

# daf yomi summary

## parashat Chayei Sarah 5781

עירובין פה - צד

EDITION: 41



הוקדש לעילוי נשמת  
הרב יונתן יעקב צבי  
בן דוד אריה זצ"ל  
והרב דוד פיינשטיין זצ"ל



spouse?! (see further Shulchan Aruch Even HaEzer 89:1).

To put the question differently, how difficult did a test need to be in order for it to qualify as a nisayon, one of the ten that Avraham faced in his life?

Perhaps the answer lies in the very humanness, suddenness, and mundaneness of the moment, in contrast to many of Avraham's prior tests.

The burial of a loved one, in all of its sadness and pain, is a mundane feature of our earthly existence; it does not require superhuman strength, it is simply an expression of our pure humanity. Avraham was being tested one last time through a test of everyday living, but in this final go-around, as opposed to prior challenges, Avraham had no time to prepare for the moment. Nevertheless, he passed the test with flying colors, and Sarah was buried in the holy city of Chevron, in the eternal resting place of Judaism's founding fathers and mothers.

Avraham's final test is perhaps his greatest legacy to all of us: how we live and elevate the moments and experiences of our daily lives is the truest test of the kind of people we are.

THURSDAY 5 NOVEMBER

THANKS TO HADRAN

עירובין פה

Towards the end of daf 87, the Gemara tells us three leniencies that Rabbi Hananya ben Akavya permitted the residents of Tiberias: "They may draw water from the sea through a hole in a balcony on Shabbat [this is the connection to our sugya], they may insulate produce in the pods of legumes, and they may dry themselves on Shabbat with a towel."

A discussion of the third leniency then continues on our daf in a braita that says a person can wash himself with cold water on Shabbat, dry himself and then leave the towel on the window. He is not allowed to give the towel to the bathhouse attendant for fear that the attendant might come to wring it out. He also may not bring the towel home with him because he might forget and wring it out. Rabbi Shalom Rosner shares a few interesting thoughts about this. The Shulchan Aruch discusses wet clothing on Shabbat, explaining that we are obviously not permitted to wring them out, but we also not permitted to warm them in any way so as to dry them, nor are we allowed to even touch them. A towel on the other hand, discussed a bit later, is a different story. We are of course not

Polling the audience: What was Avraham's tenth and final test?

If you thought it was Akeidat Yitzchak, the binding of Isaac, you are in good company, as most of the commentaries list Akeidat Yitzchak as the final and most difficult of Avraham's ten tests (see Pirkei Avot 5:3).

Yet, for Rabbeinu Yonah, Avraham's tenth and final test was the burial of his wife, Sarah. What made this moment so trying for Avraham?

R. Yonah explained: G-d told Avraham, "Rise, walk in the land, to its length and to its breadth, for I will give it to you." Now his wife had passed and he had no place to bury her until purchasing a piece of land, yet he did not question G-d.

We can certainly appreciate the vulnerability of the moment. Avraham was mourning, and he was then told to pull out his checkbook, and add a few extra zeros to purchase a burial site for his wife. Until that point, Avraham had lived with the knowledge of G-d's eternal promise of the Land, and there he was being taken advantage of in his vulnerable state, and yet he did not question G-d's motives or reasoning, he simply followed the plan as it was presented to him.

It was not long before this test that he had been presented with a challenge that flew in the face of another promise G-d had made to him; that he was to take the life of the very child who was to continue his line into the next generation.

Avraham passed this test as well. Yet, we may wonder why Avraham should be celebrated as having 'passed' a test for arranging the burial of his wife; what loving, caring husband of so many years would not ensure the most sensitive and honorable burial for their

