

# daf yomi summary

## parashat Vayera 5781

עירובין פא - פז

EDITION: 40

### HONORING WEALTH V LEARNING

THANKS TO RABBI LARRY SHAIN  
YESHIVAT ATERET YAACOV

The top of our Gemora Eruvin daf 86a teaches that Rebbi, our famed Rabeinu HaKadosh - the Holy Rebbe, "honored the wealthy"...so did Rabbi Akiva... Why?

A practice surely not to be expected of such holy men? We are taught to honor the learned, the righteous and the humble. We are taught that all that we retain eternally is the Torah we have learned and the good deeds we have performed. All of the wealth and honor attained in this temporary world is but fleeting and of no inherent value. So how do we understand this statement?

There are a number of approaches to resolving this question. One is mentioned by the Gemora itself, and that is that Rebbi understood that those who help the poor and support the study of Torah are utilizing their resources in the optimum manner intended and therefore deserving of honor.

Another answer is that Rebbi honored those whom Hashem Himself chose to bless with wealth, thereby indicating that they are deserving custodians of a powerful potential to do good in the world. There is a third answer (among many others of course...) which is more subtle.

Rebbi desired no "payment" for any of his accomplishments or status in this world, electing rather to receive any reward due to him exclusively in the next world. For every pleasure or benefit we receive in this world, perforce in some minute measure detracts from our payout in the next.

"I have managed to learn a little Torah in my time in this world (and performed a few good deeds); do not honor me for this in this world, rather let me receive my full measure of whatever due me in the next." Rebbi was both enormously learned and extremely wealthy. He employed what was in essence a 'distraction tactic'. "You might wish to honor me for my Torah, please rather honor me for my wealth!"

In order to accomplish this, he honored men of wealth, demonstrating that this was appropriate...others would thus emulate him and in turn honor him for his wealth...his Torah would thus remain 'intact', untainted by any ulterior benefit or gain.

The famed Sochatchover Rebbe, Gadol and Posek, in the introduction to his work Eglei Tal, says that there is one 'ulterior gain' which is endorsed and encouraged when learning Torah, and that is to learn Torah with excitement and joy. "On the contrary," he writes, "the essential learning of Torah should be with simcha, and thus the Torah will be absorbed into his very bloodstream and by enjoying this study he will become one with the Torah."

May we all merit to learn Torah with simcha!

THURSDAY 9 OCTOBER  
THANKS TO HADRAN

### עירובין פא

The daf describes the basic criteria by which neighbors can join together to form an eruv. Rabbi Yehoshua asserts that every household in the chatzer must provide a full loaf of bread for the eruv chatzerot to be valid, and it is insufficient for someone to bring a full loaf and others to bring a slice of bread. Nor is it acceptable for everyone to only bring a slice of bread lest in the future some start to bring full loaves and others only bring slices. Rabbi Yehoshua was sensitive that each member of the eruv contribute equally. He was concerned about enmity, איבה, developing between neighbors.

The word איבה (enmity) is first mentioned in Bereishit (3:15), relating to the punishment of the snake, Adam and Chava for eating from the Tree of Knowledge. Later, in Bamidbar (35:21, 35:22), a person who kills accidentally without "איבה" is accepted in the city of refuge. Rabbi Yosi, son of Rabbi Yehoshua in Pirkei Avot (4:7) suggests that one should avoid becoming a judge as he will be the recipient of "הביאי" from the parties he rules against. Finally, the Rambam, in Hilchot Teshuva (7:3), directs us to do teshuva not only for our misdeeds but also for negative feelings such as anger and איבה.

איבה in these references is not simply neighborly discord - it relates to more intense emotions that can be destructive to the fabric of the community.

The Rabbis had a keen understanding of human nature and the importance of positive neighborly relations, as well as how easy it is to find fault with a neighbor. Rather than just give advice to maintain positive relationships, Rabbi Yehoshua suggests a structure that achieves this noble goal. Research has shown that we have many cognitive biases and the best way to ensure that our behaviors match our values is through structures that encourage the outcome we

