



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

Eiruv Daf Ayin Hey

MISHNA

- If there are two chatzeiros – one within the other (the inside chatzer's only access to the street is through the outside chatzer):
 - If the inside chatzer made an eiruv but the outside one did not, carrying would be permitted in the inside chatzer and prohibited in the outside chatzer.
 - If the outside chatzer made an eiruv but the inside one did not, carrying in both chatzeiros is assur.
 - If each chatzer made their own eiruv: **T"K** says carrying is permitted within each chatzer. **R' Akiva** says carrying is only permitted in the inside chatzer, because the right of the inner chatzer to walk through the outer chatzer prohibits the outer chatzer from carrying. The **Chachomim** say that the right to walk through does not prohibit carrying in the outer chatzer.
 - If one of the members of the outer chatzer forgot to join their eiruv, he prohibits carrying in the outer chatzer, but the inside chatzer remains permitted to carry in.
 - If one of the members of the inner chatzer forgot to join their eiruv, he prohibits carrying in both chatzeiros.
 - If the two chatzeiros made a joint eiruv (which the Gemara explains to mean that they then put in the outer chatzer), and a member of either chatzer forgot to join the eiruv, it is assur to carry in both chatzeiros
 - If only one person lived in each chatzer, no eiruv is necessary.

GEMARA

- **R' Dimi** said that **R' Yanai** explained the machlokes in the Mishna as follows. **R' Akiva** says the right to walk through the outer chatzer prohibits carrying there even when the people of the inside chatzer may carry in their own chatzer. The **Chachomim** say, just like the right to walk through does not prohibit the outer chatzer when the people of the inside may carry within their own chatzer, it also does not prohibit when the people of the inside chatzer are assur to carry within their own chatzer.
 - **Q:** The Mishna said, if the outer chatzer made an eiruv but the inner chatzer did not, both chatzeiros are assur to carry in. This can't be following **R' Akiva**, because he would say even if the inner made an eiruv the outer would be assur. It must be following the **Rabanan** and we see that they must hold that if the inner chatzer is assur, they would prohibit the outer chatzer as well!? **A:** The Mishna is following **R' Akiva**, and the Mishna first says that the outside chatzer is assur when the inside chatzer is assur. **R' Akiva** then teaches the larger chiddush that even if the inside chatzer is permitted to carry, the outside will not be permitted.
 - **Q:** The Mishna says, if each chatzer made their own eiruv, both chatzeiros as mutar. It is mashma that if the inner chatzer did not make an eiruv, the outer chatzer would be assur to carry in. This can't follow **R' Akiva**, because he says that even when each made an eiruv the outer would be assur to carry in. It must follow the **Rabanan** and we see that they only allowed carrying in the outer when carrying is permitted in the inner as well?! **A:** This part of the Mishna follows **R' Akiva**, and the Mishna is discussing a case where there is a small door between the chatzeiros. In that case, the inner chatzer has effectively renounced its right to walk through the outer chatzer. That is why the outer chatzer remains mutar to carry in.

- **Q: R' Bibi bar Abaye** asked, the Mishna said, that if one person lives in each chatzer, the chatzeiros are mutar to carry in. It is mashma, if there was more than one person in the inner chatzer and an eiruv was not made, in which case they are assur to carry in the inner chatzer, they would also be assur to carry in the outer chatzer. Again, we see that the inner chatzer prohibits the outer chatzer if the inner chatzer itself is prohibited. This can't follow **R' Akiva** and must therefore be the shitah of the **Rabanan**, which is not how **R' Dimi** explained it!? **Q2: Ravina** asked, the Mishna says, if a member of the outer chatzer forgot to join the eiruv, carrying is mutar in the inner chatzer but assur in the outer chatzer. If a member of the inner chatzer forgot to join, carrying in both chatzeiros is assur. It is mashma, if he had not forgotten, both would be mutar. Again, this cannot follow the shitah of **R' Akiva**, so it must be the shitah of the **Rabanan**, which is not how **R' Dimi** explained it!? **A: Ravin** said that **R' Yannai** said there is a 3-way machlokes regarding this in the Mishna: The **T"K** says that if it is mutar to carry in the inner chatzer, the right to walk through the outer chatzer will not make carrying in the outer chatzer assur. But, if carrying is assur in the inner chatzer, their right to walk through the outer chatzer will make carrying assur in the outer chatzer. **R' Akiva** holds, the right to walk through prohibits carrying in the outer chatzer even if carrying in the inner chatzer is permitted. The **Rabanan** hold that the right to walk through never prohibits carrying in the outer chatzer.

