



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

Eiruv Daf Lamed Aleph

- **R' Yehuda** says in a Braisa that a tahor Kohen may make an eiruv with tahor terumah on top of a kever. The way that can be done is by the Kohen being carried over the kever in a box (as described in the last Gemara).
 - **Q:** The terumah will become tamei when being placed on the kever!? **A:** The terumah was not "muchshar l'kabel tumah".
 - **Q:** How does the Kohen get access to the terumah? As soon as he sticks his hand out of the box he will become tamei!? **A:** He uses a flat piece of wood that is not a keili and cannot become tamei.
 - **Q:** The piece of wood will act as an ohel over the meis and the Kohen, and will make him tamei!? **A:** The piece of wood is not even a tefach wide and therefore cannot act as an ohel.
 - **Q:** If so, why do the **Rabanan** say that a Kohen cannot make an eiruv like this? **A:** They say that one may not be "konah" a dwelling place in a place that is assur to benefit from (and it is assur to benefit from a grave).
 - **Q:** How does **R' Yehuda** allow establishing the eiruv there? **A:** An eiruv is only established to help accomplish a mitzvah, and performing mitzvos is not considered to be having a benefit from it.
 - **Q:** Maybe this concept that **Rava** says that performing mitzvos is not considered to be having benefit is a machlokes between **R' Yehuda** and the **Rabanan** (**R' Yehuda** agrees with it and the **Rabanan** seem to argue)!? **A:** **Rava** would answer that all agree that performing mitzvos is not considered to be having a benefit. The machlokes is, the **Rabanan** say an eiruv may be established for any purpose (and a purpose other than a mitzvah is considered to bring benefit). **R' Yehuda** says an eiruv may only be established to help in the performance of a mitzvah, and therefore never provides any "benefit".
 - **Q:** This din of **R' Yosef** that one may only establish an eiruv to help in the performance of a mitzvah seems to be the subject of a machlokes!? **A:** **R' Yosef** would say that all agree that an eiruv may only be established for a mitzvah, and all agree that performance of mitzvos provide no benefit. The machlokes is whether once the eiruv is established the person cares if the eiruv food remains intact for possible consumption at a later time. **R' Yehuda** says a person doesn't care about that as long as the eiruv has been properly established, and therefore the kever provides no additional benefit. The **Rabanan** say that the kever provides that benefit of protecting the food for a later time, and people want that benefit and it may therefore not be used.

MISHNA

- A person may make an eiruv using demai, ma'aser rishon whose terumah was taken, or ma'aser sheini or hekdesch that was redeemed. Also, a Kohen may make an eiruv using Challah or terumah.
- An eiruv may not be made with tevel, with ma'aser rishon whose terumah was not taken, or with ma'aser sheini or hekdesch which was not redeemed.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Demai is not fit to be eaten, so how can it be used as an eiruv?! **A:** Since the person can give away all his possessions and become a pauper (who is allowed to eat "demai") it is considered fit for him now as well.

U'MA'ASER RISHON SHENITLA TERUMASO...

- **Q:** This is obviously fit to be eaten?! **A:** We are talking about a case where the Levi took the ma'aser before there was a chiyuv for the owner to give Terumah Gedolah (before it was smoothed into a pile), and therefore, Terumah Gedolah was never given. We would think that is assur and therefore it should not be allowed as an eiruv. The Mishna is telling us like **R' Avahu**, that in this case the Levi only needs to give his Terumas Ma'aser, not the Terumah Gedola and it is therefore fit to be eaten. However, had the Levi taken the ma'aser after there was already a chiyuv for the owner to give the Teruma Gedola, the Levi would have to separate Teruma Gedola as well as Terumas Ma'aser.

U'MA'ASER SHEINI V'HEKDESH SHENIFDU...

- **Q:** This is obviously fit to be eaten?! **A:** The Mishna is discussing where he gave the principle amount of the redemption, but not the additional fifth. The Mishna teaches that the redemption is considered complete without it as well.

AVAL LO B'TEVEL

- **Q:** Tevel is obviously not fit to be eaten!? **A:** We are discussing something which is tevel only D'Rabanan (e.g. something grown in a flowerpot without a hole). The Mishna is teaching that even that is considered not fit to be eaten to the point that it may not be used for an eiruv.

V'LO MA'ASER RISHON SHELO NITLAH TERUMASO...

- **Q:** This is obviously not fit to be eaten!? **A:** We are discussing where the Levi took his ma'aser after the produce was smoothed into a pile but before the owner separated terumah. One would think (based on the psukim) that the Levi should not have to separate the owner's portion of the terumah as well. The Mishna teaches that he does, and until he does it is not to be used for an eiruv.

V'LO B'MA'ASER SHEINI V'HEKDESH SHELO NIFDU...

- **Q:** This is obviously not fit to be eaten!? **A:** This is discussing where it was redeemed, but not properly. For example, the ma'aser was redeemed onto coins that have no image on it (the pasuk teaches that it must have some image), and the hekdesch was redeemed onto land (the pasuk teaches that hekdesch may not be redeemed onto real property).

MISHNA

- If one sends an eiruv to be placed down by a deaf-mute, a deranged person, or a minor, or by one who doesn't believe in the halachos of eiruv, even if the eiruv is properly placed it does not have a din of an eiruv. However, if the sender (the one who desires to establish the eiruv) arranges for a competent person to take the food from these people and to have the competent person place the eiruv, the eiruv is effective.

GEMARA

- **Q: R' Huna** said that a minor may collect the food needed from the joint owners of a chatzer to create an eiruv!? **A:** Eruvei chatzeiros is different, because once the food is placed all are automatically joined into the eiruv. By eruvei techumin, the one placing the eiruv must make a kinyan on the dwelling place. These incompetent people lack the capacity to make a kinyan.

OY B'YAD MI SHE'EINO MODEH B'EIRUV

- **R' Chisda** explained, the Mishna is referring to a Kuti.

V'IHM OMAR L'ACHER L'KABLO HEIMENU HAREI ZEH EIRUV

- **Q:** We should be concerned that these incompetent individuals will not bring the eiruv to the competent person?! **A:** Like **R' Chisda** said elsewhere, the Mishna is discussing where the sender watches until the incompetent person reaches the competent person.
- **Q:** We should be concerned that the competent person will not take the eiruv and place it down as instructed!? **A:** Like **R' Yechiel** said elsewhere, we have a "chazakah" that a "shaliach" does what he was instructed to do (and we can rely on that).
- **R' Chisda and R' Yechiel** said their din in regard to the following Braisa. The Braisa says, if one gave an eiruv to a trained elephant or monkey to place down, it is not a good eiruv. If he instructed a competent person to take it from the animal and place it down as an eiruv, it is a valid eiruv.
 - **Q:** We should be concerned that the animal will not bring the eiruv to the competent person?! **A: R' Chisda** says, the Braisa is discussing where the sender watches until the animal reaches the competent person.

- **Q:** We should be concerned that the competent person will not take the eiruv and place it down as instructed!? **A: R' Yechiel** says, we have a "chazakah" that a "shaliach" does what he was instructed to do (and we can rely on that).
- **R' Nachman** said, this chazakah is only relied upon when dealing with a D'Rabanan, not a D'Oraisa. **R' Sheishes** said this chazakah is relied upon even when dealing with D'Oraisa matters.