



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

### Eiruv Daf Pey Aleph

#### MISHNA

- **R' Eliezer** says, all foods can be used for an eiruv or a shituf, except for water and salt. **R' Yehoshua** says, an eiruv can only be made from complete loaves of bread, even if they are very small. Broken pieces cannot be used for a eiruv, even if they are very large.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** An earlier Mishna already said that all can be used for eiruv and shituf except for water and salt. Why does the Mishna repeat it here? **A: Rabbah** said, our Mishna repeats it to contrast it with the view of **R' Yehoshua** who says that only whole loaves of bread may be used. The Mishna teaches that **R' Eliezer** says that all foods may be used.
  - **Q: Abaye** asks, a Braisa says like our Mishna that an eiruv and shituf may be made with "everything", but then goes on to say that an eiruv must be made with bread and a shituf can be made with all foods. We see that when our Mishna says an eiruv may be made with "everything", it may mean only bread. If our Mishna is understood like that, it does not argue on **R' Yehoshua** at all, so why did we repeat it!? **A: Rabbah bar bar Chana** says, the Mishna is teaching that **R' Eliezer** does not hold like **R' Yehoshua** and he allows even pieces of bread to be used for the eiruv.
    - **Q:** Why does **R' Yehoshua** not allow using pieces of bread? **A: R' Yose ben Shaul in the name of Rabbi** said, he is afraid it will cause fights between the people who contribute whole loaves and those who contribute broken loaves.
    - **Q: R' Acha the son of Rava** asked **R' Ashi**, would it be permitted if all members contributed broken loaves (there is no reason for them to fight)? **A:** He said it will not be permitted, because that will lead to some people giving full loaves and others giving broken loaves in another case.
- **R' Yochanan ben Shaul** said, if a piece is removed from a loaf for purposes of taking "challah", or for purposes of removing a piece to remove its safek terumah status if terumah and chullin were mixed into the dough (but the terumah was at most 1% of the mixture), those remaining loaves are considered to be "complete loaves".
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that if challah was removed from a loaf the loaf is no longer considered complete!? **A:** If the challah is taken off by a commercial baker (who only has to give half the amount of challah that a layman must give), it is still considered to be complete. If the challah was taken off by a layman, the loaf is no longer considered to be complete.
- **R' Chisda** says, if one reattaches a broken loaf with a toothpick, it may be used for an eiruv.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that may not be used!? **A:** If it is noticeably broken and reattached, it may not be used. If it looks whole, it may be used.
- **R' Zeira in the name of Shmuel** said, an eiruv may be made of rice bread and "dochan" bread. **Mar Ukva** said that **Shmuel** only allowed using rice bread. **R' Chiya bar Avin in the name of Rav** said that lentil bread may be used.
  - **Q:** We find that **Shmuel** once made lentil bread, and his dog wouldn't even eat it!? **A:** That bread was made of many different types of flour, including lentil flour.

#### MISHNA

- **R' Eliezer** says that a person may give money to a storeowner or baker who lives in his chatzer so that he can buy into the food or bread that will be used for the eiruv. The **Chachomim** say that money cannot make a kinyan (he needs "meshicha" – to drag the item) and therefore it is not an effective way to join the eiruv (he showed that he doesn't want to get the food for free, and therefore an attempt to do so will not be effective).

- The **Chachomim** agree that giving money to someone other than a storeowner or baker acts as an instruction to that person to act as a shaliach to join this person in the eiruv. Therefore it is effective, because he is clearly consenting to being joined in the eiruv, which is necessary for one to join an eiruv.
- **R' Yehuda** says, consent is only necessary to join one in an eiruv techumin (because although it increases his ability to travel in one direction, it limits his travel distance in the other direction). Consent is not necessary to join someone into an eiruv chatzeiros (because it is only benefit for him and no detriment).

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** How can **R' Eliezer** say that by giving money he has joined an eiruv? He only gave money and cannot take ownership since he did not do meshicha (which the **Rabanan** require for one to make a kinyan)!? **A:** **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avahu** said, **R' Eliezer** says, to help facilitate the establishment of the eiruv we allow the kinyan to take place with the mere transfer of money (which is the halacha D'Oraisa). We find that this allowance is also made at other times when we want to facilitate a kinyan (e.g. before certain Yomim Tovim, when everybody is looking to buy meat, the Mishna says that one is koneh meat that he buys by a mere tendering of money, even without meshicha).

#### UMODIM B'SHA'AR KOL HA'ADAM...

- **Rav and Shmuel** say, the “other people” referred to in the Mishna are regular balei batim (homeowners who are not storeowners or bakers).
  - **Shmuel** also said, giving money to the storeowner or baker does not effect a kinyan, but giving them a keili would (it would be a “kinyan chalipin”).
  - **Shmuel** also said, it is only a problem if he told the storeowner or baker to “give me ownership” for the money. However, if he told them to “make an eiruv for me”, he has appointed them as a shaliach and they can include him in an eiruv.

#### AMAR R' YEHUDA BAMEH DEVARIM AMURIM...

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said that we pasken like **R' Yehuda**. Moreover, we pasken like **R' Yehuda** whenever he has a psak with regard to eiruvim.
  - **Q:** **R' Chana of Baghdad** asked, did **Shmuel** say we follow **R' Yehuda** even in regard to his psak about a lechi or korah that fell on Shabbos (he said that it remains mutar to carry in that mavoit the entire Shabbos)? **A:** **R' Yehuda** answered, he only paskened like him regarding establishing an eiruv, not regarding matters that have to do with a wall (which is what a lechi and korah are).
  - **Q:** **R' Acha the son of Rava** asked **R' Ashi**, if we pasken like **R' Yehuda** in the Mishna, that means that someone argues on him. But, **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, that whenever **R' Yehuda** says “Eimasai” or “Bameh” (like in our Mishna) he is only explaining the previous shitah, and not arguing!
    - **Q:** The previous Mishna says that we do need people’s consent for eiruv, which clearly does argue on **R' Yehuda**! **A:** That could be discussing a case where a chatzer has a choice to join one of 2 mavois, in which case, joining one is a detriment because he would be stopped from joining the other. In that case even **R' Yehuda** may agree that his consent is needed.
    - **Q:** We learned that **R' Shizbi in the name of R' Chisda** said that the previous Mishna does argue on **R' Yehuda**!? **A:** **Shmuel** says that **R' Yehuda** is arguing (which is why he had to pasken like him) and **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** says he does not argue.
- **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said that whenever **R' Yehuda** says “Eimasai” or “Bameh” (like in our Mishna) he is only explaining the previous shitah of the **Rabanan**, and is not arguing. **R' Yochanan** says, when **R' Yehuda** says “Eimasai” he is only explaining the **Rabanan**. However, when he says “Bameh”, he is arguing.

**HADRAN ALACH PEREK CHALON!!!**