NASNU EIRUVAN B'MAKOM ECHAD V'SHACHACH ECHAD BEIN MIN HAPNIMIS...

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** explains that the term "makom echad" refers to the eiruv being placed in the outer chatzer. It is so called because it is the one place that is designated for members of both chatzeiros.
 - A Braisa says this as well. The Braisa says, if a joint eiruv was placed in the outer chatzer and one member of either chatzer forgot to join, it is assur to carry in either chatzer. If the joint eiruv was placed in the inner chatzer and a member of the inner chatzer forgot to join, it is assur to carry in both chatzeiros. If the joint eiruv was placed in the inner chatzer and a member of the outer chatzer forgot to join, **R' Akiva** says it is assur to carry in both chatzeiros, and the **Rabanan** say it is mutar to carry in the inner chatzer but assur to carry in the outer chatzer.
 - **Q: Rabbah bar Chanan** asked **Abaye**, in the last case of the Braisa, the **Rabanan** say it is mutar to carry in the inner chatzer, because we say that the inner chatzer "closes the door" and separates themselves from the outer chatzer. Why doesn't **R' Akiva** say that as well?! **A: Abaye** said, the fact that the eiruv is in the inner chatzer makes the people of the outer chatzer used to using the inner chatzer. Therefore, they cannot be said to disassociate themselves from the outer chatzer.
 - **Q: Why don't the Rabanan** say this as well? **A:** They say, that the people of the inner chatzer can say to the members of the outer chatzer, "We have joined with you to make things better, not to make things worse", and they have made things worse by the fact that one of their members have forgotten to join the eiruv.
 - **Q: Why doesn't R' Akiva** say this as well? **A:** The inner chatzer cannot simply disassociate themselves, because the people of the outer chatzer can relinquish their rights in the inner chatzer to the members of the inner chatzer. Until they do so, **R' Akiva** says that both chatzeiros are assur. Once they do so, he would agree that the inner chatzer would be mutar. The **Rabanan** however say that members of one chatzer cannot relinquish their rights to members of another chatzer.
 - **Q: Shmuel and R' Yochanan** argued earlier whether rights may be relinquished from the members of one chatzer to those of another chatzer. Maybe they argue in machlokes between **R' Akiva and the Rabanan** here? **A: Shmuel** would say that even **R' Akiva** normally says that rights may not be relinquished between chatzeiros. Only in the case of a chatzer within a chatzer he allows it because they restrict each other. **R'**

Yochanan would say that the **Rabanan** only don't allow relinquishing from one chatzer to another in the case of a chatzer within a chatzer, because they say the chatzer may simply disassociate themselves and become mutar without having to wait around for a relinquishment of rights.

V'IHM HAYU SHEL YECHIDIM...

- **R' Yosef** said, that **Rebbi** taught a Braisa that said if there are 3 people among the 2 chatzeiros, they do make it assur to carry. This is so even if the inner chatzer only has one resident. The reason is that we are concerned that it may get confused with a case where the inner chatzer has 2 residents.
 - **R' Bibi** said, it was not actually a Braisa taught by **Rebbi** that said this. It was **R' Ada bar Ahava**.
 - **Shmuel** argues and says it would only be assur if there are actually 2 residents in the inner chatzer.
 - **R' Elazar** said, if there is only one resident in the inner chatzer but he is a goy, he prohibits carrying in the outer chatzer.
 - **Q:** Why is it that when the single resident is a Yid we are not concerned, because we say people either know that he is a single resident, or if they don't, they will assume that an eiruv was made, if he is a goy we should say that either people know that a goy doesn't prohibit a chatzer when he is alone, and if they don't know he is alone, they would say that the Yid must have leased the rights to the chatzer from him!? **A:** Goyim don't typically lease out their rights, and if the goy did, people would have known.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, if there are 10 attached houses, with one of the end houses opening into a chatzer, only the house opening to the chatzer needs to contribute to the eiruv. **R' Yochanan** said even the outside one (presumably all the way at the other end) must contribute.
 - **Q:** The outside one is a gatehouse for the other houses to pass through to the outside, and a gatehouse does not need to join an eiruv!? **A:** He means the house attached to the house which opens to the chatzer. He holds that since it is only a "pass through" for the one house, it is not considered to be a "gatehouse" and needs to be included in the eiruv. **Shmuel** holds that it has the status of a gatehouse and therefore does not need to be included in the eiruv.