

This month's Daf Digest is dedicated
L'iluy Nishmas Mrs. Yenta Weiss, Rivke Yenta bas Asher Anshel & Yosef ben Chaim HaCohen Weiss
By Mr. and Mrs. Manny Weiss
L'iluy Nishmas שרגא פייוול דוד בן קמואל
By the Abramowitz family

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Making an eruv for a kohen (cont.)

The Gemara questions the validity of placing an eruv for a kohen in a cemetery since the terumah will become tamei rendering it inedible.

Two solutions are provided where the terumah will not become tamei.

The Gemara questions how the kohen will retrieve the terumah without becoming tamei.

A solution is suggested. The solution, however leads the Gemara to the understanding that the dispute between R' Yehudah and Rabanan is whether it is permitted to derive benefit from an object which is prohibited from benefit. How could R' Yehudah maintain that it is permitted?

The Gemara resolves this difficulty by explaining that according to all opinions, mitzvos were not given for the purpose of deriving benefit and the point of dispute is whether an eruv may be made for purposes that are discretionary

A second explanation is offered to account for a statement of R' Yosef. According to R' Yosef, the point of dispute is whether the owner has an interest in the place protecting the food

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses other types of foods that may or may not be used to make an eruv techumin.

3) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara explains why demai is considered an edible food for the owner on Shabbos.

The novelty in the Mishnah's ruling that ma'aser rishon whose terumah has been removed and ma'aser sheni and hekadesh that have been redeemed is explained.

The novelty in the Mishnah's ruling that ma'aser rishon whose terumah has not been removed and ma'aser sheni and hekadesh that have not been redeemed is explained.

4) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah enumerates different people who may not serve as a shaliach to place the eruv in the designated spot. A solution that permits using a disqualified person is offered.

5) The use of a child

The Gemara questions the Mishnah's disqualification of a child from R' Huna's ruling that permits a child to collect the food for the eruv.

The Gemara distinguishes between an eruv techumin

(Continued on page 2)

Distinctive INSIGHT

A monkey as an agent

נתנו לפיל והוליכו, לקוף והוליכו

It is possible to place the items for an eruv in the paw of a monkey or elephant and have the animal carry the food to the designated spot at the edge of 2000 amos. Yet this eruv is not valid unless it follows the stipulations which the Gemara sets forth.

Rashi explains that we sometimes find that it is possible to train monkeys and elephants to follow instructions given by man.

Meiri also comments that a monkey or even an elephant which is brought up in a domestic setting can be trained to follow instructions given by man. Meiri then points out that the Yerushalmi even says that these animals can be trained to follow instructions in seventy languages. (We do not have this citation in our Yerushalmi).

Rabbeinu Nissim Gaon explains that this means that the animal can be trained to follow commands and to respond to what is being asked of it, but not that the animal can comprehend the language itself. Melech Shlomo (Kilayim 8:6) says that an elephant can actually understand the language of man.

Psikta Zutresi (Bereshis 3:1) relates that the original נחש conversed with Chava in the Holy Tongue. He then adds that "each species of the animals has its own language."

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What are the two ways the teruma does not become tamei even though it is placed in a cemetery?

2. Explain מצוות לאו להיאנות ניתנו.

3. What is the mechanism that renders d'mai an edible food for anyone?

4. Why is it permitted for a child to gather the food for the eruv chatzeiros?

Distinctive INSIGHT

The credibility of minors

והאמר רב הונא קטן גובה את העירוב לא קשעא כאן בעירובי תחומין כאן בעירובי חצירות

Rashi understands the Gemara as teaching that although a minor is capable of collecting the bread that serves as an eruv chatzeiros, he is incapable of making the "acquisition" that is the basis of eruv techumin.

Tosafos (d.h. Kan) understand the Gemara differently, and that it is teaching us that since the prohibition of Techum Shabbos has a basis in Torah law, the Rabbis were stringent and did not allow it to be entrusted to a minor.

Tosafos ask that, if so, why are minors believed when they say a house has been checked and is chametz-free (Pesachim 4b)? Tosafos respond that it is only concerning the house in which the minor himself lives that the Rabbis credited his assertion that the house was checked, as the minor [assuming he is old enough to understand the issue of chametz - i.e., "he'gi'ah l'chinuch] feels that responsibility incumbent upon himself. The minor would not be believed, however, concerning a house other than his own - even if he was specifically delegated the responsibility of checking the other

and an eruv chatzeiros.

6) Clarifying the Mishnah

R' Chisda identifies the "One who does not acknowledge the eruv" as cuthites.

The case where we permit the disqualified person to carry the eruv to a competent shaliach is where he can be seen handing the eruv to the competent shaliach. The reason the competent agent is trusted is based upon the principle that a shaliach will perform his assigned task.

The source of this principle is identified and a discussion begins regarding the extent of to which it applies. ■

house.

In terms of practical Halachah, however, the Mishnah Berurah (Orach Chaim 537:16) rules that a minor is even believed when he tells us that a house other than his own home was checked (see Shaar HaTziyun ad loc. #19). This is because the primary reason that he is held to be credible is because the entire checking procedure is only a "back-up" to the primary procedure of Bittul - the negation of the chametz. However, accordingly, the minor is only believed in conjunction with Bittul. Hence, if it is already so late on Erev Pesach that Bittul is no longer effective, the minor is not believed either, and an adult must check the premises. ■

STORIES off the Daf

The pleasure of doing a Mitzvah

מצוות לאו ליהנות ניתנו

Mitzvos are not for given for the purpose of deriving benefit from them.

The Strikover Rebbe, zt"l, told the story of a fine Jew who lived in Lodz, whose name was R' Dovid Kaplan. He was a member of the Strikover chassidim community, and R' Dovid was once asked what the Gemara means when it says that "mitzvos are not given for benefit." He explained it by illustrating the concept with a story.

Once there was a wealthy man who came home from work at the end of the day. He entered into the dining room of his mansion to eat a hearty meal which was prepared by his servants. Each attendant stood at his position, ready to

fulfill his duty. One helped him collect the hem of his robe, while the other pulled his chair and held it for him. And so it was, with each servant taking his turn performing his task for the wealthy master.

Finally, the head chef entered, ready to serve the master his favorite soup, a delicacy cooked and served to perfection. The master delved into his portion, enjoying every spoonful. Suddenly, the butler of the mansion burst into the room, anxious and out of breath. He approached the master, and whispered into his ear. A telegram had just arrived informing them that the master had just won forty thousand rubles in a state lottery!

"Now," R' Dovid Kaplan explained to his listeners, "could we imagine that this rich man would still show any interest in the taste of the dumplings in his soup at that moment? He would be so

overwhelmed with the news of his extended fortune that nothing about his food could impress him at that moment!"

This is also the concept illustrated in our Gemara which discusses the pleasure derived in the performance of mitzvos. If we would think about the pleasure in the World-to-Come for our performance of mitzvos, there is no element of physical pleasure while performing a mitzvah in this world which would compare to it in any way. ■

(Insight...continued from page 1)

This seems to suggest that he believes that they actually converse and have a means of communicating among themselves. Nevertheless, we must say that this only means that the animals of each species have an instinctive manner of understanding one another, but not that they necessarily possess an entire language of their own. ■