



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Eruvin, Daf עו – Daf פב

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

-----Daf עו-----76-----

- **R' Nachman in the name of Rabba bar Avuha in the name of Rav** said, if there are 2 chatzeiros with 3 row houses lined up between them (each house at the end opening to one of the chatzeiros), and each chatzer has other houses there as well so that an eiruv is needed, the people of one chatzer may walk through the first house on their side and place the eiruv in the middle house (thereby giving the first house the status of a gatehouse which need not join the eiruv) and the people of the other chatzer can do the same on their side. The result would be that the first house on each side need not contribute to the eiruv, and the middle house also does not need to contribute to the eiruv, because it is the house in which the eiruv is placed in (which never needs to contribute to the eiruv).
- **Rachva** tested the **Rabanan** with the following case. If two chatzeiros had 2 houses (that are attached) in between them, and the people of each chatzer bypassed the first house on their side and placed their eiruv into the second house, would that be an effective placing of the eiruv? Can the first house of each chatzer (which is the second house of the opposite chatzer) be considered a gatehouse for the adjoining chatzer and at the same time be considered a house for the other chatzer? The **Rabanan** answered that the placement of the eiruv in this way makes the eiruv ineffective. Because, if it is considered a gatehouse, placing an eiruv in a gatehouse is ineffective. If it is considered a house, that first house has never joined the eiruv and the eiruv can therefore not be carried through that house.
  - **Q:** Why is this different than the case of **Rabbah**? **Rabbah** said, if one person's eiruv techumin was put in place Friday afternoon and was destroyed bein hashmashos, and another person's eiruv was placed during bein hashmashos and was intact until after nightfall, both eiruvim are effective. If bein hashmashos is considered day for one, how can it be considered night for someone else!? **A:** With regard to bein hashmashos, it is possible that one part is considered day and another is night, and therefore treating it as such will not lead to people making fun of the halachos of the **Rabanan**. However, if we treat one structure as a house for one person and a gatehouse for another person, that will lead to ridicule, so it cannot be done.

**HADRAN ALACH PEREK HADAR!!!**

**PEREK CHALON -- PEREK SHEVI'I**

#### MISHNA

- If two chatzeiros are separated by a wall which has a window that is 4x4 tefachim and is within 10 tefachim to the ground, they have the choice of each chatzer making their own eiruv or of joining into a joint eiruv.
  - If the window is smaller than 4x4 or higher than 10 tefachim off the ground, they must make separate eiruvim and cannot join.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** By stating that a window less than 4x4 is not considered to be an opening, our Mishna seems to be following **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**, who says that the halacha of "lavud" applies to anything less than 4 tefachim!? **A:** Even the **Rabanan** agree that an opening is not considered to be an opening if it is less than 4x4. It is only regarding lavud that they argue and say that a space of even 3 tefachim is not considered to be closed.

#### PACHOS M'ARBA'AH...

- **Q:** The Mishna already said that if it is 4x4 and below 10 tefachim it can join the chatzeiros. Why does the Mishna need to say the negative as well? **A:** It is teaching us that it is only a problem if the *entire* window is

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

above 10 tefachim. However, if even a part of the window is within 10 tefachim of the ground, it will serve to connect the chatzeiros.

- **R' Yochanan** said, if the window between the chatzeiros is round, in order to connect the chatzeiros it must have a circumference of 24 tefachim, with the lower 2+ tefachim sitting within 10 tefachim to the ground, so that if we drew a square of 4x4 inside the circle, part of that square would be within 10 tefachim to the ground.
  - **Q:** A circle's circumference is 3 times its diameter. If so, for the circle to have a diameter of 4 tefachim the circumference only needs to be 12 tefachim!? **A:** The 3:1 ratio is true for a circle. We need to end up with a square that is 4x4. That is why a larger circumference is needed.
    - **Q:** A perimeter of a square encompassing a circle is  $\frac{1}{4}$  greater than the circumference of the circle. If so, the circumference of the circle only needs to be 16 tefachim! Not 24 like **R' Yochanan** said!? **A:** that formula works when encompassing a circle in a square. We need the 4x4 square to be encompassed within the circle. Therefore, the circumference needs to be larger.
    - **Q:** The diagonal of a square is 1.4 times its side. Therefore, the diagonal of this square is 5.6 tefachim (which is the diameter of the circle enclosing it). Based on the 3:1 ratio, the circumference of this circle will only need to be 16.8 tefachim!? **A:** **R' Yochanan** based his measurement on the formula of the **Rabanan** that the circumference of a circle encompassing a square is 1.5 times the perimeter of that square (i.e.  $16 \times 1.5 = 24$ , see Tosfos regarding how it is possible that the **Rabanan** had an erroneous mathematical calculation).

PACHOS M'ARBA'AH AHL ARBA'AH...

- **R' Nachman** said, the only time a window needs to be within 10 tefachim to the ground is when it is joining 2 chatzeiros. However, a window between 2 houses would join the 2 houses even if it was above 10 tefachim. This is so because we view the house as if it was full of things so that the window was within 10 tefachim to the ground.
  - **Q:** **Rava** asked **R' Nachman**, a Braisa says: A window between chatzeiros, between 2 houses, between 2 attics, between 2 roofs, or between 2 rooms, are all the same in that they must be 4x4 and within 10 tefachim to the ground!? **A:** The halacha regarding being within 10 tefachim to the ground only applies to a window between chatzeiros.
    - **Q:** The Braisa says "they are all the same"! **A:** That was said in regard to the 4x4 requirement.
  - **Q:** **R' Abba** asked **R' Nachman**, if a ground floor and attic are owned by different people, and there is an opening in the floor of the attic, does there need to be a permanent ladder in place to access that opening in order to join the floors? Do we say that we view a house as filled with things only with regard to reaching heights on a wall, or do we say so even for this opening in the ceiling? **A:** **R' Nachman** said, no permanent ladder is needed.
    - **R' Abba** thought this meant that a temporary ladder would be necessary. However, **R' Yosef bar Minyumi in the name of R' Nachman** said, no ladder at all is needed.

