



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

### Eiruv Daf Yud Zayin

- **R' Gidel in the name of Rav** said, there are times when 3 people can enclose an area of 5 beis se'ah with inferior walls and may not carry within them, and there are times when they can enclose 7 beis se'ah and may carry within them.
  - **R' Ashi** explains, this is what **Rav** meant. Both cases are discussing where they enclosed an area of 7 beis se'ah. In the first case they only need 5 beis se'ah for their use and the other 2 remain empty, therefore they are prohibited to carry even in the 5. The second case is where they need 6 beis' se'ah for their use. There are no 2 beis se'ah that are left empty and therefore the entire area of 7 is mutar.
    - **Q:** A Braisa taught that 2 beis se'ah may not be left empty. Presumably that means that each person is allowed an area of 2 beis se'ah, and therefore 3 people can have an area of 6 beis se'ah (plus less than 2 more so that there is no area of 2 beis se'ah empty)?! **A:** The Braisa means that there can't be 2 beis se'ah empty of keilim. It is not an automatic amount given based on the number of people. It is based on actual requirements.
- If there were 3 people at the onset of Shabbos (which allows the area enclosed by these inferior walls to be as large as they need) and one of them died on Shabbos (2 people may only enclose an area of 2 beis se'ah), or if there were 2 people at the onset of Shabbos and an additional person came, there is a machlokes between **R' Huna** and **R' Yitzchak** how this is treated: one says it is dependent on the situation at the onset of Shabbos, and the other says it is dependent on the number of people there at any given time.
  - We can bring a proof that **R' Huna** is the one who says we look at the situation at the onset of Shabbos. **R' Huna** told **Rabbah**, if one made an eiruv based on an opening between two areas and the opening became closed up on Shabbos, it is still permitted to transfer via that eiruv because the entrance existed at the onset of Shabbos. We see that **R' Huna** is the one who says that we look at the situation at the onset of Shabbos.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can say that they argue in the same machlokes as **R' Yose** and **R' Yehuda**, who argue in the case of a mavui whose walls partially collapsed on Shabbos. **R' Yehuda** says it is still mutar to carry there on that Shabbos, because it was mutar at the onset of Shabbos. **R' Yose** says that it is even assur to carry on the remaining part of that Shabbos, because the situation has changed. Maybe **R' Huna** holds like **R' Yehuda** and **R' Yitzchak** holds like **R' Yose**? **A:** **R' Huna** would say that **R' Yose** only holds that way in that case because the walls are no longer intact, but where the walls are intact and only the number of residents have changed it could be he would agree to **R' Huna**. **R' Yitzchak** would say, **R' Yehuda** only holds that way in that case because the number of residents remains constant, but where the number of residents would change, it could be he would agree to **R' Yitzchak**.

### V'CHACHOMIM OMRIM ECHAD MISHNEI DIVARIM

- **Q:** These **Chachomim** are saying the same thing as the first **Chachomim**?! **A:** The first **Chachomim** only allow an individual to use these inferior walls when he is travelling and must stop for Shabbos. The second **Chachomim** even allow use of these walls by an individual who is in a typical, residential area.

## MISHNA

- The **Rabanan** allowed 4 things for an army camp (that has gone out to war) that are typically assur: 1) they may bring wood from anyplace and don't have to be concerned for stealing, 2) they do not have to wash their hands before eating, 3) they may eat "demai" (food of an "ahm ha'aretz" from which we are not positive that ma'aser has been taken), 4) they don't have to make an eiruv (an eiruvi chatzeiros).

## GEMARA

- A Braisa says, an army that has gone out to a discretionary war is allowed to take even dry wood wherever they find it (even though it is possible the owners had left them there to dry for firewood). **R' Yehuda ben Teima** says, they may also set up camp wherever they want (even on private property), and they are buried wherever they are killed.
  - **Q:** Yehoshua, upon entering Eretz Yisrael, had set up that people may collect wood from the property of others?! **A:** Yehoshua had allowed for the taking of bushes that are typically not used by the owners. Our Mishna allows the army to take any type of wood. **A2:** Yehoshua allowed taking wood that was still attached to the ground, our Mishna allows even where the owner had cut the wood off. **A3:** Yehoshua had allowed taking moist wood, our Mishna even allows the taking of dry wood.

## R' YEHUDA BEN TEIMA OMER...

- **Q:** This is obvious, because the killed soldiers have a din of a "meis mitzvah", who is allowed to be buried wherever he is found!? **A:** The soldiers are allowed to be buried there even if they have family who will bury them. A "meis mitzvah", on the other hand, is someone who doesn't have family to deal with his burial.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that a meis mitzvah is moved to the side of the road, or to a less developed field and not buried exactly where he is found!? **A:** **R' Bibi** says, this Braisa is talking about a meis mitzvah who is found lying across the entire road. The meis must be moved to allow Kohanim to walk over this road. Once the meis is moved, we may move it to the side of our choice.

## U'PITURIN M'RICHITZAS YADAYIM

- **Abaye** said, washing before meals is what the **Rabanan** said the army need not do. However, washing after meals ("mayim achronim") is obligatory even for them.
  - **R' Chiya bar Ashi** explains that mayim achronim removes the dangerous salt that remains on the fingers after eating and can cause blindness.
    - **Q: R' Acha the son of Rava** asked **R' Ashi**, if one measures salt (but did not eat), must he wash his hands? **A:** He said that he absolutely must.

## UMIDEMAI

- **B"S** prohibit giving poor people and soldiers to eat from demai. **B"H** allow it.

## UMILE'AREIV

- In the **Yeshiva of R' Yannai** they said that the soldiers need not make an eruvei chatzeiros (it is only D'Rabanan) but they must make an eruvei techumin, because **R' Chiya** taught in a Braisa that one gets malkus D'Oraisa for going beyond the techum without an eruvei techumin.
  - **Q: R' Yonason** asked, the issur of going beyond the techum is written with the word "ahl", and we don't give malkus for an issur that is termed with the word "ahl"?!
    - **Q: R' Acha bar Yakov** asked, we find that the issur of following types of sorcery is written with the word "ahl" and all agree that malkus is given! **A: R' Yonason** meant that the issur of techum is also used to teach that transferring from one reshus to another on Shabbos is assur, and that issur is punishable with the death penalty, and we have a rule that a pasuk which teaches that something is punishable by death cannot also teach that it is punishable with malkus. To that question **R' Ashi** says that although the pasuk teaches about transferring from reshus to reshus, the words of the pasuk ("ahl yeitzei") refer to leaving the techum and that issur is not punishable with the death penalty (and can therefore teach that it is punishable with malkus).