

10 Elul 5780
August 30, 2020



Eiruvim Daf 21

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h
Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

Mav the studing of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and mav their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

The Chachamim only allowed one to use the boards of the well for the animals of the Jewish pilgrims on the festivals.

Rabbi Yitzchak bar Adda said: The Chachamim only permitted people to enclose the area of the well with boards for the use of the Jewish pilgrims who would come to Jerusalem for the festivals and needed to draw water. But a Baraisa taught: Well-boards were not permitted except for animals? – The Gemara answers: This means that the permit was for the animals of the pilgrims, but (the Baraisa continues) if a person wished to drink from the well, he would have to climb into the well and drink inside the well. And although Rav Yitzchak said in the name of Rav Yehudah, who said in the name of Shmuel that the boards for the well are only permitted for a well that contains spring-water which is a natural spring, and to an animal – it makes no difference if the well contains running water or collected water, this only means that the water must be fit for human consumption, but the permit of the boards was specifically for the animals of the pilgrims. (20b – 21a)

We return to what was stated before: Well-boards were not permitted except for animals, but if a person wished to drink from the well, he would have to climb into the well and drink inside the well. If the well was too wide for a person to manage to climb inside (*for he could not brace himself on its walls*), then even a person was permitted to rely on the boards enclosing the well area in order to draw water. A man must not draw water and hold it before his animal (*to drink*) on the *Shabbos*, but he draws water and pours it out (*into a trough*) and the animal drinks of its own accord.

Rav Anan asked: If so, what was the use of the wooden boards around the wells?

The *Gemora* wonders: “What was the use?” you ask; surely it is to enable people to draw water from the wells!?

The *Gemora* explains Rav Anan’s question: Of what use is it that the head and the greater part of the body of the cow is within the enclosure? [*If he is merely placing the bucket down before the animal, why is it necessary to for the animal to be inside the enclosure?*]

Abaye explained: Here we are dealing with a trough that stands in a public domain, and one that is ten *tefachim* high and four *tefachim* wide (*making it into a private domain, one where it would be permitted to carry on top of it*), and one of its sides projects into the area between the *pasei bira’os*. (21a)

In Babylonia, the huts that are outside the city are not included in a town’s boundaries, and the ruling regarding the boards for wells only applies in Eretz Yisroel and Babylonia.

Rav Yirmiyah bar Abba said in the name of Rav: The boundaries in the towns of Babylonia did not extend to include huts that were placed outside the town’s limits. [*Normally a temporary hut would be viewed as a house and we would measure the edge of the town from the location of the house that is the furthest from the town, provided that the house or houses are within seventy and two third Amos from each other. The reason the leniency of huts does not apply in Babylonia is because flash floods were common in Babylonia, which could wash the huts away. In other lands where floods were not common, the ruling regarding huts did apply.*] The law of the well boards allowing one to draw water

from a well only applied in *Eretz Yisroel* and in Babylonia, but not in the rest of the Diaspora, because *Mesivtos*, study halls, were not prevalent in the Diaspora. [In *Eretz Yisroel* and in *Babylonia*, students were constantly traveling back and forth to cities that had *Mesivtos*, and they were therefore permitted to draw water from a well enclosed by boards.]

An alternative version in the *Gemora* states that the ruling regarding huts and the boards used to enclose wells did not apply in Babylonia or any land outside of *Eretz Yisroel*. This version maintains that the ruling of huts did not apply in other lands because thieves would steal the huts, so they are not significant enough to be viewed as houses. The reason this version maintains that the boards for enclosing wells was not applied in Babylonia is because there was sufficient water from streams in Babylonia, and people did not have to depend on well water. The Chachamim permitted the use of the boards enclosing the wells in *Eretz Yisroel* because *Eretz Yisroel* depends primarily on rainwater, not on streams. (21a)

Rav Chisda said to Mari, the son of Rav Huna, the son of Rav Yirmiyah bar Abba: People say that you walk on the *Shabbos* from Barnish to Daniel's Synagogue, which is (a distance of) three *parsa'os* (a *parsah* is equivalent to four mil, and a mil is 2,000 amos – the distance one is permitted to walk on *Shabbos*); what do you rely upon (to walk so far)? Are you relying on the isolated huts (that are located at intervals of seventy amos)? But didn't the father of your father say in the name of Rav that the law of isolated huts is not applicable to Babylonia? The other (Mari) went out and showed him certain ruined settlements (between Barnish and Daniel's Synagogue) that were contained within seventy amos and a fraction (of each other). (21a)

The whole world is one part in three thousand two hundred of the Torah.

