



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

### Eiruv Daf Pey Beis

#### PEREK KEITZAD MISHTATFIN -- PEREK SH'MINI

##### MISHNA

- How can one set up a communal eiruv techumin to allow anyone to join? He places a barrel of food at the place of the eiruv and he states that it should be for anyone in the city who needs to make use of it to go comfort a mourner or join a wedding party. Anyone in the city who accepts to have the eiruv effective for him before Shabbos begins, is permitted to travel based upon that eiruv. If he makes that decision after Shabbos had begun, the eiruv is not effective for him, because an eiruv must be established before Shabbos begins.

##### GEMARA

- **R' Yosef** said, one may only establish an eiruv techumim to facilitate the performance of a mitzvah.
  - **Q:** That is obvious, because our Mishna says the person set up the eiruv to allow one to go do a mitzvah!? **A:** We would have thought that the Mishna is saying the usual case, that it is set up for one who has to travel for those reasons, but it may in fact be set up for any reason. **R' Yosef** teaches that it may only be set up for a mitzvah.

##### V'CHOL SHEKIBAL ALAV MIB'OD YOM

- **Q:** Since the eiruv must be accepted before Shabbos begins, it seems that the Mishna does not hold of the concept of "breirah"! **A:** **R' Ashi** said, the Mishna means that he must have knowledge before Shabbos that the eiruv exists. If he does, he would be allowed to decide to use it on Shabbos and the principle of breirah would make his choice effective from before Shabbos.
- **R' Assi** says, a child in his 6<sup>th</sup> year (and certainly a child who is younger than that) automatically gets the boundary of his mother's eiruv.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that a child who still "needs his mother" gets the boundary of her eiruv. A child who does not "need his mother" does not automatically get the boundaries of his mother's eiruv. With regard to the obligation of sitting in a succah, a Mishna uses the term of a child who doesn't "need his mother". **R' Yannai** explained the term to mean a child who can go to the bathroom and doesn't need his mother to clean him. **Reish Lakish** says it means a child who wakes up without screaming incessantly for his mother. The Gemara explains that this refers to a child who is in his 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> year. This is different than **R' Assi** said! **A:** **R' Yehoshua the son of R' Idi** said that **R' Assi** would agree that a child is only automatically included in his mother's eiruv until the end of the 5<sup>th</sup> year. **R' Assi** was talking about a case where a child's father made him an eiruv in one direction, and his mother made him an eiruv in another direction. **R' Assi** says, a child, even in his 6<sup>th</sup> year, wants to be with his mother, and therefore the eiruv that his mother set up for him is the one that will be effective.
    - **Q:** A Braisa says that a child until his 6<sup>th</sup> year gets the boundaries of his mother's eiruv. That is not like **R' Yehoshua** has just explained!? **A:** **TIYUFTA**. This refutes **R' Yehoshua's** explanation.
    - **Q:** This seems to refute **R' Assi** as well, because the Braisa says "until" the 6<sup>th</sup> year, and **R' Assi** said though the 6<sup>th</sup> year!? **A:** **R' Assi** says "until" means "until and including" the 6<sup>th</sup> year.
    - **Q:** This seems to refute **R' Yannai and Reish Lakish**!? **A:** The case in Succah was where the boy's father was in town. Therefore, even at a younger age he was

not so dependent on his mother. The Braisa is discussing where the father is not around and that is why even an older child needs his mother.

