

5 Kislev 5781  
Nov. 21 2020



Eiruvin Daf 104

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

**Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

MISHNAH: Salt may be crushed [and scattered]<sup>1</sup> on the Altar's ramp<sup>2</sup> that the Kohanim shall not slip. Water also may be drawn on the Shabbos by means of a wheel from the Exile's Well<sup>3</sup> and from the Great Well; and on a festival day from the Hakir Well also. (104a)

GEMARA: Rav Ikka of Pashronia pointed out to Rava the following inconsistency. We learned: Salt may be crushed [and scattered]<sup>4</sup> on the Altar's ramp<sup>5</sup> that the Kohanim shall not slip. Thus only in the Mikdash is this permitted but not in the country. But isn't this inconsistent with the following: If a courtyard floor was damaged by rainwater one may bring straw and level it?<sup>6</sup> — Straw is different since its owner does not renounce it.<sup>7</sup> (104a)

Said Rav Acha son of Rava to Rav Ashi: How are we to understand the case of the Salt? If its owner has renounced it, wouldn't the scattering constitute an addition to the structure?<sup>8</sup> And if he did not renounce it, would it not constitute an unlawful interposition?<sup>9</sup> — This

is a case where the salt<sup>10</sup> was scattered when the limbs of sacrifices were carried up the ramp, an act which is not regarded as part of the Mikdash service. But is it not indeed? Was it not in fact written in Scripture: And the Kohen shall offer the whole, and make it smoke upon the Altar, a text which, a Master explained, refers to the carrying of the limbs up the ramp?<sup>11</sup> — Rather say: This refers [to salt scattered] when the wood is carried to the Altar pile which is an act that is no part of the Mikdash service. (104a)

Rava expounded: If a courtyard floor was damaged by rainwater one may bring straw and level it. Said Rav Pappa to Rava: Was it not taught. When he levels the ground he must not scatter the straw either with a small basket or with a large one but only with the bottom broken from a basket? Rava thereupon appointed a speaker and delivered the following discourse: The statement I made to you was an error on my part. But it was this indeed that was reported in the name of Rabbi Eliezer: 'And when he

<sup>1</sup> On the Shabbos.

<sup>2</sup> Which had a smooth surface and after a rain was very slippery.

<sup>3</sup> One of the cisterns in the Temple court said to have been dug by the exiles after the return from Babylon.

<sup>4</sup> On the Shabbos.

<sup>5</sup> Which had a smooth surface and after a rain was very slippery.

<sup>6</sup> Or 'make a path in'. Which shows that even in the country it is permissible to scatter straw on the ground. How then is this to be reconciled with our Mishnah which allows salt to be scattered in the Mikdash court only?

<sup>7</sup> But intends to collect it later and to use it as fodder for cattle or to mix it in a mortar. The scattering of materials on the ground on the Shabbos is forbidden as 'levelling' which is a form of 'building', but since the straw is not to remain on the ground

permanently the act of scattering cannot be regarded as 'building'. Salt, on the other hand, being useless after it has once been scattered on the ground, is presumed to have been renounced by its owner once it has been scattered. The act, therefore, is permitted in the Mikdash court only but not in the country.

<sup>8</sup> Of course it would; and this is forbidden even on a weekday since nothing may be added to the Mikdash structures.

<sup>9</sup> Between the surface of the ramp and the Kohanim's feet.

<sup>10</sup> Which in fact was not renounced, since it could be collected and used for the salting of the skins of the sacrifices.

<sup>11</sup> How then could it be said that the carrying forms no part of the service?

levels it he must not scatter the straw either with a small basket or with a large one but with the bottom broken from a basket.’ (104a)

Water also may be drawn . . . of a wheel from the Exile’s Well. Ulla once happened to visit Rav Menasheh when a man came and knocked on the door. ‘Who’, he exclaimed ‘is this person? May his body be desecrated, for he desecrates the Shabbos’. ‘Only a musical sound’, said Rabbah to him, ‘has been forbidden’. Abaye pointed out an objection against him: ‘Liquids may be drawn by means of a siphon, and water may be allowed to drip from the arak,<sup>12</sup> for a sick person on the Shabbos’. Thus only ‘for a sick person’ is this allowed, but not for a healthy one. Now, how are we to imagine the circumstances? Would you not agree that this is a case where the sick man was asleep and it was desired<sup>13</sup> that he should wake up? May it not then be inferred<sup>14</sup> that the production of any sound is forbidden? — No; this is a case where he was awake and it is desired that he should fall asleep, so that the sound heard is one like a tingling noise.<sup>15</sup>

He pointed out to him a further objection: If a man guards his fruit against the birds or his gourds against wild animals he may proceed on the Shabbos in his usual way, provided he does not clap his hand, beat his chest or stamp his feet as is usually done on weekdays. Now what could be the reason? Is it not that the man produces sound and that the production of any sound is forbidden? — Rav Acha bar Yaakov replied: This is a preventive measure against the possibility of his picking up a pebble.<sup>16</sup> What, however, is the reason for the statement which Rav Yehudah citing Rav made that women who play with nuts commit a transgression? Is it not that this produces sound and that the production of any sound is forbidden? — No; the reason is that they might proceed to level the ground. For,

were you not to concede this, how would you explain the ruling of Rav Yehudah that women who play with apples commit a transgression? What sound could be produced there? Consequently, it must be conceded that the reason is that they might proceed to level the ground.