Rav Chisda said: Mari bar Mar expounded the following verse: *To every goal I have seen a limit, but Your commandment [the Torah] is very broad.* Dovid mentioned this concept (that there is no limit to Torah) but did not define it. Iyov mentioned this concept but did not define it. Yechezkel

mentioned this concept but did not define it. Until Zechariah ben Iddo came and defined it.

Dovid mentioned this concept but did not define it. As it is written: *To every goal I have seen a limit, but Your commandment [the Torah] is very broad.*

Iyov mentioned this concept but did not define it: *longer than the earth is the Torah's measure, and wider than the seas.*

Yechezkel mentioned this concept but did not define it: *Then he spread it [a scroll of the Oral Law] out before me, and it was inscribed within and without, and in it was inscribed lamentations, rejoicing, and woe.* The *Gemora* explains this last verse: 'Lamentations' refers to the travails of the righteous in this world, for so it is said: *This is the lamentation and they shall lament;* and 'rejoicing' refers to the reward of the righteous in the World to Come, for so it is said: *With singing, accompanied by the harp; and woe* refers to the travails of the wicked in the World to Come, for so it is said: *Calamity shall come upon calamity.*

The *Gemora* returns to the subject matter: Until Zechariah ben Iddo came and defined it, because it is said: *and He said to me, "what do you see?" and I said, 'I see a folded scroll, its length is twenty amos and its width is ten amos.* This refers to the *amah* of Hashem, so to speak. Unfolding the scroll would make the scroll twenty amos square, and the verse quoted above from Yechezkel states: *and it [the scroll of the Oral Law] was inscribed within and without,* meaning that it was inscribed on both sides. By peeling the scroll from the front so that the two sides of the scroll would be one, the total would be forty amos by twenty amos. It is said: *Who measured with his foist the sea; and the heavens with a span He gauged.* [A handspan is half an amah, so a square handspan is a quarter of a square amah.] [The heavens thus measured one divine handspan square, and] this teaches us that the entire world is one part in three thousand two hundred of the Torah. (21a)

Good figs symbolize the righteous and bad figs symbolize the wicked.

Rav Chisda said: Mari bar Mar expounded the following verse: It is said: *and behold two pots of figs were prepared before the sanctuary of Hashem, one pot contained figs that were very good, like the figs which ripen first; and the other pot contained figs that were very bad, which could not have been eaten because they were so bad.* The Gemora explains that the good figs symbolize those who are completely righteous, and the bad figs symbolize those who are completely wicked. Nonetheless, it is said: *the pots [literally, the violets, but here interpreted homiletically] emitted a fragrance,* which implies that even the other pot, i.e. the wicked, will eventually emit a fragrance. (21a - 21b)

Jews who have not sinned are likened to a good fragrance and Jewish women inform their husbands regarding their menstrual cycles.

Rava expounded: It is said: *the violets emit a fragrance,* and this refers to the young Jewish men who never tasted the flavor of sin. The continuation of the verse: *and at our doors are all fine fruits,* refers to Jewish women who inform their husbands that they have menstruated, so they will abstain from contact as proscribed in the Torah. Another interpretation of the latter part of the verse is that the women close their openings for their husbands, i.e. they are loyal to their husbands. (21b)

There are two interpretations for a verse stating new ones and old ones.

It is said: *new ones as well as old ones, my Beloved, I have hidden for you.* The Jewish People said before Hashem: Master of the universe, I have accepted on myself more restrictions than you have placed on me, and I have observed these rabbinic restrictions also.