-----Daf ת"ז---77-----

MISHNA

- A wall between two chatzeiros that is 10 tefachim high and 4 tefachim thick, separates the chatzeiros and they must each make their own eiruv.
  - If there is fruit on top of the wall, the people of each chatzer may climb the wall and eat the fruit on top, but may not bring the fruit down off the wall (the top of the wall is considered to be its own reshut because it is 10 tefachim high and 4 tefachim wide).
- If there is a breach in the wall less than 10 amos wide, it is considered an entranceway and the chatzeiros can therefore decide to either make separate eiruvim or join as one.
  - If the breach is wider than 10 amos, the chatzeiros are considered to be connected and must make one joint eiruv.

GEMARA

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** What is the halacha if the wall is not 4 tefachim wide? **A:** **Rav** says, in that case the top of the wall belongs to both chatzeiros, and therefore nothing may be moved at all, even if standing on top of the wall. **R' Yochanan** says the people of each chatzer may carry food to the top of the wall and eat there (it has a din of a makom petur because it is less than 4 tefachim wide).
  - **Q:** Our Mishna says that the people of each chatzer may climb the wall and eat the food there. This would seem that they are not allowed to carry the food and bring it up there!? **A:** If the wall is 4 tefachim wide, food may not be brought up there. If it is less than 4 tefachim wide, food may be brought up there.
  - **R' Yochanan** is consistent with what he says elsewhere. **R' Dimi** said in the name of **R' Yochanan** that a pillar that is less than 4 tefachim wide, which is situated in between the reshus hayachid and the reshus harabim, may be used by people of either reshus to place their packages on.
    - **Q:** Does **Rav** not agree with this halacha? **A:** He agrees that with regard to carrying in a place that is assur D'Oraisa, we are lenient and we allow placing of packages down on such an area. However, in between chatzeiros, which is only assur to carry D'Rabanan, we are not as lenient, so that people do not take the words of the **Rabanan** lightly.
- **Rabbah bar R' Huna in the name of R' Nachman** said, if the wall between 2 chatzeiros is 10 tefachim high for one chatzer but is less than 10 tefachim for the other chatzer, we allow the chatzer for which the wall is less than 10 tefachim to use the top of the wall. The rule is, when a use is easy for one and difficult for another, we allow the use for the one with the easy use.
  - **R' Shizbi in the name of R' Nachman** said, if there is a ditch between 2 chatzeiros which is 10 tefachim deep for one chatzer and less than 10 tefachim deep for the other, we allow the chatzer for which the ditch is less than 10 tefachim to use the ditch. The rule is, when a use is easy for one and difficult for another, we allow the use for the one with the easy use.
    - We need to be taught both these cases. If we would just be taught the case of the wall, we would say that is the halacha because it is easy for people to use the top of a wall, so we give it to the chatzer. However, people do not usually use ditches, and therefore we would think that neither chatzer gets rights to it. If we would just say the case of the ditch, we would think that only there we give the use to one chatzer, because it can be used without fear of falling off. However, in the case of the wall where there is fear of falling off, maybe we don't give the use to any chatzer.
- If the people of the chatzer build up the ground (with dirt or by building a platform) to decrease the height of the wall to less than 10 tefachim, if the built up area is 4 tefachim wide, it has the status of a door, and the people of that chatzer may transfer to anywhere on the wall. If it is less than 4 tefachim wide, he may only use the area opposite the built up area.
  - **Q:** If the build-up is effective, the entire wall should be permissible. If it is not, then none of the wall should be permissible!? **A:** We are talking about where one decreases the height of the wall by removing a section from the top of the wall. If it is 4 tefachim wide, it acts as an opening to the entire wall. If it is less, it is only that section that is less than 10 tefachim and may therefore be used.
  - **R' Yechiel** said, if one turns over a bowl at the wall, and the height from the bowl to the top of the wall is less than 10 tefachim, it is effective in allowing use of the wall.
    - **Q:** The bowl may be moved and Shabbos, and therefore shouldn't act to reduce the wall!? **A:** He buried the edges of the bowl in dirt, so that it cannot be removed on Shabbos.
      - **Q:** A Braisa says that as long as part of the item is sticking out it would be mutar to remove the item. The same would be with this bowl!? **A:** The bowl has a rim and if he picks up the bowl he will pick up earth with it, which would be assur to do on Shabbos.
      - **Q:** A Mishna says that one may pull partially exposed radishes from the ground (that were reinserted to the ground to ripen) even though he will inevitably remove dirt!? **A:** He attached the bowl to the ground in such a way that it can only be removed with an ax or the like. Therefore, it will not be removed on Shabbos.
- A Mitzri ladder placed against a wall is not considered to decrease the height of the wall, but a Tzuri ladder does.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **The Yeshiva of R' Yannai** explained, a Mitzri ladder is any ladder with less than 4 rungs.
- **Q: R' Acha the son of Rava** asked **R' Ashi**, why does a Mitzri ladder not decrease the height of the wall?  
**A:** He said, **Rav** explained because it may be moved on Shabbos, and anything that may be moved on Shabbos does not decrease the height of a wall.
  - **Q:** A Tzuri ladder may be moved on Shabbos as well?! **A:** Because it is so heavy it is considered to be permanent.
- **Abaye** said, if a wall between 2 chatzeiros is 10 tefachim high, and has ladders which are 4 tefachim wide on both sides of the wall, and the tops of the ladders are within 3 tefachim to each other, they act as if they are an opening between the 2 chatzeiros and they serve to connect the two chatzeiros. If they are more than 3 tefachim apart, they do not connect the chatzeiros unless the top of the wall is 4 tefachim wide.
- **R' Bibi bar Abaye** said, if one built 2 platforms (to reduce the height of a wall), one on the ground and one standing on legs and hovering in the air above the one on the ground, if the platform on the ground is 4 tefachim wide, it decreases the height of the wall. If only the upper platform is 4 tefachim wide, but it is within 3 tefachim to the lower platform, it also reduces the height of the wall (if it is more than 3 tefachim away, it is not considered connected to the ground and would therefore not be effective to decrease the height of the wall).
- **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** said, a ladder with rungs (our typical ladders), if the bottom rung (which is within 3 tefachim to the ground) is 4 tefachim wide, or, even if only the upper rung is 4 tefachim wide and there is less than 3 tefachim between rungs, the rung decreases the height of the wall.
- **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** also said, if a wall between chatzeiros has a protrusion that is 4x4 tefachim, and one places a ladder of any size against it, it reduces the height of the wall. However, the ladder must be placed leaning on the protrusion, not leaning on the wall next to the protrusion.
- **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** also said, a wall that is 19 tefachim tall only needs one protrusion of the wall (which must be within 10 tefachim to the ground (with a ladder attaching it to the ground) and within 10 tefachim to the top of the wall) to allow items to be transferred from the chatzer to the top of the wall. However, a wall that is higher than 20 tefachim will need at least 2 protrusions to allow use of the top of the wall. One protrusion will have to be within 10 tefachim of the ground (with a ladder leaning against it) and the other will have to be within 10 tefachim to the top of the wall (with a ladder from the first protrusion leaning against the second protrusion), and there must be less than 10 tefachim between the protrusions.
  - **R' Chisda** said, the protrusions must be situated so that they are not one on top of the other, because the ladder must be standing on the first protrusion and be leaned against the second protrusion.

