shachanti b'socham").
 - **Q:** Why don't they all learn the dimensions from the opening of the courtyard of the Mishkan, which the pasuk also calls an "entranceway"? The pasuk gives the dimensions of that entranceway as 20 amos

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

wide (the pasuk says the entire side of the courtyard was 50 amos, and there were 15 amos of curtains on each side of that courtyard enclosure, leaving an opening of 20 amos)? **A:** The pasuk calls an entranceway of this size the “pesach *sha’ar hechatzer*”, but it would not be characterized as a general entranceway. **A2:** The pasuk that talks about the curtains being 15 amos is referring to the *height* of the curtains, not the width (and we therefore have no way of knowing how wide the opening actually was). Although the pasuk says the height was 5 amos, that means that it was 5 amos higher than the Mizbe’ach, which itself was 10 amos tall.

- **Q:** If **R’ Yehuda** learns it from the Ulam, why does he only argue regarding the height, he should also argue regarding the width, and should say that if it is wider than 10 amos it need not be made smaller?! **A:** **Abaye** says, we find that **R’ Yehuda** does argue about the width in a Braisa. And, even in our Mishna, although he specifically argues about the height, it is understood that he argues regarding the width as well.
- **Q:** A Braisa says that **R’ Yehuda** allows a mavui to be “40 or 50 amos high”. **Bar Kappara** says that **R’ Yehuda** allows a mavui to be 100 amos high. In either case, this is more than the 40 amos of the Ulam!? We could explain **Bar Kappara** as being an exaggeration of **R’ Yehuda’s** view. But, how can **R’ Yehuda** say 50 amos if he learns it from the Ulam?! **A:** **Rav** mistakenly thought, that since a Braisa says that the **Rabanan** learn the measurements of the entranceway of a mavui from the Heichal it must be that **R’ Yehuda** learns it from the Ulam. In fact, **R’ Yehuda** learns the dimensions from the entranceways of palaces, which are considerably larger than those of the Ulam.
- **Q:** Why don’t the **Rabanan** require that the entranceway of a mavui have doors, like the entranceway of the Heichal?! **A:** The doors of the Heichal were for privacy (of the Kohen doing the avodah), but were not essential in its obtaining the classification as an entranceway.
- **Q:** According to the **Rabanan**, why is the entranceway of a mavui good even when the entranceway is wider than 10 amos, as long as there is a tzuras hapesach? The Heichal’s entranceway had a tzuras hapesach, and was still only 10 amos wide?! **A:** Although there are those who say the entranceway of a mavui with a tzuras hapesach may be more than 10 amos, **Rav** says that it may not be, and **Rav** is the one who made the statement that the **Rabanan** learn the dimensions from the Heichal. (Although we have shown that a Braisa says the **Rabanan** learn the dimensions from the Heichal, see Tosfos for an approach on how to answer this).

-----Daf ל--3-----

- **Q:** If it is true, as **Rav** says, that the **Rabanan** learn the dimensions of a mavui from the Heichal, why does **Rav** say elsewhere that if the mavui has a conspicuous top to the entranceway, the korah is good even if it is higher than 20 amos? The Heichal had a conspicuous top to its entrance and was still only 20 amos high!? **A:** **R’ Yosef** said, it was actually a Braisa, and not **Rav**, who said that a conspicuous top to the mavui will permit the korah to be even higher than 20 amos.
 - **Q:** **Abaye** asked, even if it was a Braisa who said so, the Braisa is problematic for **Rav**!? **A:** **Rav** would say, without my having said anything we have contradictory Braisos (a Braisa said that the **Rabanan** learn the dimensions from the Heichal). You will answer the contradiction by saying that there is a machlokes between Tanna’im whether the **Rabanan** learn the dimensions from the Heichal. I will hold like the Braisa that says that they do learn the dimensions from the Heichal.
 - **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** says, without **Rav** (who clearly says that the **Rabanan** learn the dimensions from the Heichal), the Braisos are not contradictory, because the Braisa says that the **Rabanan’s** view of the dimensions of a mavui are *like* those of the Heichal, but not that the Heichal serves as a basis for the dimensions. The actual reason for the height limitation is that the korah must be low enough so that it is noticeable. If it is higher than 20 amos, but has a conspicuous top, it is still good because it is noticeable.
 - **Q:** **Rabbah** says the machlokes between **R’ Yehuda** and the **Rabanan** regarding a succah whose s’chach is more than 20 amos high (the **Rabanan** say it is passul and **R’ Yehuda** says it is kosher) centers around whether a height above 20 amos is noticeable.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