ברכות (63)	Jan 5 2020
שבת (156)	Mar 8 2020
עירובין (104)	Aug 11 2020
פסחים (120)	Nov 23 2020
שקלים (21)	Mar 23 2021
יומא (87)	Apr 13 2021
סוכה (65)	Jul 9 2021
ביצה (39)	Sep 2 2021
ראש השנה (34)	Oct 11 2021
תענית (30)	Nov 14 2021
הגילה (31)	Dec 14 2021
חגוע פטו (28)	Jan 14 2022
הגהה (26)	Feb 11 2022
יבמות (121)	Mar 9 2022
כתובות (111)	Jun 8 2022
נדרים (90)	Oct 27 2022
נזיר (65)	Jan 25 2023
סוטה (48)	Mar 31 2023
גיטין (89)	May 18 2023
קידושין (81)	Aug 15 2023
בבא קמא (118)	Nov 4 2023
בבא מציעא (118)	Mar 1 2024
בבא בתרא (175)	Jun 27 2024
סנהדרין (112)	Dec 19 2024
מכות (23)	Apr 10 2025
שבועות (48)	May 3 2025
עבודה זרה (75)	Jun 20 2025
חוריות (13)	Sep 3 2025
זבחים (119)	Sep 16 2025
תמורת (109)	Jan 13 2026
חז"ן (141)	May 2 2026
בבא מציעא (61)	Sep 20 2026
עירובין (33)	Nov 19 2026
תמורה (33)	Dec 26 2026
כריתות (27)	Jan 24 2027
תעיליה (36)	Feb 20 2027
גיטין (72)	Mar 28
SHYUM HASHAS	Jun 7 2027

permitted to wring them out, but we are permitted to touch them and use them.

So what is the difference between a towel and clothing? The Ran, quoting the Rashba, explains that people need to wash and clean themselves, and so we must allow them to dry themselves as well. Changing clothing is not catering to as great a need as cleaning oneself. The Vilna Gaon has a different approach. The reason we can be lenient with a towel is that people don't care very much about a towel. They do, however, care about their clothing. We can trust them to use the towel and toss it aside when they are done. With clothing, however, they might be more tempted to dry them out in order to keep them in good wearable condition.

What resonates with me in this section about Rabbi Hananya and Tiberias, and then in the follow up commentaries by the Ran and the Vilna Gaon, is the continuing prominent role of intention that pervades so many discussions in the Gemara and, ultimately, in the formation of halacha. Rabbi Hananya knows his people in Tiberias well. He knows that they take great pride in their water. He knows that they work very hard (this is what justifies their insulation of the legumes). He knows that they like to bathe and dry off. On the flip side, the braita prohibited giving the towel to the bathhouse attendant because he/she has different intentions for a towel than the Tiberias resident.

They must prepare the towels for the next person and so they might be tempted to wring them out. In this small but interesting digression we see how closely leniency is tied to intention, an idea that has appeared frequently in the tractates we have studied so far and throughout Masechet Eruvin.

FRIDAY 6 NOVEMBER  
THANKS TAL NEVIES

## עירובין פט

The ninth perek which starts on daf 89 continues to discuss the laws of eruvei chatzerios and circumstances in which carrying remains permitted between private domains even if an eruv has not been established.

In the first Mishna, there is a disagreement between Rebbi Meir, who holds that all roofs of a town are considered one domain provided one of the roofs is not 10 tephachim higher or lower than the other roofs. The Chachamim hold each roof is a separate domain unto itself (and carrying between roofs would be assur without an eruv) and the third opinion is that of Rebbi Shimon, who holds that not only roofs, but also chatzeirot and karpafs are considered one domain provided the utensil was in the area in question at the onset of Shabbat.

In trying to understand the opinion of the Chachamim, the gemoro notes the debate between Rav and Shmuel as to whether we apply the principle of Gud Asik to the walls of a house. In the case of when the roofs are separated by walls that are not visible from the roof (e.g. terraced housing), according to Rav, one would be limited to carrying only within 4 amot on each roof as they are entirely open to other roofs (and carrying would be prohibited in a similar way to a karmelis). Shmuel says it would be permitted to carry on the entire roof and only carrying from roof to roof would be prohibited.

In the daf digest summary, they bring the הגהות מהר"י"ח on the Tur

who explains the strict ruling of Rav is because the area is open and next to an area into which it is prohibited to carry (in this case another roof), the Rabbanan were afraid that a person would carry from roof to roof as there was no intervening wall or marker to stop him.

