



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

### Eiruv Daf Ayin Gimmel

- A Braisa says, if one has 5 wives who are each supported by him, and who each live in separate houses in the same chatzer as the husband, or if one has 5 servants who are supported by him, each of which live in their own houses in the same chatzer as the master, **R' Yehuda ben Beseirah** says, in the case of the wives, no eiruv is needed because they are considered to be one with their husband (even though they eat and sleep in their own houses), and in the case of the servants, an eiruv is needed to permit the chatzer. **R' Yehuda ben Bava** says, no eiruv is needed in the case of the servants (**Rav** proves from a pasuk that because of his constant obligations to his master, a servant is considered to be a resident at his master's residence), but an eiruv is needed in the case of the wives.
  - **Q:** What about a talmid who is supported by his rebbi and lives in his rebbi's chatzer? Do they need an eiruv? **A:** When **Rav** was in the **Yeshiva of R' Chiya**, he said "There is no need to join in an eiruv because we are supported by **R' Chiya**". **R' Chiya** said the same when he was learning in the **Yeshiva of Rebbi**.
- **Q: Abaye** asked **Rabbah**, if 5 people joined in an eiruv, and now want to join in an eiruv with another chatzer, can one member of the group contribute for the entire group, or does each member have to contribute? **A: Rabbah** says one person can contribute for the entire group.
  - **Q: Abaye** asked, in our Mishna the brothers are like members of a group who have joined in an eiruv (the Mishna says that they do not even need an eiruv), and yet the Mishna (as understood by **Abaye**) says that if they want to join with another eiruv they each must do so on their own!? **A: Rabbah** said, the Mishna is discussing where the brothers are trying to make an eiruv in their own chatzer, and they must do so because the case being discussed is where there are members of the chatzer besides the brothers. The Mishna is saying, since the other members of the chatzer prohibit the chatzer, the brothers are considered to prohibit as well, and they must each join on their own if the eiruv is not kept in the father's house.
    - This can be proven from the Mishna as well. The Mishna says "if there are no other residents, they do not need to join in an eiruv". It would seem that if there are other residents, they must join in an eiruv.
- **Q: R' Chiya bar Avin** asked **R' Sheishes**, the members of a yeshiva, who eat their meals in a restaurant in the valley, but sleep in the yeshiva, where is their techum measured from – the restaurant or the yeshiva? **A:** He answered, we measure from the yeshiva.
  - **Q:** When one establishes an eiruv of food and then sleeps at home, his techum is measured from his eiruv of food (representing the place he eats) and not from the place he sleeps!? **A:** When one makes an eiruv he would prefer having the ability to sleep at the place of his eiruv, so we therefore measure from there. The members of the yeshiva would prefer having food available for them at the yeshiva, so we measure the techum from the yeshiva.
- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked **R' Chisda**, a father and son, or a talmid and rebbi, are they considered to be "one person" so that if they are the only members of a chatzer they do not need to make an eiruv to permit carrying, or are they considered to be separate entities? Also, are they considered as 2 houses in the chatzer, so that the mavoi of this chatzer can be adjusted with a lechi or a korah (a mavoi can only be so adjusted when it has 2 chatzeiros opening into it, with each chatzer having 2 houses in it), or are they only considered to be "one house"? **A: R' Chisda** said, a Braisa says that a father and son, or talmid and rebbi, are considered to be one entity when there are no other members of the chatzer with regard to the fact that they need not make an eiruv. However, their mavoi may be adjusted with a lechi or korah on account of them.

## MISHNA

- 1) Five chatzeiros that are open to each other (they are in line, with an opening between each chatzer and the one(s) it neighbors) and which are also each open to the mavoi, if each chatzer made an eiruv but did not join in a shituf for the mavoi, each chatzer may carry based on the eiruv they made, but they may not carry to or in the mavoi (we don't rely on an eiruv to function as a shituf).
- 2) If they made a shituf for the mavoi (but did not make individual eiruvim) they are permitted to carry in the chatzer and in the mavoi (we rely on the shituf to function as an eiruv).
- 3) If they each made an eiruv and made a shituf, but one of the members of the chatzer forgot to join the eiruv, but did join the shituf, they are allowed to carry in the chatzer and in the mavoi (we rely on the shituf to function as the eiruv).
- 4) If they each made an eiruv and made a shituf, but one member forgot to join the shituf, they are permitted to carry in the chatzeiros, but not in the mavoi, because a mavoi is to the chatzeiros as the chatzer is to the houses.

