

In the previous Daf we learned about a non-Jew living in a מבוי, who refuses to rent his rights in the מבוי to the Jewish neighbors. The גמרא presents two suggestions for making it permissible to carry in the מכוי:

אביי suggested;

- זילו בטילו רשותייכו לגבי חד

All the Jews should give up their rights to one Jew, which will then create a situation of one Jew and one non-Jew in the אויט , in which case עיקוב holds that one is permitted to carry even without an עירוב.

When רבא heard this suggestion he said; אם כן בטלת תורת עירוב מאותו מבוי –

If they do this every שבת the members of that will forget about the concept of שיתופי מבואות entirely!

If we insist that they make a שיתוף, they will get the false impression that a שיתוף works even when there is a non-Jewish resident who is not renting his דשות.

Announcing that this שיתוף is merely a formality, and actually Halachically invalid and not necessary, is not

sufficient either because

- !?אכרזתא לדרדקי

Will the announcement be effective for the children? The children will only remember what was done – not what was announced!

2 אלא אמר רבא – Instead Rava suggests that one of the Jews should become friendly with the non-Jew, and get permission to use his place for storage, thereby making the Jew – like an employee or a farmhand of the non-Jew. The שכירו ולקיטו – can participate in the שיתוף as if he is the resident of that חצר, neutralizing any effect the non-Jew has on the יוביר. If there are multiple employees, אביי told רב יוסף, אביי told עירוב, they do not have to all participate in the

שכירו ולקיטו of דין said this רב יהודה אמר שמואל Rav אפרירו ולקיטו Rav Nachman commented;

רכמה מעליא הא שמעתא – how good is this teaching. However, when אמר שמואל said; הנדה אמר – שתה רביעית יין אל יורה –

Somebody who drank a רביעית of wine should not pasken – Rav Nachman said; - לא מעליא הא שמעתא -

This statement is not accurate, because, on the contrary, a of wine actually helps clear one's mind.













Parenthetically רבא tells ירב נחמן;
כל האומר שמועה זו נאה וזו אינה נאה מאבד הונה של תורה
It is not appropriate to single out one teaching - as opposed to others - as being particularly beautiful, because it diminishes the honor of Torah.

- אמר ליה הדרי בי

רב נחמן regretted having done so - and as Rashi adds, he said; עוד - I will not do this again.

אמר רבה בר רב הונא שתוי אל יתפלל ואם התפלל תפלתו תפלה – One who drank wine, but is still sober enough to speak properly before a king, may not daven, but if he does daven, his חפילות are valid.

- שיכור אל יתפלל ואם התפלל תפלתו תועבה

A person intoxicated to the point that he cannot speak properly before a king, may not daven, and his תועבה is תועבה an abomination.

This distinction between שיכור and שיכור was taught by one of two Amoraim who were taking leave of each other, and said; 'Let us each say a Halachah that the other one has not heard.' As מרי בר רב הונא taught;

לא יפטר אדם מחבירו אלא מתוך דבר הלכה שמתוך כך זוכרו -One should always take leave of his friend with a word of Halachah, by which they will remember each other. Parenthetically...
רב נחכן tells רבא
כל האומר שמועה זו נאה
כל האומר שמועה זו נאה
וזו אינה נאה מאבד הונה של תורה
Inappropriate to single out one teaching
It diminishes the honor of
אמר ליה הדרי בי
רק"י – לא אוסיף עוד
I won't do this again

אמר רבה בר רב הונא שיכור אל יתפלל **שתוי** אל יתפלל ואם התפלל תפלתו תועבה ואם התפלל תפלתו תפלה **INTOXICATED DRANK WINE** Can't speak properly before a king Sober enough to speak to a king May not daven May not daven But... And... תפילות His are valid אמוראים by two הלכות As KID as as row taught. 'פמר אדם מחבירו אלא מתוך דבר הלכה שמתוך כך זוכרו

The second Amora taught;

When a person achieves wealth with little work, such as taking the possessions of a deceased convert, or marrying a wealthy woman, or having profited in a business deal or having found a valuable object, he should either buy a ספר or write תורה with some of the money.

Rashi explains;

- ובשכר אלו יתקיימו האחרים בידו

In the merit of the Mitzvah, the rest of the money will last.







7 The Gemara returns to the issue of drinking wine.
ון את היין את היין את היין את היין את רמי בר אבא דרך מיל, ושינה כל שהוא, מפיגין את הייל המול א פריביעים of wine, traveling one המיל or sleeping a bit, diminishes the effect of the wine - but if he drank more than that, travel and sleep will only increase its effect.



The ברייתא quotes a ברייתא from which we learn seven Halachos from two incidents involving רבן גמליאל:

In the first incident, דבן גמליאל to pick up a loaf of bread, and give it to a gentile who רבן גמליאל was able to identify with רבו הקודש.

This part of the story teaches three things:

-1- שאין מעבירין על האוכלין

One may not walk past food and leave it on the ground. The גמרא later clarifies that in later generations this no longer applied to whole loaves of bread, because – בנות ישראל פרוצות בכשפים

Many Jewish women practiced witchcraft, and whole loaves of bread may be a trap to cast a spell on the person.

-2- שהולכין אחרי רוב עוברי דרכים

Since the majority of passersby were non-Jews, we may not eat the bread because it probably was פת עכו"ם.

- שחמצו של נכרי אחר הפסח מותר בהנאה

From the fact that רבן גמליאל allowed די אילעאי to give the bread to a gentile, knowing that the gentile will likely do a favor in return, we see that it is מותר to benefit from חמץ of a after .פסח









The story continues that רבן גמליאל would not sit on the בית דין would not sit on the מילין to be מילין until he had walked three effects of wine he had drunk.

From this we learn four things:

-1- שרביעית יין האיטלקי משכר

A רביעית of Italian wine, the amount רבן גמליאל had drunk, causes intoxication.

- -2- שיכור אל יורה An inebriated person may not pasken.
- -3- דרך מפיגה את היין -Travelling dulls the effect of wine.

-4- אין מפירין נדרים לא רכוב ולא מהלך ולא עומד אלא יושב -4-We do not do nullify נדרים while riding walking or standing only while sitting. 9 The story continues... אכליאל would not sit on the בית דין to be מתיר נדר Until he walked three prov to dull the effects of wine We learn four things... 3 2 שיכור שרביעית מפיגה את היין יין האיטלקי **Inebriated** משכר Travelling A רביעית of Dulls effect of wine person Italian wine Tay not pasken Causes intoxication

עם פירין נדרים
אין מפירין נדרים
לא רכוב ולא מהלך ולא עומד
לא רכוב ולא מהלך ולא עומד
אלא יושב
We don't nullify נדרים while...
-Riding ~Walking ~Standing
Only while sitting!

The גמרא later clarifies that רבן גמליאל holds הברטה - we must find specific grounds for regret before annulling a ידר, which requires clarity and focus. Therefore, the דיין must sit.

However, other תנאים, who hold האין פותחין בחרטה - we do not have to find grounds for regret before annulling a ידר, it can be done even while walking, because it does not require much thought.

חלאיאל בחרמה

Don't have to find grounds for regret
Before annulling a זין בחרמה האין בחרמה

Doesn't requires much thought
Can be done...
Even while walking







The גמרא concludes its question that we see from this ברייתא that only walking three מיל, not just one מיל, dulls the effects of wine? The גמרא gives two answers;

יש דמשכר טפי – Italian wine is different because it is more intoxicating. OR

Since רבן גמליאל was riding an animal, and not walking, it took a longer distance for the wine to dissipate.