SHABBAT 7 NOVEMBER

THANKS TO MIKE GORDON

## עירובין ז

פי תקרה יורד וסותם The edge of the roof (of a portico) descends (to the ground) and seals (the portico) on all sides.

Our Gemara on daf 90b discusses a portico located in a field. Rav says that it is permitted to move an object throughout the entire portico on Shabbat, not only within four amot. Rav says this is because we say that the edge of the roof of the portico descends to the ground and seals the portico on all sides. In his book, The Contemporary Eruv, Rabbi Yosef Gavriel Bechhofer retells a fascinating incident that occurred in the early 50's in Brooklyn, NY.

Rabbi Raphael Ber Weissmandel made a proposal to permit carrying on Shabbat in Brooklyn, based on the presence of the elevated train lines in the borough. His reasoning was not based on the principle of tzurat ha'petach that we have learnt about earlier in the masechet, but rather on our concept of "pi tikra yored v'sotem" The Shulchan Aruch (361:2) clarifies this principle.

When a roof is at least four by four tefachim, and it rests on top of two complete walls, we can view the thickness of the roof as an imaginary wall for the remaining two sides. Rabbi Weissmandel wanted to apply the principle of these imaginary walls to the elevated train lines and thus "enclose" Brooklyn in imaginary walls.

Rav Moshe Feinstein, however, disagreed with the application of this principle to elevated train lines (Igros Moshe, Orach Chaim 1:138). One of his main reasons was that he noted that a number of Rishonim do not view the principle of "pi tikra" as creating walls, but rather as creating a defined area underneath the ceiling of the portico, in which one is allowed to carry.

Thus, it may be that one may have been permitted to carry directly underneath the elevated tracks, but the tracks could not serve to "wall" the area in and create an enclosed reshut.

SUNDAY 8 NOVEMBER

THANKS BENNY LAST

## עירובין צא

Our Gemora begins with Rav Yehuda's explanation of the views presented in the last Mishna on daf 89a, saying that Rav Meir holds all roofs (of similar height) in a town are considered one reshut, so one can carry from one to another.

The Chachamim say each roof is its own reshut, so one can't carry from one to another, while Rav Shimon says roofs are one reshut, courtyards are one reshut, and karpeifot (for example junkyards) are also considered one reshut.

It seems clear that Rav Shimon is the most lenient, but exactly how lenient becomes apparent as we go through the Gemora. Rashi begins by clarifying an obvious question. At first glance, it seems that Rav Shimon is saying the same as Rav Meir, that all roofs are considered one reshut, but Rashi explains that Rav Shimon is going

much further, he is saying all roofs and courtyards and junkyards are one reshut, so you can carry between all of them, ie not only from roof to roof, but even from roof to courtyard etc...

The Mishna concluded by saying that even if you allow carrying between roofs and courtyards etc., that only applies to items that began Shabbat on the roof or in the courtyard. However, any item that was in the house when Shabbat arrived cannot be taken into the neighbour's courtyard on Shabbat, and this is accepted by all. Our Gemora now refers to an argument between Rav and Shmuel that we first encountered on daf 74.

Rav says that he accepts that the halacha is like Rav Shimon, but only when there is no eruv. When there is an eruv, the halacha is not like Rav Shimon. Let's explain the case: There are two adjacent courtyards (with an opening); Courtyard A has an eruv with its house, and Courtyard B has an eruv with its house. Now, this may seem counter-intuitive - because they each courtyard has an eruv you cannot carry from one courtyard to the other, but if there was no eruv, you would be able to carry between them. Rav explains that it is the eruv that causes a potential problem.

There may be several items in the courtyard on Shabbat, but because there is an eruv with the house, it is possible that some of those items were brought into the courtyard on Shabbat, while some were already there when Shabbat came in. In this case, the Rabbonim made an extra decree that Rav Shimon's halacha would not apply and therefore you cannot carry from one courtyard to the other as you may inadvertently carry a disallowed item. Shmuel disagrees and continues the leniency of Rav Shimon.