### -----Daf פ"ז--78-----

- **R' Huna** said, a pillar in the reshus harabim which is 10 tefachim high and 4 tefachim wide (the top of the pillar therefore has the status of a reshus hayachid) can be decreased in size (thereby removing the reshus hayachid status and giving it makom petur status) by sticking any sized nail into the top of the pillar.
  - **R' Ada bar Ahava** said, the nail must be at least 3 tefachim high from the top of the pillar. **Abaye and Rava** both say that it can even be less than 3 tefachim, because the nail makes that area of the top of the pillar not usable. **R' Ashi** said, even if it is 3 tefachim high it does not make the pillar into a makom petur, because the nail is useful in that things can be hung from it. Therefore, it is considered part of the pillar and does not change its reshus hayachid status.
    - **Q: R' Acha the son of Rava** asked **R' Ashi**, what would be the halacha if one filled the entire surface of the pillar with nails? **A: R' Ashi** answered, **R' Yochanan** said that the mound of dirt around a ditch combines with it to give it the necessary measurement for a reshus hayachid (if the depth of the pit combined with the height of the mound is 10 tefachim, and the width of the pit and the mound is 4 tefachim, it is considered a reshus hayachid). Even though a person can't use the full width of the mound with the ditch (because of the hole), since he can place a board or the like across it and use it, it is considered usable and considered a reshus hayachid. The same logic applies to making the area on top of the pegs useful.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, in order to connect chatzeiros that are separated by a wall that is 10 tefachim high, with use of ladders, a ladder of 14 tefachim must be used. This is because a ladder standing

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

straight up is difficult to use and will not be considered to connect the chatzeiros. Therefore, the bottom of the ladder must be at least 4 tefachim away from the wall, which would create an easier angle. With a 14 tefach ladder, the ladder will still reach the top of the wall. **R' Yosef** says the ladders only need to be 13 tefachim and a little more, because he holds that the ladders need only reach to within a tefach of the top of the wall. **Abaye** says the ladders only need to be 11 tefachim and a little more, because he holds that the top of the ladders only need to be within 3 tefachim (lavud) of the top of the wall. **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** says, the ladders only need to be 7 tefachim and a little more, because he says the ladders can even be placed vertically along the wall, and he says that it only needs to get to within 3 tefachim of the top of the wall.

- **Rav** said, I have a kabala that a vertical ladder is effective in reducing the height of a wall, but I do not know why this is the case. **Shmuel** said, the reason is because it is like a platform on top of a platform, which reduces the height of the wall even though it is up vertically against the wall.
- **Rabbah in the name of R' Chiya** said, pieces of the trunks of palm trees can be used to decrease the height of a wall without them being attached to the ground. Although they may be moved on Shabbos, the fact that they are so heavy gives them the status of permanence. **R' Yosef in the name of R' Oshaya** said, ladders of Bavel also need not be attached to the ground to decrease the height of a wall, because their heavy weight gives them permanent status.
  - The tree trunks are heavier than the ladder, so **R' Oshaya** would definitely agree that tree trunks may be used, but **R' Chiya** may hold that ladders may not be used.
- **Q: R' Yosef** asked **Rabbah**, if one took 2 ladders, each less than 2 tefachim wide, and attached them in the middle with rungs of straw so that the new “ladder” together is 4 tefachim wide, will that be effective? **A: Rabbah** said, since the straw cannot hold someone’s weight if he were to step on it, it is not effective.
  - **Q:** He asked, what if he placed a regular ladder in the middle and extended it on each side with rungs of straw (people typically step in the middle of the ladder, so maybe this will be ok)? **A:** He answered that this is a valid extension of the ladder.
  - **Q:** He asked, if one extends the width of a ladder by carving out the wall next to the ladder, how high must he carve the wall with a width of 4 tefachim? **A:** He answered it must be carved out to a height of 10 tefachim. **Q:** He asked, if one carved the entire ladder from the wall, how high must the carved ladder go to a width of 4 tefachim? **A:** He answered, it must go up the full height of the wall.
    - **Q:** Why is the halacha different in these 2 cases? **A:** It is easier to go up an actual ladder, therefore the top can be narrower than 4 tefachim as long as the bottom is 4 tefachim. When carved totally into the wall, because it is more difficult, we require the entire ladder to be at least 4 tefachim wide.
  - **Q:** He asked, can a tree be an effective ladder to decrease the height of a wall even though it can’t be climbed on Shabbos? This can be asked according to **Rebbi** who allows an eiruv techumin to be placed in a tree, because maybe he only allows that there because you only need access during bein hashmashos, but here, maybe without access the entire Shabbos it cannot act to decrease the wall?! This can also be asked according to the **Rabanan** who do not allow an eiruv to be placed in a tree, maybe here it would still be effective because the “opening” exists, but it is as if there is “a lion blocking access”!? **Q2:** What about using an “asheirah” tree (a tree worshipped as avoda zarah which is assur to benefit from) as the ladder? This can be asked according to **R' Yehuda** who allows an eiruv techumin to be placed on a grave (although it is assur to benefit from a grave), because maybe he only allows that there because there is no true benefit of placing the eiruv there, since he doesn’t care if the eiruv is left unprotected, but here, there is true benefit from using the tree and it therefore cannot act to decrease the wall?! This can also be asked according to the **Rabanan** who do not allow an eiruv to be placed on a grave, because maybe here it would still be effective because the “opening” exists, but it is as if there is “a lion blocking access”!? **A: Rabbah** answered that the first case is permitted, but the case of the “asheirah” tree is prohibited.
    - **Q: R' Chisda** asked, logic would dictate that in the case of a tree, where the entire prohibition of use is related to Shabbos, and we are trying to use it for Shabbos, that case should definitely be prohibited. However, in the case of an “asheirah” (which was no longer attached to the ground),