ברכות(63)	Jan 5 2020
שבת(156)	Mar 8 2020
עירובין(104)	Aug 11 2020
פסחים(120)	Nov 23 2020
שקלים(21)	Mar 23 2021
יומא(87)	Apr 13 2021
סוכה(65)	Jul 9 2021
ביצה(39)	Sep 2 2021
ראש השנה(34)	Oct 11 2021
תענית(30)	Nov 14 2021
מגילה(31)	Dec 14 2021
חולת קטן(28)	Jan 14 2022
הגדה(26)	Feb 11 2022
יבמות(121)	Mar 9 2020
כתובות(111)	Jul 8 2022
נדרים(90)	Oct 27 2022
נזיר(65)	Jan 25 2023
סוטה(48)	Mar 31 2023
גיטין(89)	May 18 2023
קידושין(81)	Aug 15 2023
בבא קמא(118)	Nov 4 2023
בבא מציעא(118)	Mar 1 2024
בבא בתרא(175)	Jun 27 2024
סנהדרין(112)	Dec 19 2024
מכות(23)	Apr 10 2025
שבועות(48)	May 3 2025
עבודה זרה(75)	Jun 20 2025
חוריות(13)	Sep 3 2025
זבחים(119)	Sep 16 2025
מכות(109)	Jan 13 2026
חז"ן(141)	May 2 2026
בבא בתרא(61)	Sep 20 2026
עירובין(33)	Nov 19 2026
חמורה(33)	Dec 26 2026
כריתות(27)	Jan 24 2027
מעילה(36)	Feb 20 2027
גיטין(72)	Mar 28
Mar 28	
SIYUM HASHAS	Jun 7 2027

aspire to.

FRIDAY 30 OCTOBER

THANKS JOEL GOLDSTEIN

## עירובין פב

Eiruvin 82: The Gemara brings a מחלוקת regarding someone who plays with dice for money. The פסול לעדות say that he is פסול לעדות, and ר' יהודה says this is only the case if playing dice is his profession. ר' יוחנן explains ר"י logic; that while playing dice for money does not constitute stealing מדאורייתא, the main problem is that it is not a productive activity, therefore one is only פסול לעדות if it is their job.

The חכמים bring the principle of אסמכתא, where the people playing dice do not really intend to give up their stakes, therefore, "אסמכתא לא קניה", and the winner is in effect stealing. The ע"ש as explained by the סמ"ע paskens that gambling is גזל דרבנן, like Rabbi Yehuda.

The language of the רמ"א is somewhat ambiguous, which leads the ערוך השולחן to say that the Rema thinks that it is only אסור to play dice as a profession, otherwise it's permitted. The רב פעלים disagrees and says the רמ"א agrees with the ע"ש that playing with dice is forbidden. He then extends this to lotteries.

However, in cases where tickets are sold and there is a separate prize that is worth less than the value of all the tickets, eg school fundraisers, car raffles etc, that is allowed as the winner does not claim the car at the expense of those who purchased tickets but rather the person who is arranging the raffle.

The Gemara at the beginning of פרק ח says that one can only make עירוב תחומין for a "דבר מצוה". The בית יוסף says that once one makes the עירוב בהיתר, one cannot use it for a חול purpose. The רמ"א disagrees and says it can be used for any purpose.

The poskim disagree on what constitutes a מצוה. In a similar discussion, the ר"ת says that if one is traveling three days before שבת for business or seeing a friend it would be considered a מצוה, but a טיול is not.

The ע"ש disagrees and say none of these are a mitzvah. The רמ"א and להלכה disagree, and מ"ב says if one doesn't already have a מנה like ר"ת then one shouldn't follow him.

For an עירוב תחומין, the רמב"ם says that seeing a friend is a mitzva, but the בית יוסף says Rambam is referring only to a חבר חכם as he will be learning from them. The תרומת הדשן, however, says that the Rambam does mean any friend, and says that even going to hike in a field for enjoyment is allowed on יום טוב as part of שמחת י"ט - the רמ"א adds ושבט רמ"א.

Commenting on the רמ"א, the Tosefet Shabbat says that the hike should only be considered a mitzva on ט"י because on שבת there is no mitzva of שמחה, so enjoyable walks should not be considered a מצוה. For the רמ"א however, the mitzva of שבת עונג may be relevant enough to allow pleasurable walks to be called a מצוה.

SHABBAT 31 OCTOBER

THANKS TO RAFI COHEN

עירובין פב

Our daf takes an in-depth look at different halachic measurements and serves as the source for the determination of the quantity of dough that qualifies for the mitzva of Hafrashat Challah.

The Mishna on the previous daf discussed the quantities of food necessary to establish an eruv techumin, and in that context mentioned the quantities used to measure the amount of time one spent in a leprous house (time which would require the subject's clothes to undergo ritual washing) and the amount of ritually unclean food which, if consumed, would render the eater unfit to eat terumah.

Standard measurements of volume in the time of Chazal, as described further on our daf, are based on food items that were prevalent at that time (and perhaps even presumed to be constant in size), primarily olives (kezayit), figs (kegrogeret) and eggs (kebeitza). There are numerous debates concerning the appropriate modern translation of these measurements, with the most well-known opinions being those of Chazon Ish and Rabbi Chaim Na'eh.