- A Braisa says, a person may make an eiruv for his minor children and for his non-Jewish slaves, even without their consent. However, he may make an eiruv for his adult children, his Jewish slaves and his wife, only with their consent.
  - Another Braisa says this as well. It says, “a person cannot make an eiruv for his adult children, Jewish slaves, or wife without their consent, but can make for his minor children and non-Jewish slaves without their consent, because they are viewed as an extension of him. In fact, if this last group makes an eiruv, and their master made an eiruv in a different place, they must follow their master’s eiruv, except for a wife, who need not follow her husband’s eiruv because she is allowed to object to it.” **Rabbah** explains, this means that a wife and those similar to her (adult children and Jewish slaves) may object.
    - **Q:** It seems from the Braisa that if the wife does not explicitly object to her husband’s eiruv, she will be subject to it. However, the beginning of the Braisa says that she must explicitly consent before an eiruv can be made for her!? **A:** The beginning of the Braisa means that her silence is considered to be a showing of consent as well.
    - **Q:** The end of the Braisa says that if the minor children or non-Jewish slaves made their own eiruv, but their master made one for them as well, they are subject to their master’s eiruv. The Braisa seems to be discussing where they did not specifically object, and yet the Braisa says that in these circumstances a wife would not be subject to her husband’s eiruv. We see that she does not need to explicitly object!? **A: Rava** said, the fact that the wife went and made her own eiruv, that is considered to be an explicit objection to her husband’s eiruv.

#### MISHNA

- An eiruv techumin needs to have 2 meals’ worth of food for each person who is relying on this eiruv. **R’ Meir** says we measure based on a person’s weekday meals (which are smaller than his Shabbos meals). **R’ Yehuda** says we measure based on his Shabbos meals (which are smaller than his weekday meals).
- **R’ Yochanan ben Brokah** says, if bread is used for the eiruv, the size of the loaf must be the amount purchased for a pundyon when 4 se’ah of grain is purchased for a selah (which presumably means the loaf needs to be  $\frac{1}{2}$  of a kav, which is enough for 2 meals). **R’ Shimon** says the bread needs to be  $\frac{2}{3}$  of a loaf, of which 3 such loaves can make up a kav (which would mean  $\frac{2}{9}$  of a kav is enough for 2 meals).
  - Half of this amount is needed for measuring how long a person must be in a house with a “negah” before he becomes tamei.
  - One quarter of this amount is the amount which if eaten when tamei will cause a person to become “passul” (tamei without having the ability to pass on that tumah).

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** According to **R’ Meir and R’ Yehuda**, how much food must the eiruv have? **A: R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** says, there must be the amount of 2 breads that the farmers carry with them when they are leading the oxen. **R’ Ada bar Ahava** says 2 breads of the type they have in Nehar Pappa.
  - **Q: R’ Yosef** asked **R’ Yosef the son of Rava**, whose view did your father follow? **A:** He said that he followed **R’ Meir**. **R’ Yosef** said, I also follow **R’ Meir**, because it seems that people eat more on Shabbos, when they have all that good food.

#### R’ YOCHANAN BEN BROKAH OMER

- A Braisa says that **R’ Yochanan ben Brokah’s and R’ Shimon’s** views are very close to being the same.
  - **Q:** According to **R’ Yochanan** there are 4 meals to a kav, and according to **R’ Shimon** there are 9 meals to a kav!? **A: R’ Chisda** says, we must remove the  $\frac{1}{3}$  profit charged by the storeowner, from **R’ Yochanan’s** calculation. That would make it six meals to a kav according to him.

- **Q:** Still, **R' Yochanan** says there are 6 meals to a kav and **R' Shimon** says there are 9 meals to a kav!? **A:** The profit of the storeowner is actually  $\frac{1}{2}$ , which would mean that according to **R' Yochanan** there are 8 meals to a kav.
- **Q:** They are still not the same! **R' Yochanan** says there are 8 meals to a kav and **R' Shimon** says there are 9 meals to a kav!? **A:** They are very close, and this is what the Braisa meant.
- **Q:** **R' Chisda** is self-contradictory. On the one hand he says that the profit is equal to  $\frac{1}{3}$  and on the other hand he says it is equal to  $\frac{1}{2}$ !? **A:** When the buyer supplies the wood for the oven, the profit is only  $\frac{1}{3}$ . When the storeowner does, the profit is  $\frac{1}{2}$ .