



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

Eiruv Daf Samach Daled

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, an employee of a goy may join the eiruv in place of the goy. **R' Nachman** said, this is an excellent psak.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, one who drank a revi'is of wine may not pasken. **R' Nachman** said, this is not a good psak, because my mind is not clear until I drink a revi'is of wine.
 - **Rava** asked **R' Nachman**, why did you say “this is a good psak” and “this is not a good psak”? A pasuk teaches us that one who does so will forget his learning! **R' Nachman** said, I take back what I said.
- **Rabbah bar R' Huna** said, one who drank wine should not daven, but if he does, he has fulfilled his obligation to daven. One who is intoxicated should not daven and if he does, his davening is considered to be disgusting.
 - These terms were explained by **R' Abba bar Shumni and R' Menashye bar Yirmiya M'Gifti**, who, when taking leave of each other, each repeated something that the other had never heard as a way to remember their departing friend. One said “one who drank wine” refers to someone who can still speak in front of a king, and “one who is intoxicated” refers to someone who cannot speak in front of a king. The other one then said, if one has a financial windfall because he obtained the possessions of a “ger” who died without inheritors, if he wishes to protect the money (and not subject it to loss from “ayin harah” or other losses), he should use some of the money to purchase a Sefer Torah. **R' Sheishes** says, the same should be done by one who has acquired a lot of money through marriage. **Rava** says the same should be done by one who made a lot of money in business. **R' Pappa** says, this should even be done by one who finds a lost item and thereby becomes wealthy. **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** says, one can also buy tefillin with the money to accomplish this goal.
 - **Rami bar Abbah** says, travelling the distance of a “mil”, or sleeping for any amount of time removes the effects of the wine.
 - **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** says, this only works for one who drank a revi'is. However, one who drank more than a revi'is increases the effects of the wine by then traveling or sleeping.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says the story of **R' Gamliel** who was riding on a donkey, and was followed by **R' Illai**. They came across loaves of bread on the ground and **R' Gamliel** instructed **R' Illai** to pick them up, and he then instructed him to give them to a goy that they met whose name **R' Gamliel** knew. The goy told **R' Illai** that he had never met **R' Gamliel** and it became clear that **R' Gamliel** had “ruach hakodesh”. From this part of the story we learn: 1) we are not to leave food on the floor; 2) we follow the majority of travelers (he considered this bread to be of a goy and therefore assur for **R' Illai** to eat); 3) the chametz of a goy that was in existence over Pesach is mutar to benefit from after Pesach. The story continued, when **R' Gamliel** reached his destination, a man asked him to be “matir neder” for him. **R' Gamliel** said, because we have drank a revi'is of Italian wine, we have to travel to get rid of the effects of the wine. He then traveled 3 “mil”, descended from the donkey, wrapped himself in his talis and was matir neder for the man. From this part of the story we learn: 1) a revi'is of Italian wine intoxicates; 2) an intoxicated person may not pasken; 3) traveling rids one of the effects of wine; 4) one may not be matir neder unless he is seated. We see from this Braisa that **R' Gamliel** had to walk 3 mil to rid the effects of the wine, not just one mil?! **A:** Italian wine is stronger and therefore a longer distance of travel is needed to rid one of its effects.

- **Q: R' Nachman** said before, that if one drank more than a revi'is, because it is more intoxicating, traveling more than a mil will cause even more intoxication. If Italian wine is stronger, traveling longer distances should cause increased intoxication!? **A: R' Gamliel** was riding on a donkey, not walking. Therefore, traveling longer distances removed the effects of the wine. This is also why he had to travel 3 mil. Since he was riding and not walking, he needed to travel a longer distance to rid himself of the effects of the wine.
- **Q: R' Nachman** said that one may be matir neder when walking, standing or riding!? **A:** It is a machlokes Tana'im whether one must sit when he is matir neder. The Tanna who says the judge must find a reason to annul the vow would say that the judge must sit, because that requires concentration. The one who says that this need not be done would say that the judge need not sit. We find that **R' Gamliel** held that a judge must find a reason. That is why he sat down.
- The Braisa said that one may not leave food on the floor. **R' Yochanan in the name of R' Shimon ben Yochai** said, this is only true in the earlier generations, when Jewish girls did not practice "kishuf". However, in later generations when they did, one should leave the food on the floor.
 - A Braisa says that whole loaves should be left on the floor (because of "kishuf") but pieces should be picked up.
 - **Q: R' Assi** asked **R' Ashi**, a pasuk says that pieces of bread were used for kishuf!? **A:** It was used to pay the one doing the kishuf, but was not used for kishuf itself.
- **R' Sheishes in the name of R' Elazar ben Azarya** said, the pasuk says that after the Churban we are "drunk" from our troubles. Based on that, **R' Sheishes** said no one can be held responsible for any of their actions (and cannot be punished for them).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that a drunk is responsible for all his actions (and gets punished accordingly), although he is not allowed to daven!? **A: R' Sheishes** meant that after the Churban a person should not be punished for not davening, because we are all considered to be drunk.
 - **R' Chanina** says, a drunk is responsible for his actions only if he has not reached the level of intoxication of Lot (who was mezaneh with his own daughters due to his intoxication). However, at the level of Lot, one would not be responsible for his actions.