An interesting set of questions arises when associating the actual modern size of these items with their "halachic" size. This issue is first developed in the context of the size of a mikveh. Rambam, in Mikvaot 4:1, states that a mikveh must measure "a cubit by a cubit by a height of three cubits. This measure contains 40 se'ah of water."

In Mikvaot 6:13 Rambam lays out the following scale: "A se'ah is six kabbin, a kab is four lugim, and a log is the size of six eggs." In numbers, a mikveh thus contains  $6 \times 4 \times 6 \times 40 = 5,760$  eggs. However, when later poskim calculated the number of eggs that fit in a mikveh measuring 40 se'ah, they concluded that a mikveh actually contains double the number of eggs mentioned by Rambam.

This discrepancy was addressed by Rabbi Yechezkel Landau, better known by the names of his books Noda BeYehuda and Ziyun LeNefesh Chaya. He concluded (ZLC on Pesachim 116b) that modern eggs are physically smaller in size than the eggs in the time of Chazal, and therefore each halachic egg is actually the size of two modern-day eggs. This approach was adopted by GRA and Chazon Ish.

Chazon Ish, based on Pesachim 109a, determines that the size of an egg is 100 cubic centimeters. Rabbi Chaim Na'eh, on the other hand, utilizes an alternative source from Rambam to avoid the discrepancy between ancient and modern sizes.

Rambam's commentary on the Mishna in Eduyot (1:2) and Kelim (2:2) sets forth that an egg is equal to 18 Dirhams, a currency with a known weight of 3.205 grams. Therefore, the volume of an egg is 57.6 cubic centimeters, since that same volume of water is equal in weight to 57.6 grams. In this way, Rambam's egg is approximately equal to the modern egg.

The question of balancing ancient and modern volumes is more pronounced with regard to the olive. The halachic olive is determined by Chazal to be approximately 50% of the size of the halachic egg. However, the modern olive is only approximately 3 cubic centimeters in size, which is 1/19 of Rabbi Chaim Na'eh's egg!

Although we have archaeological evidence that ancient olives were

## עירובין פה

TUESDAY 2 NOVEMBER

THANKS TO STEVE WIND

The Gemara has a discussion about whether one who has rights to access something in the courtyard through the air (for example, by throwing or lowering a bucket) would prohibit others in the courtyard from carrying if he does not participate in the eruv.

This is a machlokes between Rav and Shmuel, and the halacha is that "air rights" do not cause a restriction. The Mishna teaches that an eruv chatzeiros placed in a structure with a roof but without complete walls, or in a balcony, is invalid, and one who resides in such a place but does not contribute to the eruv does not restrict other residents of the courtyard from carrying on Shabbos.

However, an eruv chatzeiros put in a place with a structure that is suitably protective is valid, therefore one who resides in such a place and does not contribute to the eruv restricts the other residents of the courtyard from carrying on Shabbos, unless the owner had a right to use the area for his own purpose, in which case the resident is considered a guest or family member of the owner.

The Gemara brings an example of such an owner with usage rights: the wealthy Bonyas who owned many properties and let people reside in them. This leads the Gemara onto the topic of honoring wealthy people.

MONDAY 3 NOVEMBER

THANKS DAVID GROSS

## עירובין פו

Daf 86 has three distinct topics. The first is a Mishna that details what happens when one spends Shabbat in a different city; what effect does that empty property have on an eruv?

Is the result the same if the homeowner is Jewish or not?

According to Rebbi Meir, an eruv is rendered ineffective in such a case, irrespective of whether the homeowner is Jewish or not. According to Rebbi Yossi, this is only the case if the homeowner is not Jewish.

According to Rebbi Shimon, if the homeowner happens to be visiting his daughter in the same city, the eruv remains in effect as it is considered as if the individual won't return home. And the halacha accords with the last opinion.

The second topic refers to a case where a pit exists between two courtyards requires a partition of 10 tefachim, whether fixed from above or below, according to the Tanna Kama. Beit Shammai holds that they have to be affixed from below, whereas Beit Hillel hold that they have to be affixed from above, but have to enter the water by at least a tefach.

The third topic is regarding a hanging partition (in the mode of a sukkah wall - גוד אחית); according to Rebbi Yehuda, the hanging garden is suffice in separating two domains. Rebbi Shimon holds that so long as the wall ends within 10 tefachim of the ground then it is effective. The attempt to comparison is rejected by both opinions.

similar in size to modern olives, common halachic practice is to follow Rabbi Chaim Na'eh's assessment of a halachic olive being 27 cubic centimeters (approximately the size of a matchbox) (although it should be noted that there are poskim who verbally rendered psak based on modern olives to determine whether or not one is obligated to make a bracha or how much matza must be consumed to fulfill the mitzva on Seder night).