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

since the prohibition is not related to Shabbos, and the prohibition can be removed by a goy, that is the case that should be permitted!?

- **R' Elazar and R' Yochanan** in fact pasken like **R' Chisda** says logic would dictate.
- **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said the case of the tree would be a machlokes between **Rebbi and the Rabanan**, and the case of the asheirah would be a machlokes between **R' Yehuda and the Rabanan**.

### MISHNA

- If 2 chatzeiros are separated by a ditch which is 10 tefachim deep and 4 tefachim wide, even if the ditch is filled with straw, they must make separate eiruv. If the ditch is filled with earth or rocks, they must make a joint eiruv.
- If one places a board (as a bridge) which is 4 tefachim wide over the ditch (not filled with earth or rocks), or if one places such a board from one balcony to a facing balcony, they can make separate eiruv or they can join one eiruv. If the board is less than 4 tefachim, they must make two separate eiruv.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** A Mishna says that a stack of straw 10 tefachim high separates 2 chatzeiros and requires them to make separate eiruv. How can we say that straw does not “fill up” the ditch as well? **A: Abaye** explained, all agree that straw can act as a wall. With regard to filling the ditch, if one intends on leaving it there, it would fill up the ditch. If one intends to move the straw it will not.

### MALEI AFAR

- **Q:** A Mishna says that earth and rocks only “fill” a house when they are intended to be left there!? **A:** That Mishna follows **R' Yose**.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Yose** holds that earth is automatically considered to be “intended” to be left there unless he expressly intends otherwise!? **A: R' Assi** says, *our* Mishna follows **R' Yose** and the other Mishna does not. **A2: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** says, we cannot ask from a Mishna that discusses tumah to our Mishna which discusses Shabbos. Typically earth is not intended to be left. However, on Shabbos it is, because it is assur to move it on Shabbos. **A3: R' Ashi** says, you can't ask a question from a case of a house to a case of a ditch. Earth and rocks are intended to be left in a ditch (to thereby fill it up), but are not typically intended to be left in a house.

## -----Daf 79-----

### NASAN ALAV NESER SHEROCHAV ARBA'AH

- **Rava** said, a board 4 tefachim wide is only necessary when the board is being placed across the ditch. However, if the board is being placed along the ditch (parallel to it and overhanging it on one side somewhat), a board of any width will join the chatzeiros because the board is effective in narrowing the ditch to less than 4 tefachim wide.

### V'CHEIN SHTEI GEZUZTERAOS ZU K'NEGED ZU

- **Rava** said, balconies that are not aligned are only a problem if they are unaligned (either in height or in depth) by 3 tefachim or more (the board connecting them would then have to be on a noticeable slant). Anything less than that would not be a problem.

### MISHNA

- Two chatzeiros that are separated by a haystack that is 10 tefachim high, cannot join into one eiruv and must make two separate eiruv.
  - Each chatzer may feed their animals from their side of the haystack.
  - If the haystack is reduced to less than 10 tefachim, they must make a joint eiruv and cannot make 2 separate eiruv.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### GEMARA

- **R' Huna** said, the people may not fill up baskets with straw to give to their animals, because we are afraid that they will reduce the haystack to less than 10 tefachim. It is mashma that **R' Huna** allows one to lead his animal to the haystack to eat.
  - **Q: R' Huna in the name of R' Chanina** said, a person may stand his animal on grass attached to the ground to eat (and we are not afraid that the person will rip out grass to feed the animal, because he will not transgress a D'Oraisa), but he may not stand his animal on muktzeh to eat (we are afraid that he will move the muktzeh, because it is only a D'Rabanan). Taking from the haystack is also D'Rabanan, so we should not let him lead his animal there to eat!? **A:** He is only allowed to stand in front of his animal in a way that will cause the animal will go to the haystack and eat, but he cannot take the animal there.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, "If a house is between chatzeiros and it is full of straw, the chatzeiros must make 2 separate eiruvim. Each chatzer may come and fill their baskets with straw from their side of the house. If the straw gets lower than 10 tefachim, neither chatzer may carry in the house. What can be done is for one chatzer to lock its entrance to the house and relinquish its rights, in which case that chatzer would be assur to that house but the other chatzer would be mutar. And the same concept would apply to a ditch full of straw, when the ditch at the point between the techum of two cities." The Braisa clearly says that they may fill up their baskets with the straw!? **A:** When the straw is in a roofed structure they may do so because it will be obvious when the straw gets to below 10 tefachim (the proximity to the roof makes that determination easy).
    - **Q:** The Braisa said, if the straw gets to below 10 tefachim, both chatzeiros become assur to that house. It seems that if it was exactly 10 tefachim it would still be mutar. This would mean that even temporary walls are considered walls even if they do not reach the ceiling (which is a matter of machlokes)? **A: Abaye** said, the Braisa is discussing a house whose ceiling is a little less than 13 tefachim high. Therefore, when the straw is 10 tefachim high, with lavud it is considered to reach the ceiling. **A2: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** said, the Braisa could be talking about a house with a 10 tefachim high ceiling, and the straw is a bit more than 7 tefachim high. With lavud the straw is viewed as reaching the ceiling.
      - According to **Abaye**, when the Braisa says the straw is 10 tefachim high, it means so literally. According to **R' Huna**, it means that it is considered to be 10 tefachim high through the concept of lavud.
    - **Q:** The Braisa said that if the straw becomes less than 10 tefachim high, both chatzeiros become assur. It is mashma that when new residents are introduced into a chatzer on Shabbos, they prohibit everyone from carrying? **A:** It could be that the straw became less than 10 tefachim before Shabbos. However, if it would have become less on Shabbos, it could be that they would not be assur.
    - **Q:** Why does the Braisa say that one chatzer must lock their door *and* relinquish their rights? **A:** The Braisa means that they can do one or the other. **A2:** Since they are so used to carrying there, they need to do both things to prevent them from carrying there.
    - **Q:** It is obvious that the one chatzer becomes prohibited and the other is mutar. Why does the Braisa tell us that "the people of the other chatzer are assur to carry there"? **A:** The Braisa is telling us that even if the second chatzer then relinquishes the rights back to the first chatzer, it is ineffective.
    - **Q:** It is obvious that the same halacha would apply to a ditch in between the techum of 2 cities!? **A:** The Braisa is telling us that even according to **R' Akiva** who says that techum is D'Oraisa, we are not goizer and we allow each city to take from their side.