According to **R' Nachman Bar Yitzchak**, that is the same machlokes as mavui. If so, why do they argue in both these cases? **A:** If they would only argue by succah, we would say that only there **R' Yehuda** allows higher than 20 amos, because people sit in the succah and look up (and therefore see even higher than 20 amos). But, by a mavui higher than 20 amos, which is not noticeable, **R' Yehuda** would agree that above 20 amos is passul. That's why they need to argue by mavui. If they would only argue by mavui, we would say that the **Rabanan** agree with **R' Yehuda** when it comes to succah.

- **Q:** What did the “conspicuous top” of the Ulam (and Heichal) consist of? **A: R' Chama the son of Rabbah bar Avuha** says there were bird nest like forms that protruded (they were very noticeable). **R' Dimi** said they were cedar poles that stuck out of the wall above the entranceway (they were very expensive and thus people knew about them).
- **Q:** What is the halacha if part of the thickness of the korah is within 20 amos and part is above? What about if part of the s'chach is within 20 amos and part is above? **A: Rabbah** says, the mavui is kosher but the succah is passul.
 - **Q:** Presumably the mavui is kosher because we look at the korah as if the part above 20 amos doesn't exist. If so, why don't we say the same for the s'chach that is above 20 amos? **A:** We can't do that, because if that s'chach wouldn't exist, there would be more sun than shade in the succah and the succah would be passul.
 - **Q:** If we view the portion above the 20 amos as being gone, the korah would be passul as well, because then it would be light enough to be blown away by the wind (which would be passul to use as a korah). It must be that we view the bottom portion as being made of metal and thus not capable of being blown away. If so, similarly by succah we should view the bottom portion of the s'chach as being able to create more shade than sun?! **A: Rava from Prazakya** said, a succah is used by one individual, and if the s'chach below the 20 amos were removed he would not notice and would not fix it. Therefore we render it passul. A mavui is used by many people. If the bottom part of the korah would be removed, someone would notice and have it replaced. **A2: Ravina** says, succah is a D'Oraisa and therefore we are machmir. Mavui is D'Rabanan and therefore we are lenient.
 - **R' Adda bar Masna** had the version that **Rabbah** said the mavui in that case is passul and the succah is kosher.
 - **Q:** Presumably the succah is kosher because we view the s'chach above 20 amos as if it doesn't exist. If so, we should say the same thing for the korah?! **A:** If we did, the korah would be thin and would be blown down with a typical wind, which would make it passul.
 - **Q:** If so, we should similarly say that the “remaining” portion of the s'chach would allow more sun than shade! It must be that we view it as not allowing more sun than shade. If so, we should also view the “remaining” korah as being heavy enough not to be blown away by the wind?! **A: Rava from Prazakya** said, a succah is used by one individual and therefore he will be careful to make sure to replace the portion below the 20 amos if it were removed. The mavui is used by lots of people, and no one will take responsibility to fix it if the portion below the 20 amos is removed, and therefore the **Rabanan** said it is passul. **A2: Ravina** says, succah is D'Oraisa and therefore need not be strengthened with additional gezeiros. Mavui is only D'Rabanan and therefore needs to be treated more stringently to strengthen the halacha of mavui.
 - **Q:** How do we pasken in these cases? **A: Rabbah bar R' Ulla** says the korah and the succah are passul. **Rava** says they are both kosher, because the Mishna of succah and of mavui only require that there not be an empty area of 20 amos. As long as the s'chach and korah begin within 20 amos, they are kosher.
- **Abaye in the name of R' Nachman** says, the amos used to measure for succah and for mavui are amos of 5 tefachim per amah. The amos used to measure for purposes of kilayim (planting other species in a vineyard) are amos of 6 tefachim per amah.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- Using smaller amos to measure the amos of mavui leads to a chumrah, because we are referring to measuring the height of the korah and the width of a hole in the wall of the mavui.
 - **Q:** But this leads to a leniency when we measure the minimum size of a mavui, which is 4 amos?! **A: R' Nachman** holds like the shita who says the minimum size of the mavui is 4 tefachim, not amos. **A2: R' Nachman** may hold that the minimum size is 4 amos, but when he says that the amos are amos of 5 tefachim each, he is referring to the other measurements of mavui, not this one.
- Using smaller amos to measure the amos of succah leads to a chumrah, because we are referring to measuring the height of the succah and the width of a “dofen akumah” (where the s’chach next to the wall is passul we view the wall as bending and consider the passul s’chach as an extension of the wall).
 - **Q:** But this leads to a leniency when we measure the minimum size of a succah, which is 4 amos?! **A: R' Nachman** holds like the shita who says the minimum size of the succah is large enough to be able to fit one’s head, most of his body, and his table. **A2: R' Nachman** may hold that the minimum size is 4 amos, but when he says that the amos are amos of 5 tefachim each, he is referring to the other measurements of succah, not this one.
- Using larger amos to measure for matters of kilayim leads to a chumrah, because we are referring to how much empty space is needed to plant other species in a clearing in middle of a vineyard, or at the end of a vineyard (near the wall). Using larger amos requires having more empty space and is thus a chumrah.
 - **Q:** But this leads to a leniency when we measure the distance between rows in the vineyard, which if not separated by 4 amos are not considered a vineyard and may then have other species planted close by?! **A: R' Nachman** holds like the **Rabanan** who say that even less than 4 amos between rows is classified as a vineyard. **A2: R' Nachman** is referring to the other measurements besides this one.
- **Rava in the name of R' Nachman** says that all amos are always measured using amos of 6 tefachim per amah. However, the amos used to measure succah and mavui are amos of 6 “tight” tefachim (a smaller measure) and the amos used to measure for kilayim are amos of 6 “loose” tefachim (a larger measure).

