



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

### Eiruv Daf Lamed

HANODER MIN HAMAZON MUTAR BIMAYIM...

- This teaches that only water and salt are not called "mazon" (sustenance), but all other foods are called mazon.
  - **Q: Rav and Shmuel** say that one only makes a "borei minei mezonos" on food of the 5 grains. They seemingly hold that only the 5 grains are considered to be "mazon". Our Mishna contradicts them!? **A:** Our Mishna is discussing where he makes an oath not to benefit from anything that "satisfies", and all foods satisfy except for water and salt.
  - **Q: Rabbah bar bar Channa** said that **R' Yochanan's** talmidim would bring him 1,000 large fruits from Ginosar, and he would eat them all and say that he was not satisfied!? **A: R' Yochanan** meant that he had not eaten any "sustaining" food, not that he was not satisfied.
- **R' Huna in the name of Rav** said, if one swears not to eat certain bread, he may still use it for an eiruv (other people may still eat it). If he swears and says "This bread is prohibited to me", he is not allowed to have any benefit from it and therefore can't use it as an eiruv.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says if one swears to abstain from certain bread, he may use it for an eiruv. Presumably he said "This bread is prohibited to me" and still it is mutar for an eiruv!? **A:** He said "I will not eat this bread". This makes sense, because the Braisa explains itself, that he may use it as an eiruv only when he made a promise that he will not eat it. It seems that if he prohibited the bread on himself he may not use it as an eiruv.
    - **Q:** If this is true, when the Braisa wants to give an example of bread which can't be used for an eiruv, why does it use an example of bread that he made "hekdesh"? Why didn't it give the example of when he prohibits the bread on himself? This is problematic according to **R' Huna**!? **A: R' Huna** holds like **R' Eliezer** in a Braisa who says the same as he said.
      - **Q:** We find that **R' Eliezer** says one may make an eiruv even when he prohibits the bread on himself?! **A:** There are 2 Tanna'im who had different versions of what **R' Eliezer** said.

MI'ARVIN L'NAZIR B'YAYIN...

- Our Mishna does not follow **B"S** in a Braisa who say that a nazir may not have an eiruv of wine and a non-Kohen may not have an eiruv of terumah. **B"H** allow it. **B"H** said to **B"S**, don't you agree that an adult may make a eiruv for Yom Kippur (although he can't eat it)! So too, a nazir can make an eiruv with wine and a non-Kohen can make an eiruv with terumah. **B"S** say there is a difference. In the case of Yom Kippur, it is something that the adult can eat before Yom Kippur begins. That is not true by the nazir and the non-Kohen.
  - This version of **B"S** does not follow **Chananya**. He said that **B"S** don't agree to the concept of eiruv unless one brings all of the things he needs for the entire Shabbos to the place that he wants to set up the eiruv.

SUMCHOS OMER B'CHULIN

- **Q:** Why doesn't **Sumchos** also argue with regard to a nazir's eiruv of wine? **A:** A nazir can annul his promise of nezirus and become mutar to the wine on Shabbos.
  - **Q:** He can do the same to the terumah that he separated, so it should be a good eiruv for a non-Kohen as well!? **A:** If he annuls the terumah, the food would become "tevel" again and would be assur to him anyway.
    - **Q:** After annulment he could give terumah from other food for the eiruv food!? **A:** One is not supposed to give terumah from food not near the food he is looking to make not tevel.

- **Q:** Why can't he take terumah from the eiruv? **A:** If he takes terumah there would not be enough left for an eiruv.
- **Q:** Must the case being discussed only involve an eiruv that has exactly the minimum necessary amount to be effective? **A:** We can say that **Sumchos** holds like the **Rabanan** who say that anything which is assur D'Rabanan on Shabbos is assur to be done "bein hashmashos" as well. Therefore, separating terumah may not be done bein hashmashos and therefore the eiruv cannot be effective for a non-Kohen.
- A Mishna says that the amount for the 2 meals necessary for an eiruv is determined based on the person who the eiruv is for. This seemingly follows **Sumchos** who says that the eiruv must be able to be eaten by the one who is using it.
  - **Q:** This Mishna seems to argue on **R' Shimon ben Elazar** who says the amount of an eiruv for a sick or elderly person is the amount that they need for 2 seudos, but the amount for someone who eats a lot is judged by the amount needed for typical people. This second part seems to argue with the Mishna!? **A:** The Mishna's ruling is referring to sick and elderly people. Others would follow typical people.

#### U'LIKOHEN B'BEIS HA'PRAS

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, a Kohen may walk through a beis hapras by blowing on the ground to uncover any possible bone fragments before he steps on any given place. Therefore, he can get to the eiruv if he wants to.

#### R' YEHUDA OMER AHF BEIS HAKVAROS

- This eiruv would be good because the Kohen can enter the cemetery in a box large enough to separate him from the tumah.
  - **R' Yehuda**, who allows this, must hold that a "moving tent" is considered to be a tent, which acts as a partition for tumah. This is actually a machlokes Tanna'im in a Braisa where **Rebbi** says it does not act as a partition and **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** says that it does.