



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

### Eiruv Daf Ayin Beis

#### MISHNA

- If 5 groups of people stayed in one mansion over Shabbos: **B"S** say each group must contribute to the eiruv of the chatzer in which the mansion belongs to allow carrying in the chatzer, and all groups must join the eiruv to allow transferring between the areas of the groups. **B"H** say they only need to join the eiruv as one party (and not 5 separate groups) to allow carrying in the chatzer, and they may carry between their areas without an eiruv.
  - **B"H** agree, that if some of them are in rooms or upper floors, each group must join the eiruv on their own.

#### GEMARA

- **R' Nachman** said, the machlokes between **B"S** and **B"H** is only where the groups are separated by walls of less than 10 tefachim high. However, if they are separated by walls that are 10 tefachim high, even **B"H** would agree that they each must join the eiruv independently.
  - **Others say** that **R' Nachman** said, the machlokes between **B"S** and **B"H** is even when the walls dividing the groups are less than 10 tefachim high. In both cases **B"S** say they are distinct for eiruv purposes and **B"H** say they are not.
- **R' Chiya and R' Shimon b'Rebbi** argue as to the parameters of the machlokes between **B"S** and **B"H**:
  - **One says** the machlokes is where the walls separating the groups reach the ceiling, but if the walls do not reach the ceiling **B"S** would agree that the groups are considered to be one for eiruv purposes. **The other** says, the machlokes is where the walls do not reach the ceiling, but if the walls do reach the ceiling, even **B"H** would agree that the groups are treated as being independent for eiruv purposes.
    - A Braisa says: **R' Yehuda Hasavar** said, **B"S** and **B"H** do not argue when the walls separating the groups reach the ceiling, and they both agree that the groups are considered distinct in that case. They only argue when the walls do not reach the ceiling. In that case **B"S** say that the groups are still considered separate and **B"H** say that the groups are considered as one for eiruv purposes.
      - This clearly refutes the view that the machlokes between **B"S** and **B"H** is even when the walls reach the ceiling.
      - This clearly supports the view that there is no machlokes when the walls reach the ceiling.
      - This refutes the version of **R' Nachman** which says that the machlokes is only when the walls are less than 10 tefachim.
      - **Q:** Does this also refute the version of **R' Nachman** which says that the machlokes between **B"S** and **B"H** exists where the walls are less than 10 tefachim *and* where they are more than 10 tefachim? Does the Braisa mean to say that the machlokes only exists when there are high walls that just don't reach the ceiling? **A: R' Nachman** would say, the Braisa would agree that the machlokes exists even by walls less than 10 tefachim as well. The reason it terms the machlokes in terms of a higher wall is to teach the extent of **B"H**, that they say that even such a wall does not separate the groups for eiruv purposes. The reason the Braisa focuses on teaching the extent of **B"H** rather than of **B"S** is because **B"H** is more lenient, and showing the extent of a leniency is always preferable, because it is a greater chiddush.
      - **R' Nachman in the name of Rav** paskens like **R' Yehuda Hasavar**.

- **R' Nachman bar Yitzchok** said, our Mishna is mashma like that as well. The Mishna concludes, that if some groups are in rooms or upper floors, they are considered separate and distinct for the eiruv. The Mishna can't mean that the groups are in actual, separate rooms, because that would be obvious. It must mean that if they are in areas that are "like" separate rooms, in that the walls reach to the ceiling, they are considered separate and distinct for eiruv purposes. This is the shita of **R' Yehuda Hasavar**.
- A Braisa says, the machlokes in our Mishna is only where the eiruv for the chatzer is being kept over Shabbos outside of the mansion (i.e. even **B"S** agree that the mansion makes all the groups into one group for purposes of their own eiruv, and the machlokes is whether any group which has made an eiruv and now wants to join their eiruv with another group, needs each member of the group to separately join that new eiruv, or can one member of the existing eiruv join for them all – **B"S** say each must separately join and **B"H** say one may join for them all). However, if the eiruv is kept in the mansion, all agree that the groups are considered one even for purposes of this other eiruv, and because it is left in the mansion, no members of these groups need to add to the eiruv.
  - Based on this Braisa, another Braisa which says, "when one group wants to join the eiruv of another group, one member of the group can join for all the other members", must be following the shita of **B"H**.
  - **Others say**, the Braisa mentioned 2 paragraphs up was said differently. The Braisa says, the machlokes between **B"S** and **B"H** is where the eiruv is kept in the mansion (**B"S** say that even in that case the groups must contribute to the eiruv). However, all (even **B"H**) would agree that if the eiruv is kept elsewhere, each group must join the eiruv on its own.
    - Based on this version of the Braisa, another Braisa which says, "when one group wants to join the eiruv of another group, one member of the group can join for all the other members", does not follow **B"S** or **B"H**.

#### MISHNA

- Brothers who "eat at their father's table", but sleep in their own houses, must each join the eiruv separately. Therefore, if one of them forgets to join the eiruv, he must relinquish his rights to the others.
  - This is true if the eiruv is not being kept in their father's house. However, if it is kept in their father's house, or if these brothers and the father are the only residents of their chatzer, they need not join the eiruv.

#### GEMARA

- The Mishna seems to support the view that the place where one sleeps determines his residence (although they are eating together, since they sleep in their own houses they are considered to be separate for the eiruv).
  - **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, the Mishna is discussing where the brothers are being supported by their father, but they each actually eat in their own houses. Therefore, it may be that the place of eating is what determines residence for eiruv purposes.
- What is considered to be the place of one's residence? **Rav** says it is the place where one eats his meals. **Shmuel** says it is the place where one sleeps.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, shepherds and watchman who perform their duties outside the city, if they return to the city to sleep, their residence for techum purposes is deemed to be in the city. If they sleep outside the city (even if they eat in the city), their residence is considered to be outside the city. We see that one's place of sleeping is considered his residence, which refutes **Rav**!? **A:** In that case, it is clear to us that they would rather the food be brought to them in the field. Therefore, we consider their residence to be outside the city.

- **R' Yosef** said, I never heard this halacha of **Rav**. **Abaye** said, you told us this halacha of **Rav** in regard to the following Mishna (our Mishna). **Abaye** said, we asked you that the Mishna is mashma that the place where one sleeps determines his residence. You told us that **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** says, the Mishna is discussing where the brothers are being supported by their father, but they actually each eat in their own homes. Therefore, it may be that the place of eating is what determines residence for eiruv purposes.