We learned: Water also may be drawn on the Shabbos by means of a wheel from the Exile’s Well<sup>17</sup> and from the Great Well. Thus only in the Mikdash is this permitted but not in the country. But what could be the reason? Is it not that the revolution of the wheel produces a sound which is forbidden? — No; this is a preventive measure against the possibility of a man’s drawing the water for his garden or his ruin.

Ameimar allowed the drawing of water by means of a wheel at Machuza; ‘for’, he said, ‘on what ground did the Rabbis enact a preventive measure against such drawing? Only on the ground that a person might also draw water for his garden or his ruin. But in this place there is neither garden nor ruin’. When, however, he observed that they began to soak flax in it he forbade it to them. (104a – 104b)

And from the Hakir Well. What was the ‘Hakir Well’? — Samuel replied: A cistern concerning which arguments welled forth and its use [on a Festival] was declared to be permitted. An objection was raised: Not all the Hakir cisterns but only this one, did they permit. Now if you explain it to mean that concerning it arguments welled forth, what could be the meaning of ‘only this one’? — Rather, said Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak: A well of living water, as it is said in Scripture: As a wellspring causes its water to flow. (104b)

[To turn to] the main text. Not all the Hakir cisterns, but only this one, did they permit. And when the exiles

<sup>12</sup> A perforated vessel used in sick rooms.

<sup>13</sup> By the production of the sound of the arak which is a mere noise without any musical quality whatever.

<sup>14</sup> Since the instrument mentioned may be used for a sick man only but not for a healthy one.

<sup>15</sup> Which lulls the patient to sleep by its musical notes.

<sup>16</sup> To throw it at a bird, and he would thus transfer an object from a private domain into a public domain, which is forbidden.

<sup>17</sup> One of the cisterns in the Temple court said to have been dug by the exiles after the return from Babylon.

returned they encamped by it, and the prophets among them, permitted them to use it [on Festivals]; and not only the prophets among them did this but it was a practice of their forefathers that they upheld. (104b)

**MISHNAH:** If a sheretz was found in the Mikdash,<sup>18</sup> a Kohen should carry it out with his sash<sup>19</sup> to avoid keeping the tumah there any longer than is necessary; these are the words of Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah. Rabbi Yehudah ruled: [It should be removed] with wooden tongs<sup>20</sup> in order that the tumah shall not increase.<sup>21</sup> From where must it be removed? From the Temple, from the Antechamber and from between the Antechamber and the Altar;<sup>22</sup> these are the words of Rabbi Shimon ben Nanas. Rabbi Akiva ruled: From any place where kares is incurred for entering presumptuously and a chatas for entering it in error it must be removed. In any other places, however a copper pot is to be put over it.<sup>23</sup> Rabbi Shimon said: Wherever the Sages have permitted you anything they have only given you what is really yours, since they have only permitted you that which is forbidden as shevus. (104b)

**GEMARA:** Rav Tavi bar Kisna citing Shmuel ruled: One who brings into the Mikdash all object that was defiled by a sheretz incurs guilt, but if one brings in the sheretz itself one is exempt. What is the reason? — Scripture said: Both

man and women shall you send out, from which it is inferred that only that which may attain taharah in a mikvah is subject to the prohibition,<sup>24</sup> a sheretz, however, is excluded since it can never attain taharah. May it be suggested that the following provides support for this view? Both man and women shall you send out excludes an earthen vessel; these are the words of Rabbi Yosi HaGellili. Now what could be the reason? Is it not because it cannot attain taharah through a mikvah? — No; only that which may become a primary source of tumah is subject to the prohibition, an earthen vessel, however, is excluded since it can never become a primary source of tumah.<sup>25</sup>

Must it be conceded that on this question there is a divergence of opinion between the following Tannaim: If a sheretz was found in the Mikdash, a Kohen should carry it out with his sash to avoid keeping the tumah there any longer than is necessary; these are the words of Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah. Rabbi Yehudah ruled: [It should be removed] with wooden tongs in order that the tumah shall not increase. Now do they not differ on this point: That he who said: to avoid keeping, holds the opinion that one who takes a sheretz into the Mikdash incurs guilt,<sup>26</sup> while he who said: In order that . . . shall not increase holds the opinion that one who takes a sheretz into the Mikdash is exempt? — No, all may agree that guilt is incurred, but the

<sup>18</sup> On the Shabbos, when it is forbidden under the laws of shevus to handle a sheretz.

