



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

Eiruv Daf Lamed Zayin

- **Ulla** said, **Ayo's** Braisa must be incorrect, because our Mishna says that **R' Yehuda** does hold of "breirah".
 - **Q:** The Gemara brought a Braisa that said that **R' Meir** says there is breira and **R' Yehuda, R' Yose, and R' Shimon** say we don't say the concept of breira!? **A:** **Ulla** says that **R' Yehuda** should be paired with **R' Meir** in the Braisa, meaning that he would hold of breira.
 - **Q:** Does **R' Yose** not believe in breira? **R' Yose** says in a Mishna that if 2 women buy their birds (where they are each required to bring a chatas and an olah bird) together and give the 4 birds to the Kohen, or if they give money for the birds to the Kohen, the Kohen can use any bird for any woman for either korbon. Presumably, that can only work if he holds of the concept of breira!? **A:** **Rabbah** said, that Mishna is discussing where they each stipulated that the Kohen should be able to decide on the use of each bird. Therefore, the Kohen may do as he chooses without coming onto the concept of breira.
 - **Q:** If so, it is obvious that the Kohen can choose. What is the chiddush of the Mishna?! **A:** The Mishna teaches us the din of **R' Chisda**, that even though the birds are bought in pairs, the Kohen may use both birds of the pair for chatas or for olos, and we don't say that one chatas and one olah must come from each pair.
 - **Q:** We find a Braisa where **R' Yose** says that a chaver who purchased produce for an ahm ha'aretz along with produce for his own use, does not need to give ma'aser before giving it to the ahm ha'aretz (because breira tells us that the produce he gave to the ahm ha'aretz was never his all along). The **Chachomim** say he must give ma'aser!? **A:** We must switch the rulings and have it so that **R' Yose** is the one who says he must give ma'aser before giving it to the ahm ha'aretz.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if a person says "My ma'aser should be redeemed on the coin that I will eventually take out of my wallet", **R' Yose** says it works, even though to say so means we are relying on the concept of breirah!? **A:** We must reverse this ruling as well and say that **R' Yose** says it is *not* a good redemption.
 - **Q:** Why do we change 2 Braisos for a Mishna? Maybe we should change the Mishna!? **A:** The Braisa with the ma'aser redemption clearly must be reversed because it later says that **R' Yose** agrees that if he says the ma'aser should be redeemed on the new coin in his wallet, it is a good redemption. If he "agrees" that it is a good redemption here, it must mean that he held earlier that it is NOT a good redemption.
 - This later case in the Braisa is discussing where he has only one new coin, and that is why it is a good redemption even without the concept of breira.
- **Rava** asked **R' Nachman**, we find a Braisa where a Tanna does not hold of breira even regarding eiruv, which is a D'Rabanan concept. Who is the Tanna who does not hold of breira even by a D'Rabanan? **R' Nachman** remained silent.
 - **Q:** Why didn't he say it was **Ayo's** version of **R' Yehuda** in the Braisa we discussed? **A:** He was unaware of **Ayo's** Braisa.
 - **R' Yosef** quotes a Braisa which says that if a person sets an eiruv and says it should be effective for all Shabbosos of the year whenever I want it to be effective, if he decides any Friday during the day, it is effective. If he decides on a Shabbos, **R' Shimon** says it is effective (he holds of breira) and the **Chachomim** do not (this is the Tanna who doesn't hold of breira even by a D'Rabanan).

- **Q:** The Braisa quoted earlier said that **R' Shimon** does NOT hold of breira (in the case where one designated portions of his wine as terumah and ma'aser and leaves over some wine at the end of the barrel to be considered the terumah and ma'aser that was separated)!? **A:** Reverse the rulings in the Braisa just quoted by **R' Yosef**.
 - **Q:** Maybe **R' Shimon** only doesn't hold of breira by a D'Oraisa, but by a D'Rabanan he agrees that we do say breira!? **A:** **R' Yosef** says, whoever holds of breira holds of it in all cases and visa-versa.
- **A2:** **Rava** says that **R' Shimon** really does hold of breira. The reason he says that the terumah is not considered to be separated in the earlier Braisa is because when one separates terumah it must be noticeable that he left over something. In the case of the barrel, that is not noticeable.
 - **Q:** **Abaye** asks, we find that **R' Shimon** allows one to designate terumah in a pile of produce without actually separating the terumah?! **A:** In that case he says "the terumah is *within* the pile", which means that the produce around the edges are not terumah. Thus, there is produce that is visibly not part of the terumah. However, in the case of the wine, the terumah is not distinguishable from the remaining wine.
- **A3:** **R' Shimon** holds of breira. The reason he does not allow the separation of the terumah wine while in the barrel is because (like he says to **R' Meir** in the Braisa), we must be concerned that the barrel will break after he has drunk some wine, resulting in the loss of the remaining wine (which has the terumah in it). This would mean that whatever he drank was tevel.