Rav Chisda asked a certain scholar who would arrange the Aggadata before him what the words *new ones as well as old ones* refer to, and the scholar responded that the verse refers to lenient and stringent commandments. Rav Chisda questioned this interpretation, because the Torah was only given once. Rav Chisda then interpreted the verse as follows:

old ones refer to laws given at Sinai, and *new ones* refer to *Divrei Sofrim*, laws instituted by the Chachamim. (21b)

One who violates the words of the Chachamim is liable the death penalty.

Rava expounded: It is written: *and more than these, my son, be heedful, the making of many books* etc. This means that one should heed the words of the Chachamim more than the words of the Torah, because the words of the Torah contain positive and negative commandments, with various levels of punishment, whereas one who violates the words of the Chachamim is liable the death penalty. The words of the Chachamim were not written in the Torah because an endless amount of books would have been required to write all the rulings of the Chachamim.

And much study is a weariness of flesh. Rav Pappa, the son of Rav Acha bar Adda stated in the name of Rav Acha bar Ulla: This teaches us that he who scoffs at the words of the Sages will be condemned to boiling excrements.

Rava asked: Is it written: '*la-ag*' (with an '*ayin*') - 'scoffing'? The expression is '*la-hag*' (with a '*hey*') - 'study'?

Rather, this is the exposition: He who studies them (*the Torah*) feels the taste of meat. (21b)

Rabbi Akiva was meticulous to wash his hands in prison even when there was insufficient water for him to drink.

The Gemora cites a *braisa*: The Romans imprisoned Rabbi Akiva for teaching Torah, and Rabbi Yehoshua Hagarsi attended to his needs. Every day Rabbi Yehoshua Hagarsi would bring Rabbi Akiva a measured amount of water. One day the prison guard said that there was too much water being brought, and he suspected Rabbi Akiva of attempting escape, claiming that Rabbi Akiva would use the water to soften the ground of the prison so he could dig an escape tunnel. The guard poured out half the water, which Rabbi Yehoshua brought to Rabbi Akiva. Rabbi Akiva requested that Rabbi Yehoshua give him the water so Rabbi Akiva could wash his hands before eating bread. When Rabbi Yehoshua pointed



out to Rabbi Akiva that there would not be sufficient water with which to drink, Rabbi Akiva responded that it would be better for him to die because of thirst than to transgress the words of the Chachamim who mandated that one wash his hands before eating bread. Rabbi Akiva did not eat until he washed his hands, and the Chachamim, upon hearing this incident, commented that Rabbi Akiva must have been even greater when he was younger and when he was not in prison, more than he was now, old and incarcerated. (21b)

Shlomo HaMelech instituted the laws of Eirubin and washing one's hands.

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: When Shlomo HaMelech instituted *eirubin* and the washing of the hands, a Heavenly Voice came forth and declared, "My son, if your heart is wise; My heart shall be glad as well." And it is written: "My son, be wise, and make my heart glad - that I may answer he who disgraces Me."

Rava expounded: It is said: *Come, my Beloved, let us go out to the field, let us lodge in the villages. Let us arise early to the vineyards, let us see if the vine has flowered, the grape blossom has opened, the pomegranates are in bloom; there I will give my love to You. Come, my Beloved, let us go out to the field* is interpreted as follows: The Jewish People say to Hashem: "Master of the universe, do not judge me like those who reside in the cities, where theft, immorality, vain oaths and false oaths are prevalent. Rather, *let us go out to the field*, i.e., I will show you Torah scholars studying Torah amidst dire poverty. *Let us lodge in the villages*. Do not read the word *bakefarim* (in the villages) but read it *bakofrim* (among those who deny the existence of Hashem). The descendants of Esav have been granted prosperity and yet they still deny Hashem. *Let us arise early to the vineyards* refers to the synagogues and study halls. *Let us see if the vine has flowered* refer to those who study Scripture. *The grape blossom has opened* refers to those who study *Mishna*. *The pomegranates are in bloom* refers to those who study *Gemora*. *There I will give my love to You* is interpreted to mean: "I will show you my glory and my greatness, the praise of my sons and daughters.