### MISHNA

- One can make a shituf for his mavoi without having to collect food from all the members of the mavoi. He can take a barrel of his own food and say that it should belong to all members of the mavoi. He then has his adult

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

sons or daughters, or his Jewish slaves, or his wife be koneh it for them. He cannot have his minor sons or daughters, or his non-Jewish slaves be koneh for them, because their hands are like his hands.

### GEMARA

- **R' Yehuda** says, the person being koneh for the members of the mavoi must lift the barrel of food one tefach off the ground.
  - **Rava** said the Elders of Pumbedisa (**R' Yehuda and his Yeshiva**) said the following 2 halachos: 1) the mentioned above. 2) One who makes Kiddush must drink a cheek-full of the wine to be yotzeh.
    - **R' Chaviva** said, the Elders of Pumbedisa said another halacha: **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, we may light a large fire on Shabbos for a woman who has just given birth to warm herself (she is put in danger if she is not warm). It was initially thought that this halacha only applied to a woman who had given birth (but not any other sick person) and only in the winter (when it is cold). However, **R' Chiya bar Avin in the name of Shmuel** said it applies to all sick people and even in the summer months.
    - **Ameimar** said, the Elders of Pumbedisa said another halacha: Which tree do we assume to be an ashierah tree (worshipped for avoda zarah)? **Rav** said, if the assistants of an avoda zarah guard this tree and don't eat from its fruits. **Shmuel** said, also, if we hear them saying that the dates of this tree will be used for beer to drink on the holiday of an avodah zarah. The **Elders of Pumbedisa** paskened like **Shmuel**.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that the barrel of food only needs to be lifted a tiny amount!? **A:** The "tiny amount" needed is a tefach.

### -----Daf 80-----

- **Rav** says that no kinyan need be made to me makneh a shituf made by one person for all the members of the mavoi. **Shmuel** says a kinyan does need to be made. However, when making an eruv techumin for himself and others (as described in the upcoming Mishnayos), **Rav** says a kinyan must be made and **Shmuel** says no kinyan needs to be made.
  - **Q: Shmuel's** view regarding each case follows the Mishna in each case. Why does **Rav** not follow the Mishnayos? **A:** It is a machlokes Tannaim. With regard to techumin we find that **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** tells a story that **R' Oshaya's** daughter in law was beyond the techum when Shabbos began, but his wife prepared an eiruv techumin for her before Shabbos began. **R' Chiya** (who was **Rav's** rebbi) said the eiruv was ineffective. **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yose** said, his father said we can be lenient regarding eiruv. The talmidim asked, was **R' Chiya** machmir because the eiruv food belonged to the mother-in-law and she failed to be makneh it to her daughter-in-law, or was it because although the food was the daughter-in-law's, the eiruv was done without her knowledge? **R' Yaakov** said, it was because the mother-in-law was not makneh it to her. Based on this, **Rav** followed his rebbi and required that a kinyan be made for an eruv techumin.
  - **R' Nachman** asked, does an eiruv tavshilin made for someone else need to be "given" to the other person via a kinyan or not? **R' Yosef** asked, did **R' Nachman** not hear that **Shmuel** said a kinyan is required!? **Abaye** said, **R' Nachman** must have not heard that, because he would not question something that **Shmuel** said. **R' Yosef** said to **Abaye**, we know that **Shmuel** said that an eiruv techumin does not need to be given with a kinyan to the people it is being made for, and yet **R' Nachman** says it does!? We see he doesn't simply follow **Shmuel**!? **Abaye** said, he says different than **Shmuel** there because **Rav** argues with him. Regarding eiruv tavshilin no one argues on **Shmuel**, so had **R' Nachman** known what **Shmuel** said, he would not have questioned it.
- There was a goy who lived in the neighborhood of **R' Zeira** and he would not lease his rights to allow the Yidden to make an eiruv. The people asked **R' Zeira** whether they could lease the rights from the goy's wife. He said that **Reish Lakish in the name of R' Chanina** allowed a wife to join an eiruv without the husband's consent, so this should likewise be permitted. A similar story happened and **R' Yehuda** said that **Shmuel** allowed a wife to join an eiruv without her husband's consent, so this should likewise be permitted.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A Braisa says that women who join an eiruv or shituf without their husbands' consent, the eiruv or shituf is not effective!? **A:** Women are permitted to join without their husbands' consent if their joining is necessary to validate the eiruv. If it is not necessary, they may not join without their husbands' consent.
  - **Shmuel** must agree with this distinction, because **Shmuel** says elsewhere that a woman who lives in between 2 mavois (in which case we view her as belonging to the mavois that she normally accesses) may join the eiruv of the mavois she normally accesses (and whose eiruv will be passul unless she is to join) without her husband's consent. We see that it is only in that mavois that she may join without consent, but to join the other mavois (whose eiruv will be mutar without her participation) she would need her husband's consent.
  - Proof to this principle can be brought from the fact that a Braisa allows us to force a member of a mavois to contribute towards the cost of a lechi or korah. Presumably the same would be that we can force him to contribute to the eiruv or shituf. However, the Gemara says that a lechi and korah offer some protection and security for the mavois, and it may be because of that reason that we can force him to contribute towards those.
- **R' Chiya bar Ashi** says we may make a lechi from an asheira tree. **Reish Lakish** says we may make a korah from an asheira.
  - **Reish Lakish** would surely allow a lechi made of an asheira, because a lechi can be of any minute width. **R' Chiya** may not allow a korah to be made of an asheira, because a korah needs to be of a certain size and strength, and since an asheira must be burned, it is as if it is of no size.