He says the halacha follows Rav Shimon in all cases, whether there is an eruv or not, and we do not require rabbinic decree to avoid mix-ups. People are perfectly capable of remembering which items were brought into the courtyard from the house on Shabbat.

The Gemora supports Shmuel's understanding of Rav Shimon - the Gemora we learnt on Daf 45 with the case of the three adjacent courtyards where Rav Shimon makes this very point.

TUESDAY 9 NOVEMBER

עירובין צב

THANKS TO RAV JONNY SOLOMON -  
[HTTPS://RABBIJOHNNYSOLOMON.COM/](https://rabbijohnnyso.com/)  
IN MEMORY OF RABBI SACKS ז"ל

Yesterday, for the first time in over five months, I did not post a Daf Yomi thought, and this is because I, like so many others around the world, was still in shock having learnt about the death of Rabbi Lord Jonathan Sacks zt'l from whom - both personally, and from his many books - I was privileged to learn so much.



Still, while I may have had a valid reason not to write yesterday, I don't have a valid reason for today's thought not to touch upon both yesterday's daf (Eruvin 91) and today's (Eruvin 92), and this is what I have attempted to do - while relating the concepts and cases found on these dapim to Rabbi Sacks and his influence on me and so many others.

The Mishna (Eruvin 9:2, 92a) discusses the case of a large roof that is adjacent to a small one, as well as the case of a large courtyard that is adjacent to a small courtyard. In both instances, no physical wall or physical partition separates the two. However, while in the case of the large roof and the large courtyard where each are considered to be distinct domains since each have a halachically valid virtual partition surrounding their entire area, both the small roof and the small courtyard are - at that moment - not considered to be fully-fledged distinct spaces as they lack a halachically valid virtual partition surrounding their entire area.

Given this, Rabbah, Rabbi Zeira and Rabba Bar Rav Chanan rule that "the domain of the large [courtyard] extends into the small [courtyard]" - meaning that while the small courtyard is its own space but at that moment lacks certain qualities and properties, its attachment to the larger courtyard means that it can benefit from its proximity to the larger space, and as the Gemara proceeds to explain, this principle has a variety of applications, including how produce is grown in the small courtyard, or how prayers recited in the small courtyard can attach themselves to the community in the large courtyard.

In terms of Rabbi Sacks, he was a 'giant' - both in terms of his intellect and in terms of his scholarship. Yet, not only was he abundantly generous to give his time, encouragement and support to so many others who were comparatively much 'smaller' in terms of wisdom and scholarship, but like the roofs and courtyards discussed in today's daf, he did so without walls or partitions i.e. without pretenses (NB among the many random memories I have of him is when I, along with a number of other young teachers, were hosted at his home in Hamilton Terrace to discuss how to address issues of prayer and spirituality in schools, he insisted on pouring and serving the tea to each of us).

Rabbi Sacks wasn't just interested in what he could teach others, but also what he could learn from others. He wasn't focused on growing himself, but instead, on growing others. He wished to do all he could to help and encourage others, and we, his disciples, were blessed to benefit from his generosity such that "the domain of the large extended into the small".

However, to compare Rabbi Sacks to a roof or a courtyard is also a misrepresentation, because it presumes that he can be compared to a space that doesn't move. Rabbi Sacks was quite the opposite! He had an abundant unstoppable energy that was driven by his recognition that we are living in challenging times and that we must do all we can, and answer God's call, to share ideas of Torah and morality around the world.

Like Rabbi Yehuda testifies (in Eruvin 91a) about times of danger when he would "carry a Torah scroll from a courtyard to a roof, and from there to a courtyard, and from there to a karpaf in order to read Torah", Rabbi Sacks would travel wherever was necessary to make sure that the voice of Torah and morality could be heard. Along these lines, I recall some years ago when a good friend of mine, who at that time was a Rabbi for young professionals, consulted Rabbi Sacks about whether it would be appropriate for him to deliver shiurim in more informal settings like restaurants or bars to help connect with the young people whom he sought to engage with.