-----Daf 7---4-----

- **Q:** A Braisa says, “all amos mentioned by the **Chachomim** are amos of 6 tefachim per amah, but not all amos are the same”. This makes sense according to **Rava’s** version of **R' Nachman** (he said we always use an amah of 6 tefachim, just sometimes measured tightly and sometimes measured loosely). However, according to **Abaye’s** version of **R' Nachman** (sometimes we use an amah of 5 tefachim and sometimes one of 6 tefachim), this Braisa is difficult!? **A: Abaye** will say that the Braisa refers to the amah used to measure for kilayim, which is always an amah of 6 tefachim.
 - **Q:** The end of the Braisa quotes **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** who says that for kilayim we must use an amah of 6 tefachim, measured loosely. He seems to be arguing on the **T”K**, which would mean that the **T”K** is saying we use 6 tefachim amos for ALL measuring, and not just kilayim?! **A: Abaye** will say that **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** clearly says that an amah of 6 tefachim is only used for measuring kilayim, so my version will follow **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**.
 - **Abaye** will have to say that the **T”K** and **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** argue. **Rava** can say that they agree that all amos used for measuring have 6 tefachim per amah, and **R' Shimon** is clarifying that 6 loose tefachim are used when measuring for kilayim.
 - **Q:** If **R' Shimon** is just coming to clarify, why does he say “all amos that the **Chachomim** use for measuring kilayim, *are of 6 tefachim* and are measured loosely”? It seems that he is saying there are other amos that are NOT measured 6 tefachim per amah?! **A:** He is referring to the amos used for the measurements of the Mizbe’ach, where, based on a pasuk, some of the amos are amos of 5 tefachim and others are amos of 6 tefachim.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Chiya bar Ashi in the name of Rav** said, the halachos of “shiurin” (the measurements used for various things in the Torah), of “chatzitzin” (that one cannot have anything separating his body from the water when he immerses in a mikveh), and “mechitzin” (the structure of walls) are all Halachos L’Moshe M’Sinai.
 - **Q:** The halachos of “shiurin” are learned from a pasuk!? The pasuk lists all the “shivas haminim” and **R' Chanah** says, each one of the minim is listed to teach us a particular shiur: **Chita** – achilas pras of wheat bread is the time one needs to be in a house with a negah to make his clothing tamei, **Se'ora** – a human bone fragment the size of a barley is metameh through touching and carrying, **Gefen** – the amount of solid grape product that a nazir must eat to be chayuv is equal to a revi'is of wine, **T'eina** – one is chayuv for carrying the size of a dried fig of food on Shabbos, **Rimon** – a hole the size of a rimon renders a keili useless even for a regular user (as opposed to a merchant), **Zeis Shemen** – many shiurim are kezayis, **D'vash** – one who eats food the size of a date on Yom Kippur is liable!? **A:** The shiurin are not actually written in the pasuk. In truth they are a Halacha L’Moshe M’Sinai and the **Rabanan** use the pasuk as an “asmachta” (support), but not as a true source.
 - **Q:** The halacha of “chatzitza” is learned out from a pasuk!? **A:** The Halacha L’Moshe M’Sinai teaches that a chatzitzah may not exist even in one’s hair.
 - **Q:** That is also learned from a pasuk!? **A:** The Halacha L’Moshe M’Sinai teaches the halacha taught by **R' Yitzchak** that only a chatzitza that covers most of the area **and** is something that the person objects to its being there is considered a chatitzah. The **Rabanan** were then goizer that if something has one characteristic (either it covers most **or** he objects to its being there) it is also considered a chatzitza. They were not goizer on something that has neither characteristic, because that would be a gezeirah on top of a gezeirah.