### MISHNA

- If the amount of food of the shituf diminished to less than the required amount before Shabbos, he must add more food and be makneh it to the people, but need not let them know that he is adding food (even if he took food from them). If more residents joined the mavois, he must add food to the shituf (if there isn't enough for them), be makneh it to them, and he must let them know (if he is taking food from them).
- How much food is needed for a shituf? If there are "many" residents, there needs to be enough for two meals' worth for one person. If there are "few" residents, there needs to be enough for the size of a dried fig for each person.
  - **R' Yose** said, this is true when an eiruv is initially set up. However, for an eiruv that is already in existence, as long as any small amount remains, it is an effective eiruv.
  - The only reason the **Rabanan** said an eiruvei chatzeiros needs to be made if a shituf is in place, is so that the children should not forget about the halachos of eiruv chatzeiros.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna said that if the food in the eiruv diminished, more can be added without the consent of the members. We have learned that if the same type of food is being added, consent should not be needed even if the eiruv is completely gone. If a different type of food is being added, consent should be needed even if the eiruv has only been partly diminished (which is the halacha as stated in a Braisa). If so, what is the case of the Mishna which says that consent is not needed to add to a diminished eiruv? **A:** We can answer that the Mishna is discussing adding the same food and the Mishna actually means to say that no consent is needed even if the eiruv is totally gone. We can also answer that the Mishna is discussing adding a different food to a partly diminished eiruv. The Braisa, which requires consent, was discussing a case where the eiruv was totally gone.

### NITOSFU ALEIHEN MOISIF U'MIZAKEH...

- **R' Shizbi in the name of R' Chisda** said, our Mishna which says that the consent of the new residents is needed to join them to the shituf argues with **R' Yehuda** of a later Mishna who says that consent is not needed for eiruvei chatzeiros.
  - **Q:** It is obvious that they argue!? **A:** We would think that our Mishna is discussing a chatzer that is between two mavois, in which case they have a choice to join whichever mavois they prefer. But, in the

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

case of a chatzer in one mavo, maybe no consent would be needed. **R' Chisda** teaches that even in that case our Mishna requires consent.

KAMAH HU SHIUROI...

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, “many” residents means 18 or more residents.
  - **Q:** What is special about 18 residents that the required amount changes? **A: R' Yitzchak the son of R' Yehuda** said that his father explained to him, when there are 18 residents, if each one were to have an amount of a dry fig, it would equal the amount of 2 meals' worth of food. We are meikel and never require more than that amount to be given. We are also meikel the other way - if there are less than 18 people they only need to give enough food for a dried fig size for each person, which totals to less than the amount needed for 2 meals' worth.

### -----Daf נד-----81-----

MISHNA

- **R' Eliezer** says, all foods can be used for an eiruv or a shituf, except for water and salt. **R' Yehoshua** says, an eiruv can only be made from complete loaves of bread, even if they are very small. Broken pieces cannot be used for a eiruv, even if they are very large.

GEMARA

- **Q:** An earlier Mishna already said that all can be used for eiruv and shituf except for water and salt. Why does the Mishna repeat it here? **A: Rabbah** said, our Mishna repeats it to contrast it with the view of **R' Yehoshua** who says that only whole loaves of bread may be used. The Mishna teaches that **R' Eliezer** says that all foods may be used.
  - **Q: Abaye** asks, a Braisa says like our Mishna that an eiruv and shituf may be made with “everything”, but then goes on to say that an eiruv must be made with bread and a shituf can be made with all foods. We see that when our Mishna says an eiruv may be made with “everything”, it may mean only bread. If our Mishna is understood like that, it does not argue on **R' Yehoshua** at all, so why did we repeat it!? **A: Rabbah bar bar Chana** says, the Mishna is teaching that **R' Eliezer** does not hold like **R' Yehoshua** and he allows even pieces of bread to be used for the eiruv.
    - **Q:** Why does **R' Yehoshua** not allow using pieces of bread? **A: R' Yose ben Shaul in the name of Rabbi** said, he is afraid it will cause fights between the people who contribute whole loaves and those who contribute broken loaves.
    - **Q: R' Acha the son of Rava** asked **R' Ashi**, would it be permitted if all members contributed broken loaves (there is no reason for them to fight)? **A:** He said it will not be permitted, because that will lead to some people giving full loaves and others giving broken loaves in another case.
- **R' Yochanan ben Shaul** said, if a piece is removed from a loaf for purposes of taking “challah”, or for purposes of removing a piece to remove its safek terumah status if terumah and chullin were mixed into the dough (but the terumah was at most 1% of the mixture), those remaining loaves are considered to be “complete loaves”.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that if challah was removed from a loaf the loaf is no longer considered complete!? **A:** If the challah is taken off by a commercial baker (who only has to give half the amount of challah that a layman must give), it is still considered to be complete. If the challah was taken off by a layman, the loaf is no longer considered to be complete.
- **R' Chisda** says, if one reattaches a broken loaf with a toothpick, it may be used for an eiruv.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that may not be used!? **A:** If it is noticeably broken and reattached, it may not be used. If it looks whole, it may be used.
- **R' Zeira in the name of Shmuel** said, an eiruv may be made of rice bread and “dochan” bread. **Mar Ukva** said that **Shmuel** only allowed using rice bread. **R' Chiya bar Avin in the name of Rav** said that lentil bread may be used.
  - **Q:** We find that **Shmuel** once made lentil bread, and his dog wouldn't even eat it!? **A:** That bread was made of many different types of flour, including lentil flour.

