



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

Eiruv Daf Ayin

V'EIN NOTLIN RESHUS

- **Q:** The Mishna already said this halacha!? **A:** The chiddush is, that even if the people relinquished the rights to one of the others on the condition that he then give those rights to the other individual, it will still not be effective.
- **Q: Abaye** asked **Rabbah**, when relinquishing rights to people of a chatzer, must the rights be relinquished to each person, or is relinquishing to one person sufficient? **A: Rabbah** said that the rights must be relinquished to each individual.
 - **Q:** A Braisa has six halachos (which will be explained in the Gemara). The first halacha says that one who forgot to join the eiruv may relinquish rights to “one who did join the eiruv”. Obviously there is more than one person in the eiruv, and still the Braisa says giving the rights to one person is enough! This is not like **Rabbah** said!? **A: Rabbah** says the Braisa is discussing a case where the other member of the eiruv died. Therefore, there is only one remaining person to relinquish the rights to.
 - **Q:** The Braisa later says that one who had joined the eiruv may not relinquish his rights to one who forgot to join the eiruv. If that case is talking about where the other member of the eiruv died, then why can't this be done? It must be that there is another member of the eiruv in existence! If so, the beginning of the Braisa must also be discussing where the other member of the eiruv is in existence!? **A:** It could be that the beginning of the Braisa is discussing where the other member of the eiruv died, and the end of the Braisa is discussing where he did not die. In fact, the “end of the beginning” of the Braisa says that 2 people who did not join the eiruv may relinquish their rights to two people who did. We see that it must be to both people who joined, and relinquishing to just one of them would not be enough.
 - **Abaye** says, that “end of the beginning” means that they must relinquish to one of the two people who have joined the eiruv. It does not mean that it must be relinquished to both.
 - **Q:** Who doesn't the Braisa say “to one of the people...”? That remains a **Kashyeh**.
 - The Braisa listed 6 cases. The Gemara now explains the necessity of each case.
 - “One who did not join the eiruv may give his rights to one who did join the eiruv”. **Abaye** says this teaches that rights need be relinquished to only one person of the eiruv. **Rabbah** says this is discussing where the other member of the eiruv died, and we are not goizer for a case when the second member did not die.
 - “Two members of the eiruv may give their rights to one who did not join”. Although this seems obvious, we would think that we should penalize the one who did not join the eiruv and not allow him to receive the rights from the others. The Braisa teaches that we allow it.
 - “Two members who have not joined the eiruv may give their rights to two who have joined”. **Rabbah** says this teaches us that the rights must be given to all members of the eiruv. **Abaye** says, this teaches that we need not be goizer and say that if we allow 2 who have not joined to give their rights, we may come to allow them to receive rights as well.
 - “Two members who have not joined the eiruv may give their rights to another who has not joined.” This teaches that we are not goizer when all members of the story have not joined an eiruv (we would think that we only allow

relinquishing of rights when some members have joined the eiruv and others have not).

- “But, one who has joined the eiruv may not give his rights to one who has not joined”. **Abaye** says this teaches that the Braisa (including the first case) is discussing where there are more members of the eiruv in existence. **Rabbah** says this case is mentioned only because it is the reverse of the very first case of the Braisa.
 - “Two people who have joined the eiruv may not relinquish their rights to two who have not joined the eiruv”. The chiddush here is that even if one of the 2 who have been given the rights then relinquishes all the rights to the other, it is not effective.
 - “Two people who have not joined the eiruv may not relinquish their rights to two others who have not joined the eiruv”. The chiddush is, this may not be done even if one of the 2 people on the receiving end were told that they were getting the rights on the condition that he then gives it to the other person.
- **Q: Rava** asked **R’ Nachman**, if a person dies on Shabbos, may his inheritor relinquish his rights to other members of the chatzer or not? Maybe only one who could have joined the eiruv before Shabbos may relinquish rights, and the inheritor could not have joined the eiruv before Shabbos. Or maybe a son is considered an extension of his father, and therefore can relinquish his rights just like his father could have done? **A: R’ Nachman** said, I say that he may relinquish his rights, but in the **Yeshiva of Shmuel** they said that he cannot relinquish his rights.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says: Any chatzer that was permitted to carry in at the beginning of Shabbos remains permitted for the entire Shabbos (e.g., if there was an opening between chatzeiros, and eiruv was made between the two of them, and then the opening became closed, it remains permitted to carry between those chatzeiros, or if the lechi or korah of a mavoi fell down on Shabbos, it remains permitted to carry there on Shabbos). Any chatzer that was prohibited in the beginning of Shabbos remains prohibited for the entire Shabbos (e.g. two houses on either side of reshus harabim where goyim walled off the reshus harabim in between the houses on Shabbos, since it was prohibited at the onset of Shabbos because the walls were not there and no eiruv could be made, it remains assur even when the walls are there, or if a goy was a member of a chatzer, so no eiruv could be made, and then he died on Shabbos, it remains assur the entire Shabbos) **except**, where one relinquished his rights. From this last part of the Braisa it seems that a person may only relinquish his own rights, not rights he inherited that Shabbos!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to the concept of relinquishing, and doesn’t mean to limit it to a person’s own rights.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that if one who owned (but did not live in) a house in a chatzer died on Shabbos, and the inheritor is a member of the chatzer, the chatzer remains prohibited. It seems that an inheritor may not relinquish his rights!? **A:** The Braisa means that it remains assur *until* the rights are relinquished.