 - **Q:** The halacha of “mechitzta” is learned out from a pasuk which says that the Aron was 1 and a half amos tall (which is 9 tefachim) and the “kapores” was a tefach tall, which means the top of the Aron was 10 tefachim tall. The Gemara learns from here that walls 10 tefachim high create a new reshus!? **A:** The Halacha L’Moshe M’Sinai is needed according to **R' Yehuda** who says that the amos used for the keilim (including the Aron) were amos of 5 tefachim (which means that the Aron was less than 10 tefachim tall and could not establish that a wall 10 tefachim high is needed to separate a reshus).
 - **Q:** According to **R' Meir** who says the Aron was 10 tefachim tall, what does the Halacha L’Moshe M’Sinai teach? **A:** It teaches the halachos of “gud achis and gud asik” (that a wall extends up and down), “lavud” (spaces less than 3 tefachim are considered to be closed), and “dofen akumah”.
- **Q:** If a korah is more than 20 amos high and one wants to make it less than 20 amos high (by building up the ground underneath it), how much of the ground (in the depth from the reshus harabim into the mavui) must he build up? **A:** **R' Yosef** says he must build up a tefach. **Abaye** says he must build up 4 tefachim.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that they argue in whether one may carry underneath the korah itself. **R' Yosef** says that one may do so, and that’s why he need only build up one tefach – the tefach underneath the korah, and **Abaye** says one may not carry underneath the korah, so he must build up 4 tefachim of space – which will take him beyond the korah and into the mavui? **A1:** It could be all agree that one may carry underneath the korah. **R' Yosef** says the purpose of the korah is for it to act as a reminder that one is in a mavui. For that, building up the tefach under the korah is sufficient. **Abaye** says that the purpose of a korah is to act as a wall enclosing the mavui. A wall is only legally considered a wall when it encloses an area that is at least 4 tefachim, which is why an area of that size must be built up. **A2:** Maybe all agree that the purpose of a korah is to act as a reminder. **R' Yosef** says the size of the reminder below (the ground within 20 amos to the korah, from which one can see the korah) can be the same size as the reminder above (i.e. the korah which must be one tefach). **Abaye** says that the reminder below must be larger than the reminder above, and he therefore requires a space of 4 tefachim. **A3:** Maybe all agree that it really only need be one tefach of raised ground. **Abaye** is concerned that the area may become less than one tefach, and therefore **Abaye** is goizer that the person must build up an area of 4 tefachim.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** If a korah is less than 10 tefachim high (a korah needs to be a minimum of 10 tefachim high to be valid) and one wants to make it more than 10 tefachim high (by digging out the ground underneath it), how much of the ground (in the depth from the reshus harabim into the mavui) must he dig out? **A: R' Yosef** says he must dig out 4 tefachim. **Abaye** says he must dig out 4 amos. (He must dig a place large enough to be considered a mavui, so they argue with regard to what the minimum size of a mavui is).
 - **Q:** Maybe they argue in the din of **R' Ami** and **R' Assi**. They say, that if the wall of a mavui near the korah is missing, if there is a piece of the existing wall that is 4 tefachim wide before the piece that is missing, the missing piece can even be up to 10 amos large and it will not be an issue (presumably because the 4 tefachim represent the minimum required size for a mavui). If not, the missing piece must be less than 3 tefachim to be ok. Maybe **R' Yosef** holds of **R' Ami** and **R' Assi**, and that's why he only requires the area to be 4 tefachim, and **Abaye** does not hold like them and says that the minimum size of a mavui is 4 amos? **A: Abaye** will say that when there was a proper mavui and now something happened to call that into question, as long as 4 tefachim remain it will retain its status as a proper mavui. However, our case is one of creating a new mavui. To create a mavui there must be an area of 4 amos.