Rav Hamnuna said: What are the allusions in that which was written: *And he spoke three thousand parables; and his songs were a thousand and five*? This teaches us that Shlomo uttered three thousand parables for every single word of the Torah and one thousand and five reasons for every single word of the Sages.

Rava expounded: It is said: *and besides being wise, Koheles [Shlomo HaMelech] also taught knowledge to the people, he listened, and sought out and arranged many proverbs. He taught knowledge to the people* means that Shlomo taught the Torah and the *Mishna* with the symbols of cantillation, and Shlomo explained the Torah with analogies. *He listened, and sought out and arranged many proverbs* means Shlomo HaMelech made handles for the Torah (which means that Shlomo HaMelech instituted the laws of *eiruvei chatzeiros* and that one must wash his hands before eating bread; they were safeguards against violating the Biblical prohibition of carrying from a private domain into a public one, and that sacred food should not become *tamei*). (21b)

Torah scholars study Torah in poverty and those who study Scripture, Mishna and Gemora are praiseworthy.

It is written: *His locks are curled*. This, said Rav Chisda in the name of Mar Ukva, teaches us that it is possible to pile up mounds of expositions on every single point (*of the letters of the Torah*). *And black as a raven*: With whom do you find these? It is with one who, for their sake (*the words of Torah*), comes early in the morning, and remains late in the evening in the study hall.

Rabbah explained: You find these with one who, for their sake (*the words of Torah*), blackens his face like a raven (*due to his exhaustion from studying*).

Rava explained: You find these with one who can bring himself to be cruel to his children and household like a raven, as was the case with Rav Adda bar Masna: He was about to go away to the study hall when his wife said to him, "What shall I do with your little children (*to feed them*)?" He retorted, "Are there no more wild vegetables in the marsh?" (21b – 22a)



INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

The Origins of Netilas Yadayim

Before eating bread, we wash our hands and recite, “Blessed are You, Hashem...Who sanctified us with His commandments, and commanded us concerning *netilas yadayim*.” What are the origins and the reasons behind this Rabbinic commandment? Our *Gemara* explains that Shlomo Hamelech originally enacted that the Kohanim must immerse their hands in a mikveh (see Maharsha) before touching *korbanos*. If a Kohen would touch *korbanos* without first immersing his hands, he would render them *tamei*. He instituted this practice in order to heighten the Kohanim’s sensitivity to the importance of maintaining ritual purity in the *Beis HaMikdash*.

Hillel and Shammai attempted to expand upon this enactment, by requiring washing hands before touching *terumah*. However, their decree was not accepted until a later generation when their students succeeded in including it as one of the eighteen enactments instituted in the attic of Chananyah ben Chizkiyah ben Garon.

Rashi’s teachers and the Rambam explain the reason for this second enactment of *netilas yadayim* because of a concern for *tumah*. Rashi himself, however, asks that if this was their concern, what did they gain by requiring washing the hands? If a person was in fact *tamei*, he would need to immerse his entire body in a mikveh to purify himself, and not merely wash his hands. The Acharonim explain (see *Mishna Acharonah Yadayim* 3:1) that *netilas yadayim* for *terumah* was based on an earlier enactment, before Shlomoh Hamelech and not mentioned in our *Gemara*, that when a person touches something that is itself *tamei*, but cannot impart *tumah* to others (*midoraisa*), his hands become *tamei*. To remove this limited form of *tumah midrabanan*, it suffices for one to wash his hands. Based on this, the students of Hillel and Shammai instituted a further enactment that one must always wash his hands before touching *terumah*, for concern

that he might have unknowingly touched such a limited form of *tumah*.

Rejecting the interpretation of his teachers, Rashi (s.v. *netilas yadayim*) explains that the enactment of *netilas yadayim* was for the sake of cleanliness. By touching *terumah* with dirty hands one might ruin it, thereby transgressing the prohibition against causing *terumah* to become inedible. Our Sages wished to accustom the Kohanim to refrain from touching *terumah* with dirty hands, and for this purpose they enacted *netilas yadayim*.