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## MISHNA

- **R' Eliezer** says that a person may give money to a storeowner or baker who lives in his chatzer so that he can buy into the food or bread that will be used for the eiruv. The **Chachomim** say that money cannot make a kinyan (he needs “meshicha” – to drag the item) and therefore it is not an effective way to join the eiruv (he showed that he doesn't want to get the food for free, and therefore an attempt to do so will not be effective).
  - The **Chachomim** agree that giving money to someone other than a storeowner or baker acts as an instruction to that person to act as a shaliach to join this person in the eiruv. Therefore it is effective, because he is clearly consenting to being joined in the eiruv, which is necessary for one to join an eiruv.
  - **R' Yehuda** says, consent is only necessary to join one in an eiruv techumin (because although it increases his ability to travel in one direction, it limits his travel distance in the other direction). Consent is not necessary to join someone into an eiruv chatzeiros (because it is only benefit for him and no detriment).

## GEMARA

- **Q:** How can **R' Eliezer** say that by giving money he has joined an eiruv? He only gave money and cannot take ownership since he did not do meshicha (which the **Rabanan** require for one to make a kinyan)!? **A:** **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avahu** said, **R' Eliezer** says, to help facilitate the establishment of the eiruv we allow the kinyan to take place with the mere transfer of money (which is the halacha D'Oraisa). We find that this allowance is also made at other times when we want to facilitate a kinyan (e.g. before certain Yomim Tovim, when everybody is looking to buy meat, the Mishna says that one is koneh meat that he buys by a mere tendering of money, even without meshicha).

## UMODIM B'SHA'AR KOL HA'ADAM...

- **Rav and Shmuel** say, the “other people” referred to in the Mishna are regular balei batim (homeowners who are not storeowners or bakers).
  - **Shmuel** also said, giving money to the storeowner or baker does not effect a kinyan, but giving them a keili would (it would be a “kinyan chalipin”).
  - **Shmuel** also said, it is only a problem if he told the storeowner or baker to “give me ownership” for the money. However, if he told them to “make an eiruv for me”, he has appointed them as a shaliach and they can include him in an eiruv.

## AMAR R' YEHUDA BAMEH DEVARIM AMURIM...

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said that we pasken like **R' Yehuda**. Moreover, we pasken like **R' Yehuda** whenever he has a psak with regard to eiruv.
  - **Q: R' Chana of Baghdad** asked, did **Shmuel** say we follow **R' Yehuda** even in regard to his psak about a lechi or korah that fell on Shabbos (he said that it remains mutar to carry in that mavoi the entire Shabbos)? **A: R' Yehuda** answered, he only paskened like him regarding establishing an eiruv, not regarding matters that have to do with a wall (which is what a lechi and korah are).
  - **Q: R' Acha the son of Rava** asked **R' Ashi**, if we pasken like **R' Yehuda** in the Mishna, that means that someone argues on him. But, **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, that whenever **R' Yehuda** says “Eimasai” or “Bameh” (like in our Mishna) he is only explaining the previous shitah, and not arguing!
    - **Q:** The previous Mishna says that we do need people's consent for eiruv, which clearly does argue on **R' Yehuda**! **A:** That could be discussing a case where a chatzer has a choice to join one of 2 mavois, in which case, joining one is a detriment because he would be stopped from joining the other. In that case even **R' Yehuda** may agree that his consent is needed.
    - **Q:** We learned that **R' Shizbi in the name of R' Chisda** said that the previous Mishna does argue on **R' Yehuda**! **A: Shmuel** says that **R' Yehuda** is arguing (which is why he had to pasken like him) and **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** says he does not argue.
- **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said that whenever **R' Yehuda** says “Eimasai” or “Bameh” (like in our Mishna) he is only explaining the previous shitah of the **Rabanan**, and is not arguing. **R' Yochanan** says, when **R' Yehuda** says “Eimasai” he is only explaining the **Rabanan**. However, when he says “Bameh”, he is arguing.

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

HADRAN ALACH PEREK CHALON!!!

-----Daf כב---82-----

## MISHNA

- How can one set up a communal eiruv techumin to allow anyone to join? He places a barrel of food at the place of the eiruv and he states that it should be for anyone in the city who needs to make use of it to go comfort a mourner or join a wedding party. Anyone in the city who accepts to have the eiruv effective for him before Shabbos begins, is permitted to travel based upon that eiruv. If he makes that decision after Shabbos had begun, the eiruv is not effective for him, because an eiruv must be established before Shabbos begins.

## GEMARA

- **R' Yosef** said, one may only establish an eiruv techumim to facilitate the performance of a mitzvah.
  - **Q:** That is obvious, because our Mishna says the person set up the eiruv to allow one to go do a mitzvah!? **A:** We would have thought that the Mishna is saying the usual case, that it is set up for one who has to travel for those reasons, but it may in fact be set up for any reason. **R' Yosef** teaches that it may only be set up for a mitzvah.

