

3.6.9

71a (משנה ה) → 72a (כרבי מאיר)

- I. **משנה ה'**: multiple residents who are business partners in distribution of food
- if they are all partners in one foodstuff (e.g. wine), they need no **עירוב**; if different foods, require **עירוב**
 - even if the partnerships are in variegated foodstuffs (e.g. wine and oil), they need no **עירוב**
 - they may only join together if their foods are in one barrel
 - possible proof from **משנה**; since if the wine were in separate barrels, no different than wine/oil
 - Challenge (אבי)**: wine/wine could be mixed (even if currently in separate barrels) for an **עירוב** unlike wine/oil
- II. Analysis of the dispute: **רבה/ר' יוסף**
- Inference (of ר"ש's position)**: they don't even need to be **מערב** if $A \leftrightarrow B$ is wine and $B \leftrightarrow C$ is oil?
 - case is a **חצר** between 2 **מבואות** – and **ר"ש** is following his own ruling:
 - if 3 **חצרות** are open to each other and to **רה"ר** and A and C both made **עירובין** with B
 - Then: A and B may carry to each other; so may B to C – but A to C is forbidden
 - Here too: only the partners may carry to the adjacent partner
 - Challenge (אבי)**: disanalogous; in that case, **ר"ש** ruled that A and C may not inter-carry; here – no **עירוב** at all
 - Defense (רבה)**: here, it means that the partners don't need **עירוב** with **ב** בעה"ב – but they need with each other
 - dispute is specific to wine and oil, following dispute of **ריב"נ/רבנן** (טבול יום ב:ה)
 - oil atop wine and **טבר"י** touched oil
 - חכמים (כרבנן)**: only oil is **טמא** (no **חיבור**)
 - כר"ש (ריב"נ)**: all **טמא** (**חיבור**)
- III. **ברייתא** – 3rd opinion (to our **משנה** דאי: **ר"א בן תדאי** (more severe than **רבנן**))
- Even**: multiple partnerships in the same food don't obviate the need for an **עירוב**
 - Analyses**: of the dispute between **ראב"ת** and **ש"חכמים**
 - all would agree that if the partners all put their wine into one barrel – no need for **עירוב**
 - Dispute**: if they bought a barrel of wine together (**ברירה**)
 - dispute is if **עירוב** **שיתוף** subsumes **דב יוסף**
 - doesn't subsume (→ **מבוי** may be used, but **חצרות** aren't included)
 - Proof**: from 2 statements of **רב**
 - ruled like **ר"מ** (**שיתוף**) doesn't obviate need for **עירוב** - below) and like **ראב"ת** → identical rationale
 - Justification**: we might think that we don't accept 1 **תנא**'s **חומרות** twice
 - by splitting his ruling, **רב** allows the stringent position to be maintained
- IV. Background: bread for **עירוב** (may be used for **שיתוף**); wine for **שיתוף** (not for **עירוב**)
- dispute **ר"מ/חכמים** regarding need for both
 - always need both **עירוב** and **שיתוף** so that children will always be aware of **עירוב** תורת **ד"מ**
 - either is sufficient
 - Approach1 (ר' נחומי or ר' רבה)**: dispute is only if they used wine; if bread, only 1 needed
 - Approach2 (ר' נחומי or ר' רבה)**: dispute only if they used bread; if wine, all agree both are needed
 - Final ruling**: follows **ר"מ**
 - דב** → "הלכה" → we publicize ruling
 - ד' הונא** → "נהגו" → we privately direct this way
 - ד' יוחנן** → "נהגו" → if someone does this, we don't correct it