<sup>19</sup> But not with his bare hand, in order to avoid direct contact with the sheretz and the latter's consequent conveyance of tumah to the Kohen's body. Carrying alone, in the absence of direct contact, does not cause tumah and the sash, though it contracts a certain degree of tumah (first grade) from the sheretz, cannot carry any tumah to the Kohen's body since no degree lower than that of primary tumah can affect the tumah of a human being.

<sup>20</sup> Which are unsusceptible to tumah.

<sup>21</sup> By its spread to the sash. In Rabbi Yehudah's view it is preferable to allow the offending object to remain in the Mikdash a little longer until wooden tongs can be obtained and thus to limit the extent of the tumah, rather than to remove it sooner and thereby cause the tumah to spread to another object.

<sup>22</sup> Sc. the brazen Altar that stood in the Mikdash court in front of the Ulam. If the offending object was found in any other part of the Mikdash court it could not be removed on the Shabbos (until after nightfall) on account of the prohibition against moving objects from a private into a public domain.

<sup>23</sup> To keep it covered during the Shabbos. After dusk it is removed.

<sup>24</sup> Of entering the Mikdash.

<sup>25</sup> The only primary source of tumah which a vessel can contract is that of midras tumah, to which all earthenware vessel is not susceptible. For bringing in a sheretz, however, since it is a primary source of tumah, one does incur guilt, contrary to the view of Shmuel.

<sup>26</sup> Biblically. Hence it is preferable to extend tumah to the sash rather than to continue a transgression against a Biblical prohibition.



point at issue here is the following: One Master holds that it is preferable to keep a tamei object a little longer<sup>27</sup> while the other Master holds that it is preferable to increase the tumah.<sup>28</sup>

The point at issue is rather the same as that between the following Tannaim. We learned: From where must it be removed, etc. Now do they not differ on this point: That he who ruled that from the Mikdash court it may not be removed is of the opinion that one who takes a sheretz into the Mikdash is exempt,<sup>29</sup> while he who holds that it must be removed from any part of the court is of the opinion that guilt is incurred? — Rabbi Yochanan retorted: Both expounded this same text: And the Kohanim entered into the inner part of the house of Hashem to cleanse it, and brought out all the tumah that they found in the Mikdash of Hashem into the court of the House of Hashem. And the Levites took it to carry it out abroad to the Kidron Valley. One Master holds that since in the court there was a change over to the Levites, there can be no prohibition against allowing tumah to remain for some time in the court, while the other Master holds that up to the point where it was impossible for the Levites to attend the Kohanim had to carry the tumah out, but where it could be done by the Levites the Kohanim could no longer defile themselves. (104b – 105a)

#### INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

One is not supposed to make musical noises on Shabbos with anything else, even if that other thing is not a musical instrument but something like a door. However, the Gemora understands that if it is not in a manner of a tune one would be allowed to knock on a door.

The Rema (Orach Chaim 338:1) extends this prohibition further. He says that one also may not knock on the door

<sup>27</sup> Rather than increase tumah by imparting it to the sacred sash.

<sup>28</sup> Rather than keeping a tamei object in the Mikdash even only one minute longer than is absolutely necessary.

with a door knocker. This is even if he is not intending to make a musical sound with the knocker. The Mishna Berura explains that we suspect that a person will make a nice sound when he uses a door knocker, and it is therefore prohibited to be used altogether.

Similarly, any kind of doorbell chime, even if does not involve electricity, is also forbidden to be used. This is explicitly stated by the Eliya Rabah and Pri Megadim (and quoted by the Mishna Berura).

However, the Rema says that it is permitted to whistle with one's mouth, even when whistling a tune one Shabbos, as the decree is only regarding using instruments or other things to make this musical sound.

#### DAILY MASHAL

#### THE SPECIAL POWER OF A NIGGUN

Rabbi Aryeh Royde was quoted in Mishpachah magazine: You never know what will touch a person. Years ago, in a community in Pennsylvania, we met a totally secular couple. They stayed in touch with us and we shared visits as they slowly transformed their lives and came closer to Torah. Today they are a strong *frum* couple who are *mekarev* others. This man was once interviewed, and said that “when the chassidim came for Shabbos and they were singing and banging on the table, I got all choked up. It reminded me of my own grandfather, who would sing and bang.” This man's grandfather was a *dayan* back in Europe. I was amazed when I read that, because for years, I hadn't known that what actually reached his heart was our banging on the table.

<sup>29</sup> Biblically. The Rabbis, therefore, enforced their shevus throughout the Mikdash, except in the case of the Heichal and Ulam and between the latter and the Altar on account of their high degree of holiness.