## V'CHOL SHEKIBAL ALAV MIB'OD YOM

- **Q:** Since the eiruv must be accepted before Shabbos begins, it seems that the Mishna does not hold of the concept of “breirah”!? **A: R' Ashi** said, the Mishna means that he must have knowledge before Shabbos that the eiruv exists. If he does, he would be allowed to decide to use it on Shabbos and the principle of breirah would make his choice effective from before Shabbos.
- **R' Assi** says, a child in his 6<sup>th</sup> year (and certainly a child who is younger than that) automatically gets the boundary of his mother's eiruv.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that a child who still “needs his mother” gets the boundary of her eiruv. A child who does not “need his mother” does not automatically get the boundaries of his mother's eiruv. With regard to the obligation of sitting in a succah, a Mishna uses the term of a child who doesn't “need his mother”. **R' Yannai** explained the term to mean a child who can go to the bathroom and doesn't need his mother to clean him. **Reish Lakish** says it means a child who wakes up without screaming incessantly for his mother. The Gemara explains that this refers to a child who is in his 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> year. This is different than **R' Assi** said! **A: R' Yehoshua the son of R' Idi** said that **R' Assi** would agree that a child is only automatically included in his mother's eiruv until the end of the 5<sup>th</sup> year. **R' Assi** was talking about a case where a child's father made him an eiruv in one direction, and his mother made him an eiruv in another direction. **R' Assi** says, a child, even in his 6<sup>th</sup> year, wants to be with his mother, and therefore the eiruv that his mother set up for him is the one that will be effective.
    - **Q:** A Braisa says that a child until his 6<sup>th</sup> year gets the boundaries of his mother's eiruv. That is not like **R' Yehoshua** has just explained!? **A: TIYUFTA.** This refutes **R' Yehoshua's** explanation.
    - **Q:** This seems to refute **R' Assi** as well, because the Braisa says “until” the 6<sup>th</sup> year, and **R' Assi** said though the 6<sup>th</sup> year!? **A: R' Assi** says “until” means “until and including” the 6<sup>th</sup> year.
    - **Q:** This seems to refute **R' Yannai and Reish Lakish**!? **A:** The case in Succah was where the boy's father was in town. Therefore, even at a younger age he was not so dependent on his mother. The Braisa is discussing where the father is not around and that is why even an older child needs his mother.
- A Braisa says, a person may make an eiruv for his minor children and for his non-Jewish slaves, even without their consent. However, he may make an eiruv for his adult children, his Jewish slaves and his wife, only with their consent.
  - Another Braisa says this as well. It says, “a person cannot make an eiruv for his adult children, Jewish slaves, or wife without their consent, but can make for his minor children and non-Jewish slaves without their consent, because they are viewed as an extension of him. In fact, if this last group makes an eiruv,

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

and their master made an eiruv in a different place, they must follow their master's eiruv, except for a wife, who need not follow her husband's eiruv because she is allowed to object to it." **Rabbah** explains, this means that a wife and those similar to her (adult children and Jewish slaves) may object.

- **Q:** It seems from the Braisa that if the wife does not explicitly object to her husband's eiruv, she will be subject to it. However, the beginning of the Braisa says that she must explicitly consent before an eiruv can be made for her!? **A:** The beginning of the Braisa means that her silence is considered to be a showing of consent as well.
- **Q:** The end of the Braisa says that if the minor children or non-Jewish slaves made their own eiruv, but their master made one for them as well, they are subject to their master's eiruv. The Braisa seems to be discussing where they did not specifically object, and yet the Braisa says that in these circumstances a wife would not be subject to her husband's eiruv. We see that she does not need to explicitly object!? **A: Rava** said, the fact that the wife went and made her own eiruv, that is considered to be an explicit objection to her husband's eiruv.

### MISHNA

- An eiruv techumin needs to have 2 meals' worth of food for each person who is relying on this eiruv. **R' Meir** says we measure based on a person's weekday meals (which are smaller than his Shabbos meals). **R' Yehuda** says we measure based on his Shabbos meals (which are smaller than his weekday meals).
- **R' Yochanan ben Brokah** says, if bread is used for the eiruv, the size of the loaf must be the amount purchased for a pundyon when 4 se'ah of grain is purchased for a selah (which presumably means the loaf needs to be ½ of a kav, which is enough for 2 meals). **R' Shimon** says the bread needs to be 2/3 of a loaf, of which 3 such loaves can make up a kav (which would mean 2/9 of a kav is enough for 2 meals).
  - Half of this amount is needed for measuring how long a person must be in a house with a "negah" before he becomes tamei.
  - One quarter of this amount is the amount which if eaten when tamei will cause a person to become "passul" (tamei without having the ability to pass on that tumah).

### GEMARA

- **Q:** According to **R' Meir and R' Yehuda**, how much food must the eiruv have? **A: R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** says, there must be the amount of 2 breads that the farmers carry with them when they are leading the oxen. **R' Ada bar Ahava** says 2 breads of the type they have in Nehar Pappa.
  - **Q: R' Yosef** asked **R' Yosef the son of Rava**, whose view did your father follow? **A:** He said that he followed **R' Meir**. **R' Yosef** said, I also follow **R' Meir**, because it seems that people eat more on Shabbos, when they have all that good food.

### R' YOCHANAN BEN BROKAH OMER

- A Braisa says that **R' Yochanan ben Brokah's and R' Shimon's** views are very close to being the same.
  - **Q:** According to **R' Yochanan** there are 4 meals to a kav, and according to **R' Shimon** there are 9 meals to a kav!? **A: R' Chisda** says, we must remove the 1/3 profit charged by the storeowner, from **R' Yochanan's** calculation. That would make it six meals to a kav according to him.
    - **Q:** Still, **R' Yochanan** says there are 6 meals to a kav and **R' Shimon** says there are 9 meals to a kav!? **A:** The profit of the storeowner is actually ½, which would mean that according to **R' Yochanan** there are 8 meals to a kav.
    - **Q:** They are still not the same! **R' Yochanan** says there are 8 meals to a kav and **R' Shimon** says there are 9 meals to a kav!? **A:** They are very close, and this is what the Braisa meant.
    - **Q: R' Chisda** is self-contradictory. On the one hand he says that the profit is equal to 1/3 and on the other hand he says it is equal to ½!? **A:** When the buyer supplies the wood for the oven, the profit is only 1/3. When the storeowner does, the profit is ½.