The ramifications of these measurements span the gamut of halachic practice. Matza on Pesach, Hafrashat Challah, Kiddush on Shabbat and Birkat Hamazon are only a sampling of the mitzvot that are dependent on how we determine these measurements. The overall issue of halachic measurements reflects the periodic dichotomy between halachic rules and regulations and modern realities.

This issue arises in other contexts as well (eating fish and meat together, killing lice on Shabbat, etc.), and the position taken by Chazon Ish regarding halachic eggs can be viewed as a guiding principle throughout halachic discourse, reinforcing halacha as a way of life rather than as a set of rules dependent on changing knowledge and sensibilities: "Once the halachic ruling was determined by Noda BeYehuda, GRA, Rabbi Margalioth and Chatam Sofer, and this ruling was disseminated throughout the Jewish world, it is as if the rabbinic court fixed the measurements for all of Israel according to the view of the court itself ... and questions of accuracy and error have become irrelevant" (Chazon Ish, Kuntres Shiurim par. 5).

SUNDAY 1 NOVEMBER

THANKS

## עירובין פד

Daf 84: Abaya holds the opinion that when a height of less than 10 tefachim separates two areas, they restrict each other, irrespective of whether or not they are easy or difficult to use. The Gemara brings the case of a roof situated next to a reshus harabim, and whether or not a permanent ladder is needed to allow carrying between the roof and the reshus harabim. Shmuel ultimately rules that without a permanent ladder the roof is prohibited for carrying.

The question is asked as to how a reshus harabim can restrict an adjacent reshus hayachid? We don't find this concept anywhere else in Eruvin, as long as partitions around the adjacent areas are 10 tefachim high with no breaches more than 10 amos. Ritva answers that a roof is different, in that its use by residents of a second story is insignificant in comparison with the use of a chatzer.

Therefore, the use of a roof by an adjacent reshus harabim could mean that the reshus harabim is a partner in the use of a roof. But, in a chatzer or a mavoi, the use by an occupant is very significant, so using it in the reshus harabim bears no relevance. So too, the installation of a ladder enables the residents of a second story to use the roof, and therefore its use becomes significant.

WEDNESDAY 4 NOVEMBER

## עירובין פז

THANKS TO DR YARDAENA OSBAND - TALKING TALMUD  
PODCAST

This daf illustrates the importance of the Galil in the Tannaitic experience, and understanding the cities and their roles helps to illuminate the daf. Eruvin 87 mentions three Tannaitic cities in the Galilee - Avel, Tzipori, and Tiveria.

After the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 CE, Jerusalem and its surrounding areas were destroyed, and Chazal started to rebuild what was left of the Jewish people, settling the lower Galilee. Avel, Tzipori, and Tiveria were all important Tannaitic cities. The City of Tiveria was established by the Romans around 20 BCE and named for the second Roman emperor Tiberius.

Although it started as a non-Jewish city, it was "purified" by Rabbi Shimon Bar Yochai (Shabbat 34) and eventually became one of the four holy cities of Israel (with Jerusalem, Tzfat and Hebron). As for Tzipori, Rabbi Yehuda Hanasi moved there because of his poor health (Ketuvot 103) and in fact redacted the Mishna there.

The city of Avel was near Tzipori and its remains are believed to be at Tel Ain Al-Jenin which is east of Tzipori. Archeologists have discovered artifacts from the time of the Mishna, and an aqueduct that leads to Tzipori. The Gemara in Rosh Hashana 31 describes how there were 10 stops of the Sanhedrin from the Lishka until it finally settled in Tiveria:

וכנגדן גלתה סנהדרין מגמרא מלשכת הגזית לחנות ומחנות לירושלים  
ומירושלים ליבנה ומיבנה לאושא ומאושא ליבנה ומיבנה לאושא  
ומאושא לשפרעם ומשפרעם לבית שערים ומבית שערים לצפורי ומצפורי  
לטבריא.

Corresponding to these ten stages, the Sanhedrin was exiled in ten stages at the end of the Second Temple period and after the destruction of the Temple, and this is known from tradition: "From the Chamber of Hewn Stone, its fixed seat in the Temple, to Ḥanut, literally, shop, a designated spot on the Temple Mount outside the Temple proper; and from Ḥanut to Jerusalem; and from Jerusalem to Yavne; and from Yavne to Usha; and from Usha it returned to Yavne; and from Yavne it went back to Usha; and from Usha to Shefaram; and from Shefaram to Beit She'arim; and from Beit She'arim to Tzipori; and from Tzipori to Tiberias."

Knowledge of the geography of the Tanaim helps in understanding the Talmud.