## GEMARA

- **Q:** Section 1 of the Mishna seems to follow **R' Meir** who says that an eiruv and shituf are both necessary. However, Section 2 of the Mishna seems to follow the **Rabanan** who say that only one of the two are necessary to be done!? **A:** Section 2 is not a new case, it is a continuation of Section 1, and it is saying, if an eiruv was made, and in addition a shituf was made, the chatzer and mavoi are both permitted.
- **Q:** Section 3 of the Mishna says that although one forgot to join the eiruv, carrying in the chatzer and mavoi are mutar. That can only be true if the one who forgot to join relinquished his rights in the chatzer. However, Section 4 of the Mishna says if one forgot to join the shituf, it is assur to carry in the mavoi. If, as we established regarding Section 3, the Mishna is discussing where he relinquished his rights, why is it assur!? We can't say that **R' Meir** says one may not relinquish rights in a mavoi, because we find that he clearly allows that. It must be that Section 4 is discussing where he did not relinquish his rights. If so, Section 3 must be discussing such a case as well. This would mean that Section 3 allows carrying in the chatzer based on a shituf, which would follow the shita of the **Rabanan!** That would mean that the beginning and end of the Mishna follow **R' Meir** and the middle follows the **Rabanan!**? **A:** The entire Mishna follows **R' Meir**. The reason **R' Meir** requires an eiruv and a shituf is so that the concept of eiruv not be forgotten. In this case, since most of the people joined the eiruv, this concern is not valid. Therefore, even **R' Meir** would say that the shituf allows carrying in the chatzer.
- **R' Yehuda** says that **Rav** taught a version of the Mishna which did not say that the chatzeiros were open to the other chatzeiros. They were only open to the mavoi. If so, when the Mishna discusses eiruv it is referring to an eiruv that only permits carrying within each chatzer – not between chatzeiros. In that case even the **Rabanan** would agree that such an eiruv cannot function as a shituf. **R' Kahana** said like this as well.
  - **R' Yosef** explained, the reason **Rav** felt the Mishna must be learned that way is because **Rav** held that for a shituf to be effective, the food used for the shituf must be carried out of the chatzer, through the mavoi, and then into the chatzer in which it will be stored. Therefore, if the chatzeiros are connected, **Rav** would say the shituf is passul, because people will think the food was brought directly to the chatzer in which it is being stored without it ever having been brought through the mavoi.
    - **Q:** A Mishna says that if the people of one chatzer are partners with the people of the other chatzeiros in wine and oil, there is no need to create a shituf. According to **Rav**, since the food never entered the mavoi it should not be a good shituf!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing a case where the wine and oil was carried out from each chatzer and into the mavoi.
    - **Q:** A Mishna says that a shituf can be made by placing a barrel of wine in one of the chatzeiros and saying that it is for all the members of the mavoi. The food was never collected and therefore never brought out to the mavoi!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing a case where the barrel was carried out from each chatzer and into the mavoi.

- **Q: Rabbah bar Chanan** asked, we find that **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, that when in a bind, one may simply rely on the bread he has on his table to act as a shituf by granting ownership in it to all the members of the mavoi. Based on this statement of **Rav**, it cannot be that he holds that the shituf must be carried through the mavoi!? If so, why did **Rav** insist on learning the Mishna like he did?  
**A:** The reason why **Rav** said the Mishna is discussing where the chatzeiros are not connected is, because he felt that if they were connected they would be given the status of one chatzer. If so, the mavoi would only have one chatzer opening up into it. **Rav** holds that a mavoi must have a minimum of 2 chatzeiros (each with 2 houses) opening up into it, which this mavoi would not have if the chatzeiros were connected.