In his reply, Rabbi Sacks referred him to Shmuel I 7:16, where we

read how Shmuel "would travel year after year" across the country to encourage and inspire the people, and in this spirit, he explained that my friend should be prepared to do the same. Ultimately, the concept of Eruvin is about strengthening community and also about making room for the other, and given this I shall end this piece with one brief yet stunning insight from Rabbi Sacks who explained that "whenever Jews pray, we end with a prayer for peace, and at that point we take three steps backward.

To make peace you have to make space for someone else. You have to give up a little of your dream for the sake of someone else's dream" (From Optimism to Hope p. 18). He did this for so many of us, and this is what we must continue to do for others as well.

MONDAY 10 NOVEMBER  
THANKS DAVID GROSS

## עירובין צג

Rav rules that in the case of a wall that collapsed between two courtyards one may not carry in either courtyard more than 4 amot just like a karmelit.

Why is one prohibited from carrying in either courtyard? Rav rules like Rebbi Shimon (90a), that all adjoining courtyards are considered one domain and thus one may carry objects from one courtyard to another as long as the utensils being carried were in the courtyard before Shabbat began. Why, then, does he prohibit one from carrying in the courtyard when a wall between the two courtyards collapsed?

Rebbi Shimon's ruling that carrying is permitted between adjacent courtyards applies only when the residents of the courtyards did not make individual eruvin to permit carrying in their respective courtyards. In the case of Rav, each courtyard made its own eruv, permitting the residents of each courtyard to carry items from their homes into the courtyard. Rav maintains that there is a decree that prohibits carrying anything from one courtyard to another, including items that were in the courtyard when Shabbat began, lest one carry items that were still in the house when Shabbat began (such items may not be carried from one courtyard to another). Accordingly, Rav is consistent with his opinion earlier (91a) that Rebbi Shimon does not permit carrying from one courtyard to another when the houses in the courtyard made an eruv which permits items to be carried from the houses into the courtyard.

WEDNESDAY 11 NOVEMBER

## עירובין צד

THANKS TO DR YARDAENA OSBAND - TALKING TALMUD  
PODCAST

The Gemara discusses a case where there is a wall between two chatzerot but the residents did not make an eruv together, so the two chatzerot are not joined together at the beginning of Shabbat. What happens if the wall that separates the two chatzerot collapses on Shabbat, thereby joining the two chatzerot into one?

Can we consider this space now one large chatzer, and if yes, then where can a person carry in the new space? Is a person allowed to carry in his chatzer up until where the wall was standing?

The Gemara shares that this actually happened once to Rav and Shmuel when they were sitting together on Shabbat. They were sitting in a chatzer and a wall that was between two chatzerot fell. Shmuel tells some of the people there with him to place a cloak on

the remnant of the wall.

The Gemara describes how Rav

"אהדרינהו רב לאפיה"

Rav turned his face away. Rav turning his face away shows that he did not agree with Shmuel - Rav paskens one can only carry 4 amot in the chatzer since it was not permitted before Shabbat to carry between the two chatzerot as no eruv was made, whereas Shmuel paskens that one may carry within his chatzer up until the wall (Tosafot explains it is because Rav paskened this was an act of boneh/building whereas Shmuel does not feel this is boneh/building). The Gemara asks, if Rav disagreed with Shmuel why didn't he tell Shmuel?

The Gemara answers, because this took place in Shmuel's home, and Rav was not the halachic authority in Shmuel's residence. The Gemara then wants to understand why Rav turned his face away rather than expressing his disagreement? Rav wanted to make sure that no one who witnessed this would think that he paskened like Shmuel.

This story demonstrates the sensitivity and leadership a halachic authority like Rav understood. While he would not explicitly disagree with Shmuel since he was in Shmuel's home and not the halachic authority, Rav knew that people looked at his actions and were influenced by them. Rav still needed to make it clear to everyone in the chatzer that Shabbat that he had a different psak to Shmuel, and he expressed this by turning his face.

Being an halachic authority and leader requires a balance of understanding the limits of one's influence but at the same time recognizing that the leader's actions are watched and copied.