 - **Abaye** says, I can prove that a mavui must be more than 4 tefachim (and therefore will need to be 4 amos). A Braisa says, that an area can be considered a mavui (which can be adjusted with a lechi or a korah) only if there are a minimum of 2 chatzeiros that open up into it (with each chatzer having a minimum of 2 houses that open up into it). Each entranceway between the chatzer and the mavui must be a minimum of 4 tefachim. If the entire mavui is 4 tefachim there can be no entranceway of 4 tefachim (because that would mean there are no side walls to the mavui and no separation between it and the chatzer)! We can't say that the entrance was on the back wall of the mavui which was wider than 4 tefachim, because **R' Nachman** says that a proper mavui must have its depth greater than its width! It must be that a mavui needs to be a minimum of 4 amos.
 - **R' Yosef** would say that the entranceway between the chatzer and the mavui was at a diagonal on the corners of the mavui, and in that way it does not take up the full 4 tefachim of the wall and can be a proper mavui.
 - **Abaye** says, I can prove that a mavui must be 4 amos. **Rami bar Chama in the name of R' Huna** says, a lechi that protrudes from the mavui wall is considered a lechi unless it reaches the size of 4 amos. If it does, it is considered a mavui wall by itself and would need another lechi to allow carrying inside the mavui. We see from here that 4 amos is the size that is considered to be a mavui.
 - **R' Yosef** would say, to create a mavui one only needs 4 tefachim, but for a lechi to lose its classification as a lechi and to be considered a wall, that would take 4 amos.
 - **Q:** According to **Rami Bar Chama**, where does one place the additional lechi when the original lechi is 4 amos? If he places it by the original lechi, it just adds to that lechi and it becomes an even larger lechi, which wouldn't help!? **A: R' Pappa** said, he puts it on the other wall of the entranceway. **A2: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** says he can put in on the original lechi, but makes the new lechi taller, shorter, thinner or wider than the original one, and in that way makes it easily distinguishable from the original lechi.
 - **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** said, a 4 amah lechi is only a problem if the mavui itself is at least 8 amos wide. However, if it is less, the 4 amah lechi would act as a wall that closes most of that open side, in which case a lechi would no longer be required (the mavui on its open side is more closed than it is open). This can be proven with a kal v'chomer. If a chatzer, which (if opened to the reshus harabim) must be adjusted with 2 lechis (one alone is not enough), becomes permissible to carry in it (even if it is open to the reshus harabim) when the walls are more than the empty spaces, then a mavui, which can be adjusted with even one lechi, should surely become permitted without any lechi or korah when its walls exceed the empty spaces!

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** This kal v'chomer is not true according to **R' Huna** who says that a mavui becomes assur to carry in if its walls have openings that are only 4 tefachim wide, but a chatzer is permissible to carry in even if its walls have openings up to 10 amos wide. Since it was **R' Huna** who said that a lechi of 4 amos is passul, it makes no sense to use this kal v'chomer to say something that he wouldn't agree with?! **A: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** is saying his own opinion, that although **R' Huna** says the lechi is passul when it is 4 amos, **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** himself would say that if the mavui is less than 8 amos wide, the lechi will not need another lechi to permit carrying in the mavui.
- **R' Ashi** says, even if the mavui is exactly 8 amos wide, the 4 amah lechi will not need another lechi to make it kosher. Because, if the lechi is in fact slightly more than 4 amos, it will be permitted to carry in the mavui because it has more wall than open (8 amos long with a drop more than 4 amos of wall). If the open area is truly more than the walled area, that would necessarily mean that the walled area is less than 4 amos and would be valid as a lechi. The only concern would be that it is EXACTLY 4 amos. That is only a "safek", and given that we are dealing with the halachos of mavui, which are D'Rabanan, it is a safek D'Rabanan, in which case we are lenient.