

YESHIVAT HAR ETZION  
ISRAEL KOSCHITZKY VIRTUAL BEIT MIDRASH (VBM)  
\*\*\*\*\*

TALMUDIC METHODOLOGY  
By: Rav Moshe Taragin

[www.vbm-torah.org/archive/metho67/24metho.htm](http://www.vbm-torah.org/archive/metho67/24metho.htm)

**Shiur #24: *Eiruv Tavshilin* (Part 2)**

The previous *shiur* addressed the mitzva of *eiruv tavshilin* and outlined three different approaches toward understanding its mechanism. These different attitudes would impact the source of the mitzva, as well as the question of proximity - how close to *chag* must the *eiruv* be set.

The Rosh (*Beitza* 16b) introduces a requirement to *eiruv* which may reflect Rabbi Eliezer's logic that *eiruv* launches a cooking process BEFORE *chag* that can be culminated during *chag*. The mishna had already recorded a dispute between Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel regarding the amount of dishes to be prepared for *eiruv tavshilin*. Beit Shammai demanded two, whereas Beit Hillel sufficed with one.

The Rosh cites Rabbenu Tam's opinion that although we rule according to Beit Hillel that one dish is sufficient, the *eiruv* must consist of both ONE baked item as well as ONE cooked item. This interpretation of the dispute between Beit Shammai and Hillel certainly does not reflect the simple reading of the mishna, and seems unnecessary if *eiruv* is merely a symbolic process preserving the sanctity of Shabbat or preventing confusion about cooking on *chag*. If, however, Rabbi Eliezer is correct, and *eiruv* begins a process which is continued on *chag*, we may endorse the Rabbenu Tam's stringency. Since cooking and baking are very different processes, each must be launched prior to *chag* to be continued during *chag*. The initial baking cannot permit a continued cooking on *chag*.

An additional issue may surround an *eiruv* which suddenly vanished. The gemara in *Beitza* (18a) describes this scenario and rules that one may complete his preparations even though the *eiruv* no longer exists (for example, someone ate it). The Rosh questions whether someone may begin NEW preparations or only complete the preparations begun with an *eiruv* still

intact. Presumably, this question would be dependent upon the mechanism or the *eiruv*. If the *eiruv* protects the excitement of Shabbat - as Rava suggested - its vanishing should not impair continued preparations. According to Rav Ashi, the absence of a tangible *eiruv* may impede further cooking since preparations without the symbol of an *eiruv* may confuse people into permitting GENERAL cooking on *chag*. According to Rabbi Elazar, initial launching of cooking may conceivably be continued in the absence of the original *eiruv* since the person isn't commencing cooking but rather "picking up where he left off." Theoretically, a different view of Rabbi Eliezer's position may be adopted. If the notion of continuity is based upon the actual food and not the person cooking, the vanishing of the *eiruv* may be problematic. The Rosh's uncertainty may be based upon the model of *eiruv* he chooses, or alternatively upon his attitude toward Rabbi Eliezer's model.

An interesting comment by the Mordechai (*Beitza, siman 672*) probes the sweep of *eiruv tavshilin*. Does the *eiruv* also permit the continuation of general activities in preparation for Shabbat unrelated to cooking and food preparation? For example, is *eiruv tavshilin* necessary to allow lighting candles for Shabbat? We indeed mention general preparations in the text recited while implementing an *eiruv*. If the *eiruv* protects the integrity of *chag* and prevents confusion about preparing on *chag* for routine days (Rav Ashi's opinion), we may extend the language and the sweep to include all forms of preparation. If, by contrast, Rabbi Eliezer is correct and *eiruv* launches COOKING which is CONTINUED on *chag*, the mechanism of *eiruv* may be incompatible with non-cooking activities. Cooking may be continued on *chag*, but can lighting candles be "launched" prior to *chag* and continued during *chag*?

A fascinating gemara questions the type of food which may be employed for *eiruv*. Must primary food be designated, or can one use even neglected food? For example, can food remaining on pots after cooking be employed for an *eiruv* (presumably without even removing the food and installing it as an *eiruv*)? Conceivably, as a symbol to announce either the integrity of *chag* or the importance of Shabbat, an unnoticed or substandard food may not be used. Alternatively, if the *eiruv* is meant to launch the cooking process, any part of that process may form the foundation of the *eiruv*.

Perhaps sensing the challenge of using leftover food pots for an *eiruv* meant to symbolize and announce certain messages, the Or Zarua reinterpreted the gemara. Only if a person predetermines that leftover food upon pots will be designated for *eiruv* may it actually be employed for *eiruv*. If the food was not pre-designated and was casually left over, it may not serve as *eiruv*. One can explain that the Or Zarua believed that *eiruv* is symbolic and must include intentionally prepared items.