



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Eiruv Daf Mem Tes

- **Rabbah bar R' Huna** said, if the chatzer that is between 2 mavoi joins in the eiruv of the mavoi that it typically does not use for access, the other mavoi (the one it typically uses for access) can make an eiruv without this chatzer and the eiruv will be effective.
- **Rabbah bar R' Huna in the name of Shmuel** said, if the mavoi that the chatzer in the middle typically uses for access has made their own eiruv (leaving out that middle chatzer), and the other mavoi has not made any eiruv at all, we say that the middle chatzer is part of the mavoi that has not made an eiruv, in this way allowing the eiruv that was made by the other mavoi to be effective.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, if one of the members of the eiruv is particular about the bread that he gave and does not want anybody else eating it, it is not an effective eiruv, because the word "eiruv" means it is one mixture, which this is not. **R' Chanina** said it is a valid eiruv, although these people are to be known as stingy people.
 - **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** also said, if one of the members of the eiruv keeps his bread in a separate keili, it is also not an effective eiruv.
 - **Q:** This seemingly only follows **B"S**, who say that when an eiruv is split up into two keilim it is not a good eiruv. However, **B"H** say that it is good even if it is split up into 2 keilim!? **A:** **B"H** only allow it when it is split up because it didn't fit into one keili. Here we are discussing where one sets his eiruv food apart because he doesn't want it comingled with the others.
 - **Shmuel** needed to say both of these halachos, because if he would just say the first one we would say only there it is not effective because he doesn't let anyone share in his food, but in the second case, where he does, it would be effective. And, if he would only say the second halacha, we would say only there it is not effective because it is in a separate keili, but in the first case it would be effective.
 - **Q: R' Abba** asked **R' Yehuda**, **Shmuel** says that the owner of the house in which the eiruv is kept does not need to give bread for the eiruv. Presumably this is because he has bread in his house and that bread can be considered as if joined, even though it is in a different keili?! **A: R' Yehuda** answered, the reason he doesn't need to give bread is not because he has other bread in his house. It is because since it is being kept in his house, and he truly lives in his house, he is considered to be living in his house along with all the other members of the chatzer.
- **Shmuel** said, an eiruv works because by giving the bread it is as if the giver has purchased a piece of the house where the eiruv is. The reason why money can't be used for this is because people don't have money handy on Erev Shabbos, so the **Rabanan** instituted that bread should be used. They even said that if money is used it will not be effective, because they didn't want people thinking that money is the ideal way to create an eiruv. If people would believe that, and wouldn't have money handy, they would stop creating eiruv, which is something the **Rabanan** wanted to prevent from happening. **Rabbah** says that an eiruv works because by placing bread the person has established a residence in that house.
 - The difference between **Shmuel and Rabbah** is if one gives a keili for an eiruv (it can effect an acquisition but would not create a residence), or bread less than a peruta (it can't be used for an acquisition but can create a residence), or allowing a minor to collect and place the eiruv (a minor cannot make an acquisition, but can simply place down the food to act as a residence).

- **Q: Abaye** asked **Rabbah**, your view and **Shmuel's** view are difficult. A Braisa teaches that if a chatzer made an eiruv and one person of that chatzer takes bread to join with another chatzer as well, the entire first chatzer is deemed joined with the second chatzer. However, it is only this one person who has made the acquisition or established the dwelling!? **A: Rabbah** answered, this one person is doing the “shlichus” for the rest of the chatzer.
- **Rabbah in the name of R' Chama bar Gurya in the name of Rav** paskens like **R' Shimon** (in the case of the 3 chatzeiros).

MISHNA

- If one is travelling home on Friday evening but finds himself still beyond the techum of his house at the onset of Shabbos, and he sees a tree or fence that is within 2,000 amos from where he is currently standing and is also within 2,000 to his house (from the other side of the tree): if he says, “My residence should be under that tree”, he has said nothing; if he says, “My residence should be at the tree trunk”, it is effective and he can walk the 2,000 to the tree and then the 2,000 additional amos to his house.
- If he doesn't recognize any tree or other landmark, or even if he does, but he is unaware of the halacha that allows him to use the landmark as his eiruv, he can establish his Shabbos residence in the place that he is, and he gets 2,000 amos in every direction.
 - **R' Chanina ben Antignos** says the 2,000 amos are measured as a circle with him as the center and a diameter of 2,000 amos. The **Chachomim** say he gets a square large enough to hold the circle of **R' Chanina**, thus gaining the corners of the square.
- This is what the **Chachomim** meant that a poor person may make an eiruv with his physical presence.
 - **R' Meir** said only a poor man may do that. **R' Yehuda** said even a rich man may do that. The allowance to use bread was a kula that was instituted so that people can make an eiruv without being physically present.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What does the Mishna mean that “he has said nothing”? **A: Rav** says it means that he has no techum whatsoever and must remain within his 4 amos. By stating that he wants his residence “under the tree” he says that he does not want to make his residence at his current location. Therefore, he has no residence at all. **Shmuel** says his residence takes effect under the tree, but he may not walk the remaining 2,000 amos from the tree to his house, because we are unsure where exactly his residence is (since the area under the tree is larger than 4 amos), and he must be machmir and count the 2,000 amah techum towards his house from the part of the tree that is away from his house (thus creating a distance of more than 2,000 amos and making it impermissible to walk to his house).
 - **Rabbah** explains the reason of **Rav** to be that because he did not single out a 4 amah area, it cannot become his Shabbos residence. Another version of **Rabbah** says, the reason of **Rav** is that by saying that he wants his residence in an area with multiple 4 amah areas, it is as if he is trying to make them all his residence. Since one cannot make multiple residences one after another, he also can't do so simultaneously.
 - The difference between these versions would be if he says he wants his residence to be in “4 out of the 8 amos”. According to the first version, since he has still not singled out a place, he has not made a residence. According to the second version, since he did not try to make more than one 4 amah area as his residence, it will be effective.