Later, the Sages required every one of us, Kohen and Israelite alike, to wash hands before eating bread, in order to familiarize the Kohanim with *netilas yadayim* for *terumah* (Chullin 106a; Magen Avraham O.C. 158). Today we are all *tamei*, and the Kohanim do not eat *terumah*. Nevertheless, the Rabbinic enactment to wash hands for bread remains. When the *Beis HaMikdash* will be rebuilt (may it be soon, in our days), we will already be familiar with the practice of *netilas yadayim* (Mishna Berurah 158:1).

According to Rashi, the only reason we wash before eating bread is to ensure that the Kohanim wash for *terumah* (See Rashba, *ibid.*). However, Tosafos (*ibid.*, s.v. *mitzvah*) and Smag add that our Sages instituted the practice of washing hands for bread in order to encourage cleanliness and *kedusha*. Since the table upon which one eats is compared to a *mizbeiach*, one must conduct himself with the necessary *kedusha* during his meals. They based this enactment on the *possuk*, “Sanctify yourselves and be holy.” (Vayikra 11:44. See Keren Orah, Sotah 4b).

Tosafos agree that that *netilas yadayim* for bread was meant to ensure that the Kohanim wash for *terumah*, (as is explicit in *Maseches Chullin*, *ibid.*). Why then did they need to present the additional reason of cleanliness and sanctity?

If a person washes before beginning his meal, he fulfills the enactment to familiarize Kohanim with *netilas yadayim* for *terumah*. Even if his hands would be sullied during the meal, he would not need to wash again. However, our Sages instituted a second decree to wash hands again before

continuing the meal, in order to maintain an added degree of sanctity.

DAILY MASHAL

Emunas Chachamim, Faith in our Sages

The *Gemora* states that the words of the Chachamim were not written in the Torah because an endless amount of books would have been required to write all the rulings of the Chachamim. What is the meaning of this statement? Is it beyond Hashem's ability to write all the rulings of the Chachamim? Furthermore, the *Gemora*¹ elsewhere states that if the Jewish People had not sinned, they would only have received the Five Books of Moshe and the Book of Yehoshua, which contains the details of *Eretz Yisroel*. This implies that more writing is not beneficial, but in fact a punishment. This statement also requires explanation, because the words of the prophets contain many teachings, as is evidenced in our *Gemora*. Let us understand what the *Gemora* means by rulings of the Chachamim. Certainly most Rabbinic rulings find their origins in the Torah. Even the laws of *muktzeh* are a subject of dispute between the Ramban and Raavad as they debate the source for *muktzeh* in the Torah with regard to performing forbidden acts of labor on Shabbos. What, then, is meant by the words of the Chachamim that are not recorded? Regarding the incident with Rabbi Akiva recorded in the *Gemora*, where Rabbi Akiva refused to eat bread until he washed his hands, we see a tremendous *mesiras nefesh*, sacrifice, on Rabbi Akiva's part, to fulfill the words of the Chachamim. Rabbi Akiva chose death by thirst rather than the death penalty that one incurs for violating the words of the Chachamim. This does not only refer to the actual violation of the words of the Chachamim, but also to the *Emunas Chachamim*, the faith that one must have in the Sages. Perhaps this is the explanation of the cryptic statement that Rabbi Akiva made to Rabbi Yehoshua Hagarsi. Rabbi Akiva said, "Yehoshua, do you not know that I am old and my life depends on your life?" What did Rabbi Akiva mean by this? Perhaps Rabbi Akiva was intimating that the opposite was true. The *Gemora*² states that Rabbi Tarfon said to Rabbi Akiva "whoever separates himself from you is

considered to have separated himself from life. The Chachamim symbolize life, as the Medrash states, just like a dove cannot fly without wings, so too the Jewish People cannot survive without their elders. Rabbi Akiva was hinting to Rabbi Yehoshua Hagarsi that he was required to wash his hands before eating bread, because adhering to the words of the Chachamim is the only way to be considered truly alive.

¹ Nedarim 22a

² Kiddushin 66b