



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

Eiruv Daf Chuf Zayin

PEREK BAKOL M'ARVIN – PEREK SHLISHI

MISHNA

- One may make an eruv chatzeiros, an eruv techumin, or a shituf muvaos with any food, except for water and salt. One may use the money of ma'aser sheini to buy any food, except for water and salt. One who makes a promise not to benefit from "mazon" (nourishing food) is allowed to have water and salt.
- One may use wine to make an eiruv for a nazir (although he can't drink it). One may use terumah to make an eiruv for a non-Kohen (although he may not eat it). **Sumchos** says one may only make an eruv for a non-Kohen using chullin foods.
- One may make an eruv for a Kohen in a "beis hapras" (a field that was known to have a grave and was plowed over, thereby creating a safek whether some of the bones have been scattered and brought to the surface). **R' Yehuda** says an eiruv may even be made for a Kohen in between the graves, because the **Kohen** can be brought among the graves while he is in a box that has the characteristics which will have it not act as an "ohel" over the meis, but will rather be considered a separate place unto itself.

GEMARA

- **R' Yochanan** said, we cannot learn things from general rules, because there may always be exceptions to the rule. Even when the rule lists exceptions, still we cannot learn from the general rule, because it may not have listed ALL the exceptions.
 - **R' Yochanan** said his statement regarding the Mishna which says that "women are patur from all mitzvos which are tied to time and are chayuv in all mitzvos that are not tied to time". Although that is the general rule, the rule is not absolute, because women are chayuv in the mitzvos of matzah, simcha, and hakhel although they are tied to time, and women are patur from learning Torah, having children and pidyon ha'ben although they are not tied to time! From here we see that we cannot learn from a general rule.
 - **Abaye** or **R' Yirmiya** said, we can see this concept from another Mishna as well. A Mishna says that "anything a zav carries becomes tamei even if he doesn't touch it, but anything that carries a zav is tahor, except for things that are meant to sit on, to lean on, and a person". We know that there are other exceptions to this rule, because a pommel of a saddle becomes tamei when the zav rides on it even though it is not meant for sitting or leaning! We see that we cannot learn from a general rule even where it lists exceptions.
 - **Ravina** or **R' Nachman** said, we see this concept from our Mishna as well. The Mishna says "one may make an eruv chatzeiros, an eruv techumin, or a shituf muvaos with any food, except water and salt", yet we know that there are other foods, such as mushrooms, which may also not be used. We see that we cannot learn from a general rule even where it lists exceptions.

HAKOL NIKACH B'KESEF MA'ASER...

- **R' Elazar** and **R' Yose bar Chanina** each made the following statement, but one made it in regard to eiruv and one made it in regard to ma'aser sheini: it is only problematic when the water and salt are separate, but if they are combined into saltwater, it is permitted.
 - The one who said this regarding ma'aser (which is D'Oraisa) would surely say that saltwater is ok to use for eiruv. The one who says this regarding eiruv may hold that saltwater may not be purchased with ma'aser sheini money, because ma'aser money

must be used to purchase things which fit into certain categories that the Gemara will discuss shortly.

- **R' Yitzchak** said this statement regarding ma'aser (that the ma'aser money may be used to purchase salt water).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda ben Gadish** said to **R' Eliezer**, “my father would purchase fish brine (similar to saltwater) with ma'aser money”. **R' Eliezer** responded, maybe he would purchase fish brine with pieces of fish inside, because plain brine may not be purchased with ma'aser money. We see from here that even **R' Yehuda ben Gadish**, who is meikel, only allowed the purchase of fish brine, which at least has some fish fats mixed in, and can thus be considered a “fruit” (as will be explained), but even he would seemingly not allow plain saltwater?! **A:** **R' Yosef** answered, **R' Yitzchak** only allows saltwater when it is mixed with oil.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, if it is mixed with oil, then it should be permitted on account of the oil?! **A:** The case is that he paid more money than the value of the oil, and in that way paid for the saltwater as well (“havla'ah”). **R' Yitzchak** is saying that this is allowed to be done with ma'aser money.
 - We find a Braisa that allows “havla'ah” of non-food items when purchasing with ma'aser money: **Ben Bag Bag** says that extra words in the pasuk teach as follows: “babakar” – one may buy an animal with ma'aser money even though part of the money is paying for the non-edible skin; “u'vatzon” – one may buy sheep although money is purchasing the wool (even though, unlike skin, wool could have been removed from the animal before the purchase); “u'vayayin” – one may purchase wine along with its barrel (although it is not attached to the wine, it does preserve it); “u'vasheichar” – one may purchase the “wine” made when adding water to soak the seeds which is then left to ferment (although money is being used to purchase the water that has been added).
 - **R' Yochanan** understood why each word taught a larger chiddush (as explained in each parenthetical in the paragraph, above), but why not just say the larger chiddush and no need to say the smaller ones? **R' Yochanan** explained that if the pasuk would only say “u'vasheichar”, we would say it refers to intoxicating fruits, which is why it may be purchased with ma'aser money; and if it would then only say “u'vayayin”, we would say that the barrel preserves the wine and therefore is allowed, but wool and skin do not and may therefore not be purchased with ma'aser money; that's why the pasuk had to say “u'vatzon”, to teach that ma'aser money may be used even when partially going for the wool. The question is, why do we “babakar”? If one may use the money to purchase wool, surely he may use it to purchase skin!?
- **R' Yehuda ben Gadish** and **R' Eliezer** both allow the purchase of fish with ma'aser money. Some other Tana'im do not.
 - They argue in how to darshen the psukim. The pasuk first says the money may be used to purchase “b'chol asher ti'veh nafshicha” (a general inclusion), then the pasuk limits it to “babakar, u'vatzon, u'vayayin, u'vasheichar”, then the pasuk ends with another generalization of “u'vichol asher tishalcha nafshecha”.
 - **R' Yehuda ben Gadish** and **R' Eliezer** darshen with a “ribui u'mi'et”, which ultimately allows the inclusion of more items and they therefore include even fish. The “me'it” does exclude something: **R' Yehuda** excludes saltwater and **R' Eliezer** excludes even fish brine.
 - The other Tana'im darshen a “klal u'prat”, which is more limiting, and therefore they only include things that (according to one version) are like the specifically listed items in that they are “fruit that comes from a

fruit” and is nourished from the ground, or (according to another version) things that come from things that themselves came from the earth at Creation.

- **Abaye** explains, according to the first version fish would be allowed to be purchased (they are “fruit that come from fruit” – they are fish born to fish, and they are nourished from the ground – they eat the vegetation of the ground). According to the second version fish may not be purchased (because they were created from the water at Creation).