



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

Eiruvin Daf Lamed Hey

- **Rabbah and R' Yosef** give another understanding to the machlokes in the Mishna. They say the Mishna is discussing a large, wooden box (that can hold 40 se'ah). The **T"K** holds that it has the status of a keili and therefore can be broken open (because there is no issur of demolishing keilim on Shabbos) and **R' Eliezer** says that a box this size is considered an "ohel" (a structure, not a keili) and therefore, there is an issur of demolishing it, and there is consequently no access to the eiruv.
 - We find this to be a machlokes between Tanna'im. A Mishna says, if a zav makes a closet move through direct force (without direct contact), the **T"K** says the closet becomes tamei. **R' Nechemia and R' Shimon** say it remains tahor. Presumably, the point of dispute is whether the closet is considered to be a keili (and can therefore become tamei) or is considered an "ohel" and can't become tamei.
 - **Q: Abaye** quotes a Braisa in which all agree that an "ohel" moved by a zav is tamei as well. If so, that can't be the point of machlokes!? **A:** Rather, **Abaye** said, the point of dispute in the Braisa is whether movement caused indirectly by the zav brings about tumah as well.
 - **Abaye and Rava** say, our Mishna is discussing where the closet is locked with a rope and one needs to bring a knife to cut the rope and gain access to the eiruv. The **T"K** holds like **R' Yose** that all keilim may be moved on Shabbos except a large saw and a carpenter's tool. Therefore, the knife may be moved and used to open the closet. **R' Eliezer** holds like **R' Nechemia** that no keili may be moved except for its primary use (therefore the knife may not be moved to cut open the rope lock).

MISHNA

- In one's eiruv rolled beyond the techum, or if a heap of rubble fell on it, or if it got burned, or if it was terumah and it became tamei: if these things took place before Shabbos began, it is not a valid eiruv. If it happened after Shabbos began, it is a valid eiruv. If it is a "safek" when it took place, **R' Meir and R' Yehuda** say he is like "a donkey driver who is also a camel driver" (i.e. he may only carry in the overlapping area that would be permitted whether his dwelling is his house or the place where he placed down his eiruv). **R' Yose and R' Shimon** say a doubtful eiruv is presumed to have been valid when Shabbos began. **R' Yose** said, **Avtulmus** said in the name of 5 elders that a doubtful eiruv is considered to be valid.

GEMARA

- **Rava** says, an eiruv that rolls beyond the techum is only problematic when it rolls more than 4 amos beyond the techum, because every person gets 4 amos in addition to the 2,000 amos of the techum.

NAFAL ALAV GAL...

- The Gemara thought that the Mishna is discussing a case where the eiruv could be taken out of the rubble with only having to transgress a D'Rabanan. Based on that, the Gemara asks that the Mishna doesn't follow **Rebbi**, because according to him, the D'Rabanan may be done bein hashmashos and the eiruv would therefore be valid. The Gemara says that the Mishna is discussing a case where one would have to transgress a D'Oraisa in order to get access to the eiruv.
 - This case and the case of rolling beyond the techum are both needed. If it would have just said the case of rolling beyond the techum, we would say only there it is not valid because it is not within the techum, but when buried under rubble, it is within the techum and should be valid. If it would have only said this second case, we would say it is totally inaccessible, but when it rolls beyond the techum, a wind may come and blow

it back within the techum, so maybe it remains valid. That's why we need to mention both cases.

OY NISRAF, TERUMAH V'NITMEIS

- The case of the eiruv getting burned is to teach the extent of **R' Yose's** leniency, that even though the eiruv doesn't exist, if it is a safek as to when it happened, it is a valid eiruv. The case of terumah teaches the extent of **R' Meir's** chumrah, that even though the eiruv exists, it still is considered to be invalid.
 - **Q:** How can we say that **R' Meir** says we are machmir by a safek? We find that an anonymous **T"K** in a Mishna (which is **R' Meir**) says that when there is a safek concerning the validity of the tevila or the mikvah where a tamei person was toivel, if the person was tamei D'Rabanan we are meikel, and **R' Yose** says we are machmir!? **A:** **R' Meir** holds that the halacha of techum is D'Oraisa, so we must be machmir.
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Meir** allowed using a lenient process of measuring for techum, which would only be allowed if he held that techum is D'Rabanan!? **A:** **R' Meir** himself says techum is D'Oraisa. At times he quotes his rebbi, who held that techum is D'Rabanan.
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Meir** is lenient regarding a safek D'Oraisa in a Mishna where one touched another person at night and in the morning found the other person to be dead, and he is unsure whether he was dead when he touched him. **R' Meir** says the person remains tahor. If so, why is he machmir in our Mishna with the terumah that became tamei? **A:** **R' Yirmiya** said, our Mishna is discussing where there was a sheretz on the terumah from the very beginning of bein hashmashos.
 - **Q:** If that is the case, how does **R' Yose** say that the eiruv is valid!? **A:** **Rabbah and R' Yosef** say, our Mishna is discussing where there are 2 conflicting sets of witnesses as to when the terumah became tamei. Therefore, we do not rely on a chazakah and **R' Meir** is machmir. In the case with the dead person, there are no witnesses, so we rely on the chazakah that the person was alive and we can be lenient. **A2:** **Rava** says, in the case of the dead person there are two chazakos (1 – that the person was alive, 2 – that the live person was tahor) and we can therefore be lenient. In the case of eiruv there is only one chazakah (that the terumah is tahor) and therefore we cannot be lenient.
 - **Q:** In our Mishna **R' Yose** is lenient by a safek and in the case of the safek concerning the tevila or the mikvah, he is machmir!? **A:** **R' Huna bar Chinina** said, the case of tumah is different because tumah has a base in the Torah, whereas techum, which is only D'Rabanan, does not. **A2:** Even if we say that he holds techum is D'Oraisa, it could be that **R' Yose** himself is machmir, and in our Mishna he is quoting his rebbi, who was lenient.