



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

Eiruv Daf Lamed Vuv

- **Rava** says, the reason why **R' Yose** is machmir regarding the safek of tevila and mikveh even though he is lenient regarding a doubtful eiruv is because the person who is toivel has a chazakah that he is tamei, so he retains his tumah status.
 - **Q:** Why don't we follow the chazaka that the mikveh itself is a kosher mikveh? **A:** The Mishna is discussing a mikveh that was not measured and therefore does not have a chazaka of being kosher.
- A Braisa says, the doubtful eiruv that **R' Yose** says is valid is when, for example, an eiruv is made of tahor terumah and we are not sure if it became tamei on Friday or on Shabbos, or a case when one made an eiruv with tevel and we are not sure if terumos and ma'aseros were given on Friday or on Shabbos. However, if an eiruv of terumah was made but it is a safek whether the terumah was tahor or tamei to begin with, or if an eiruv was made of fruit which were a safek whether they were tevel or not, the eiruv is passul (in these cases it was a safek from the start, never having a chazakah of being kosher).
 - **Q:** Just like we say the terumah was tahor based on its chazaka, we should say the eiruv of tevel is passul based on its chazaka as being tevel?! **A:** Change the words of the Braisa. It is not a safek if ma'aser was ever given. It was surely not tevel and at some point tevel got mixed into it. The safek is that we don't know when the tevel got mixed in – on Friday or on Shabbos.
 - **Q:** **R' Shmuel bar R' Yitzchok** asked **R' Huna**, if a person has 2 loaves of terumah bread – one that is tamei and one that is tahor – and he is unsure which is which, can he make an eiruv by saying the eiruv should be the tahor bread, whichever one it is? Even according to **R' Meir** who is machmir with the tamei terumah, here there is a tahor loaf of terumah so maybe he would allow it? Or maybe, even according to **R' Yose** who is lenient there, that could be because he knows exactly where his eiruv is, but here he does not, so maybe it would be passul? **A:** **R' Huna** answered that according to **R' Meir** and **R' Yose** the eiruv would be passul, because at no point does he have a meal that can be eaten (because he is unsure which is the tahor one from the get-go).
 - **Q:** **Rava** asked **R' Nachman**, if one says that a particular loaf of bread should remain chullin on Friday and should become hekdesch on Shabbos, and then says that the bread should be his eiruv (an eiruv can't be made of hekdesch), is it a good eiruv? **A:** **R' Nachman** said it is a good eiruv.
 - **Q:** He then asked, what about where he says the bread should be hekdesch on Friday but should be redeemed onto money when Shabbos begins, and then says that loaf should act as his eiruv, is it valid? **A:** He answered it is not a valid eiruv.
 - **R' Nachman** explained that in each case we follow the chazaka. Therefore, in the first case it is considered chullin during bein hashmashos and in the second case it is considered hekdesch during bein hashmashos.
 - A Mishna says, if one takes a pitcher that is a "tevil yom" (which can still make terumah become tamei) on Friday, fills it with ma'aser wine that has not yet had terumas ma'aser separated from it, and says that the wine in the pitcher should be the terumas ma'aser when Shabbos begins, his designation is effective. If he then says that the wine in the pitcher should be his eiruv, the eiruv is not valid. **Rava** says, this Mishna must hold that the eiruv takes effect at the end of the day Friday (before Shabbos begins) and at that point it was still tevel and therefore is not a valid eiruv. **R' Pappa** said, even if an eiruv first takes effect when Shabbos begins (and at that point it was no longer tevel), still,

this eiruv would not be valid because there was nothing that was fit for a meal on Friday (it was still tevel then).

MISHNA

- A person may place multiple eiruvim (in multiple directions) and make a condition – for example, he can say if goyim (who he wants to avoid) come from the east, I want the eiruv to the west to be effective and visa-versa, and if they come from both sides I want to be able to choose a direction on Shabbos, and if they don't come at all, I want my dwelling to remain in my house.
- A person may place multiple eiruvim (in multiple directions) and make a condition – for example, he can say if the chachom (who he wants to go listen to) comes from the east, I want the eiruv to the east to be effective and visa-versa, and if a chachom comes from each side I want to be able to choose a direction on Shabbos, and if they don't come at all, I want my dwelling to remain in my house.
 - **R' Yehuda** says, if one of the chachomim was his rebbi, he must use the direction towards his rebbi. If both were his rebbi, he can choose whichever direction he wants.

GEMARA

- **R' Yitzchok** taught a Braisa that had the reverse of our Mishna (in the case of the goyim he was planning to go towards them and in the case of the chachom he was trying to go away from him).
 - **Q:** The Braisa says different than our Mishna?! **A:** With regard to goyim, our Mishna is discussing tax collectors and the Braisa is discussing gov't officials who can help the people. With regard to the case of the chachom, the Mishna is discussing a chachom that he wants to go hear and the Braisa is discussing a children's rebbi (where the chachom that he wants to hear is said to be coming from the opposite direction of the children's rebbi).

R' YEHUDA OMER IHM HAYA ECHAD MEIHEN...

- The **Rabanan** argue and say that at times one would rather hear someone other than his normal rebbi.
- **Rav** says, our Mishna is incorrect based on **Ayo's** version of **R' Yehuda** (in a Braisa). **Ayo** says that **R' Yehuda** does not allow one to decide on Shabbos which eiruv he will choose. He can set up two eiruvim and have the choice based on where the chachom will come, but not based on his own decision.
 - **Q:** In either case we must come onto the principle of "breirah", so why would only one case be allowed? **A:** **R' Yochanan** said, **Ayo** would say that **R' Yehuda** only allows it when the chachom has already arrived at bein hashmashos. Although the one making the eiruv does not yet know at that time which eiruv has taken effect, the arrival of the chachom has made only one of them take effect.
 - **Q:** Why don't we say that **Ayo's** Braisa is incorrect based on our Mishna?! **A:** We find elsewhere that **R' Yehuda** does not believe in the concept of "breirah".