



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

Eiruv Daf Samach

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, if a wall separating 2 chatzeiros had ladders lined up against it, even if the ladders span an area greater than 10 amos, the wall can still be considered a wall, and the 2 chatzeiros need not join in a common eiruv if they don't want to.
 - **Q: R' Bruna asked R' Yehuda**, we find that **R' Nachman in the name of Shmuel** said, if there is a 2 level structure, where the people of the upper floor have access to the chatzer via a ladder, and they must access the chatzer to exit to the street, if the people of the upper level do not join in the eiruv with the other people of the chatzer, if there is a small entrance 4 tefachim high around the ladder, they are considered to be separate from the chatzer and don't passul the eiruv that the people made. However, if no such entrance is made, no one may carry in the chatzer. According to what **Shmuel** said above, we should view the ladder as not creating an entrance into the chatzer and therefore not requiring the people of the upper level to be joined in the chatzer!? **A:** This case is discussing where the upper level is less than 10 tefachim off the chatzer, and therefore is considered as part of the chatzer even without the ladder.
 - **Q:** If the upper level is not 10 tefachim high, how does a small entrance around the ladder separate the upper level from the chatzer!? **A:** The case is where, although less than 10 tefachim high, the upper level is enclosed with an opening of less than 10 amos. Therefore, if a small entrance is made at the base of the ladder, they are showing that they have separated themselves from the chatzer.
- The people of Kakunai asked **R' Yosef** to provide them with someone who could make a proper eiruv for them. **R' Yosef** asked **Abaye** to go make an eiruv, but to do so in a way that no one will come and complain about the way in which it was done. Given that this was a public city, **Abaye** intended on making an eiruv that left out some houses.
 - He saw that there were houses at the edge of the city that only opened to the river, and not to the city. He thought to leave those houses out of the eiruv and thereby make the rest of the eiruv permissible.
 - He then said, from the Mishna it seems that the houses left out of the eiruv must be houses that could otherwise have been joined in the eiruv, but which we intentionally leave out. However, these houses at the river could not join the eiruv because they were not open to the city! Therefore, **Abaye** thought to make windows into the walls of those houses facing the city. In that way they would be allowed to join the city's eiruv, and specifically leaving them out would be effective.
 - He then said, there is no need to make windows, because even if they don't have the ability to join the eiruv, specifically leaving them out should be enough. We find that **Rabbah bar Avuha** made separate eiruvim in each neighborhood of Mechuza, even though each could not have joined with the next (because of deep pits that separated them). He did so because each eiruv encompassed less than the entire city. If so, leaving over the houses at the river should be effective even without opening windows in their walls.
 - He then said, in Mechuza, the rooftops were connected, so the houses could have all been joined in one eiruv, and maybe that is why leaving some out was effective. However, the houses by the river could not join in the eiruv of the city, and therefore leaving them out would not be effective unless windows were made into their walls!
 - He then said that windows were not necessary, because we find that **Mar bar Puphidasa** from Pumbedisa left out a storehouse as the area to be left out of an eiruv, even though a storehouse is not someplace that needs to be joined in an eiruv.

- **Abaye** said, given all these difficulties, this is what **R' Yosef** must have meant when he said to make an eiruv without causing people to complain (had he made windows unnecessarily, the people would have been angry).

ELAH IHM KEIN ASAH CHUTZAH LAH K'IHR CHADASHA

- A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** said, Chadasha was the name of a city in Yehuda, which had 50 residents, including men, women and children, and this city was used as the area to be left out of a larger eiruv.
 - **Q:** When making an eiruv in Chadasha itself, does an area need to be left out?
 - **Q:** What's the question? The same way Chadasha is left out of the larger city's eiruv, the larger city is left out of Chadasha's eiruv!? **A:** The question is, does a stand-alone city with 50 residents need to exclude some houses from its eiruv (if it used to be a public city)?
 - **A: R' Huna and R' Yehuda** argue. One says it needs to exclude some houses and one says it does not.

R' SHIMON OMER SHALOSH CHATZEIROS...

