



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

Eirubin Daf Pey

- **Rav** says that no kinyan need be made to me makneh a shituf made by one person for all the members of the mavoi. **Shmuel** says a kinyan does need to be made. However, when making an eruv techumin for himself and others (as described in the upcoming Mishnayos), **Rav** says a kinyan must be made and **Shmuel** says no kinyan needs to be made.
 - **Q: Shmuel's** view regarding each case follows the Mishna in each case. Why does **Rav** not follow the Mishnayos? **A:** It is a machlokes Tannaim. With regard to techumin we find that **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** tells a story that **R' Oshaya's** daughter in law was beyond the techum when Shabbos began, but his wife prepared an eruv techumin for her before Shabbos began. **R' Chiya** (who was **Rav's** rebbi) said the eruv was ineffective. **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yose** said, his father said we can be lenient regarding eruv. The talmidim asked, was **R' Chiya** machmir because the eruv food belonged to the mother-in-law and she failed to be makneh it to her daughter-in-law, or was it because although the food was the daughter-in-law's, the eruv was done without her knowledge? **R' Yaakov** said, it was because the mother-in-law was not makneh it to her. Based on this, **Rav** followed his rebbi and required that a kinyan be made for an eruv techumin.
 - **R' Nachman** asked, does an eruv tavshilin made for someone else need to be "given" to the other person via a kinyan or not? **R' Yosef** asked, did **R' Nachman** not hear that **Shmuel** said a kinyan is required!? **Abaye** said, **R' Nachman** must have not heard that, because he would not question something that **Shmuel** said. **R' Yosef** said to **Abaye**, we know that **Shmuel** said that an eruv techumin does not need to be given with a kinyan to the people it is being made for, and yet **R' Nachman** says it does!? We see he doesn't simply follow **Shmuel**!? **Abaye** said, he says different than **Shmuel** there because **Rav** argues with him. Regarding eruv tavshilin no one argues on **Shmuel**, so had **R' Nachman** known what **Shmuel** said, he would not have questioned it.
- There was a goy who lived in the neighborhood of **R' Zeira** and he would not lease his rights to allow the Yidden to make an eruv. The people asked **R' Zeira** whether they could lease the rights from the goy's wife. He said that **Reish Lakish in the name of R' Chanina** allowed a wife to join an eruv without the husband's consent, so this should likewise be permitted. A similar story happened and **R' Yehuda** said that **Shmuel** allowed a wife to join an eruv without her husband's consent, so this should likewise be permitted.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that women who join an eruv or shituf without their husbands' consent, the eruv or shituf is not effective!? **A:** Women are permitted to join without their husbands' consent if their joining is necessary to validate the eruv. If it is not necessary, they may not join without their husbands' consent.
 - **Shmuel** must agree with this distinction, because **Shmuel** says elsewhere that a woman who lives in between 2 mavois (in which case we view her as belonging to the mavoi that she normally accesses) may join the eruv of the mavoi she normally accesses (and whose eruv will be passul unless she is to join) without her husband's consent. We see that it is only in that mavoi that she may join without consent, but to join the other mavoi (whose eruv will be mutar without her participation) she would need her husband's consent.
 - Proof to this principle can be brought from the fact that a Braisa allows us to force a member of a mavoi to contribute towards the cost of a lechi or korah. Presumably the same would be that we can force him to contribute to the eruv or shituf. However, the Gemara says that a lechi and korah offer some

protection and security for the mavoi, and it may be because of that reason that we can force him to contribute towards those.

- **R' Chiya bar Ashi** says we may make a lechi from an asheira tree. **Reish Lakish** says we may make a korah from an asheira.
 - **Reish Lakish** would surely allow a lechi made of an asheira, because a lechi can be of any minute width. **R' Chiya** may not allow a korah to be made of an asheira, because a korah needs to be of a certain size and strength, and since an asheira must be burned, it is as if it is of no size.

MISHNA

- If the amount of food of the shituf diminished to less than the required amount before Shabbos, he must add more food and be makneh it to the people, but need not let them know that he is adding food (even if he took food from them). If more residents joined the mavoi, he must add food to the shituf (if there isn't enough for them), be makneh it to them, and he must let them know (if he is taking food from them).
- How much food is needed for a shituf? If there are "many" residents, there needs to be enough for two meals' worth for one person. If there are "few" residents, there needs to be enough for the size of a dried fig for each person.
 - **R' Yose** said, this is true when an eiruv is initially set up. However, for an eiruv that is already in existence, as long as any small amount remains, it is an effective eiruv.
 - The only reason the **Rabanan** said an eiruvei chatzeiros needs to be made if a shituf is in place, is so that the children should not forget about the halachos of eiruv chatzeiros.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna said that if the food in the eiruv diminished, more can be added without the consent of the members. We have learned that if the same type of food is being added, consent should not be needed even if the eiruv is completely gone. If a different type of food is being added, consent should be needed even if the eiruv has only been partly diminished (which is the halacha as stated in a Braisa). If so, what is the case of the Mishna which says that consent is not needed to add to a diminished eiruv? **A:** We can answer that the Mishna is discussing adding the same food and the Mishna actually means to say that no consent is needed even if the eiruv is totally gone. We can also answer that the Mishna is discussing adding a different food to a partly diminished eiruv. The Braisa, which requires consent, was discussing a case where the eiruv was totally gone.

NITOSFU ALEIHEN MOISIF U'MIZAKEH...

- **R' Shizbi in the name of R' Chisda** said, our Mishna which says that the consent of the new residents is needed to join them to the shituf argues with **R' Yehuda** of a later Mishna who says that consent is not needed for eiruvei chatzeiros.
 - **Q:** It is obvious that they argue! **A:** We would think that our Mishna is discussing a chatzer that is between two mavois, in which case they have a choice to join whichever mavoi they prefer. But, in the case of a chatzer in one mavoi, maybe no consent would be needed. **R' Chisda** teaches that even in that case our Mishna requires consent.

KAMAH HU SHIUROI...

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, "many" residents means 18 or more residents.
 - **Q:** What is special about 18 residents that the required amount changes? **A:** **R' Yitzchak the son of R' Yehuda** said that his father explained to him, when there are 18 residents, if each one were to have an amount of a dry fig, it would equal the amount of 2 meals' worth of food. We are meikel and never require more than that amount to be given. We are also meikel the other way - if there are less than 18 people they only need to give enough food for a dried fig size for each person, which totals to less than the amount needed for 2 meals' worth.