- **R' Chama bar Gurya in the name of Rav** says we pasken like **R' Shimon**. **R' Yitzchok** says one only needs to exclude a single chatzer or house.
 - **Q:** Can it be that a single chatzer with no house is considered to be "left out" of an eiruv!? **A:** He means one house in one chatzer.

MISHNA

- If one was to the east of his house when Shabbos began, but he had told his son to establish an eiruv for him to the west of his house, or visa-versa, if he is 2,000 amos away from his house, and the eiruv is further than that, he takes on the techum of his house, and not of his eiruv. If he is 2,000 amos away from the eiruv, and his house is further than that, he takes on the techum of the eiruv, and not of his house.
- If one places an eiruv in the extended boundaries of his city, he has accomplished nothing (because even without the eiruv he does not begin counting his 2,000 amos until he has gone beyond the extended boundaries).
- If one places his eiruv beyond the techum by even one amah, what he gains in one direction he loses in the other.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna said that if he is on one side of his house when Shabbos began and the eiruv is on the other, he takes on the eiruv of either his house or the eiruv, whichever is within his 2,000 amos. How can it be that his eiruv is within 2,000 amos but his house is not!? **A: R' Yitzchak** said, when the Mishna says "he is to the east" and "he is to the west", it doesn't mean to the east or west of his house. It means to the east or west of his son. So it is quite possible that he is closer to the eiruv than to his house. **A2: Rava bar R' Shila** says, the Mishna may be saying that he is east or west of his house, and the eiruv is on the opposite side of his house. However, the Mishna is discussing where his position, his house and the eiruv create a triangle. Therefore, it is possible that he is closer to his house with regard to east-west, but still closer in total to his eiruv.

HANOSEN EIRUVO B'TOCH E'BURAH...

- **Q:** The Mishna discusses the placing of his eiruv out of the techum. Such an eiruv would not be effective!? **A:** The Mishna means that the eiruv was placed outside the extended boundaries of the city, but within the techum.

MAH SHE'NISKAR HU MAFSID

- **Q:** The Mishna says that if he places the eiruv one amah out of the extended boundary, the amah he gains in one direction he loses in the other. This is not correct, because he will be losing a lot more! A Braisa says, if he places an eiruv outside the boundaries of a city, the city is no longer considered to be "4 amos", and he will have to count 2,000 amos even when walking towards and into the city. However, if his dwelling place for Shabbos is in the city, the entire city is considered to be "4 amos" and he doesn't even begin counting until he leaves the city's boundaries. If so, he is losing a lot more than one amah in the Mishna's case!? **A:** When one's 2,000 amah techum ends in middle of the city, the city is not considered to be only "4 amos".

However, if one's 2,000 amah measurement allows him to go through the entire city, in that case the city would be considered as being only "4 amos".

- **R' Idi** said this concept as well in the name of **R' Yehoshua ben Levi**. **R' Idi** said, this concept is not logical, but we accept it because it was said by **R' Yehoshua ben Levi**. Why should there be a difference if one's techum ends in middle or at the end of a city!?
 - **Q: Rava** asks, we see this concept in a Mishna, so why did **R' Idi** say there is no basis for this concept!? The next Mishna says, that when a large city neighbors a small one, the people of the large city may walk across the entire small city, but those of the small city may not walk across the entire large city. Presumably this is because the techum measurement of the large city takes them all the way to the end of the small city, but the techum measurement of the small city does not get them across the large city! **A: R' Idi** says that the proper version of the Mishna states that the people of each city may walk across the length of the other city. The reason is because the Mishna is discussing a case where an eiruv was placed in the other city.
 - **Q:** We still find this concept in a Mishna that says that if one's techum ends in middle of a cave, he may not walk in the cave beyond the limit of his 2,000 amah techum. Why did **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** have to repeat this concept!? **A:** He wanted to teach the din that if his 2,000 amos take him through the entire city, the city is considered to be only 4 amos, and the remaining of his 2,000 amos may be used to take him beyond the city in that direction.