

25 Sivan 5773  
June 3, 2013



Eiruvin Daf 87

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

1. There is an argument regarding how to be able to take water on Shabbos from a stream that passes through a courtyard.

The Tanna Kamma states that a wall of ten handsbreaths must be made at the entrance and exit of the stream from the yard. Although we usually say that a “hanging wall” (i.e. a wall of the yard hanging over the stream) suffices when it comes to water, there has to be a wall in this case that is clearly made for the stream. Rabbi Yehuda argues that a hanging wall in this case suffices.

2. The Tanna Kamma agrees that if the stream is not ten handsbreaths deep or four handsbreaths wide, the wall in the stream is not necessary.

When Rabbi Yehuda attempted to bring proof to his point from a stream that went from Aivel to Tzipori and that was used on Shabbos without walls in the water, the Tanna Kamma countered that it was not four handsbreaths wide or ten handsbreaths deep. Rashi explains that in order for water to be its own domain, it must be four handsbreaths wide and ten handsbreaths deep. Otherwise, it is merely part of any domain where it is located. If it does have these dimensions, it is a public domain if it is running through a public domain, and a karmelis if it runs through a private domain.

3. There is an argument whether there is a law that “holes of a karmelis” are like a karmelis.

There is a concept that “holes of the public domain” are like the public domain itself. This applies to a wall facing the public domain that contains a small hole. If someone throws an item from a private domain into that hole in the wall, he has thrown into the public domain and has transgressed Shabbos. Abaye and Rav Chanina, sons of Avin, say that the same law applies to a karmelis. However, Rav Ashi argues that this is incorrect, and would never apply to a karmelis, as the Rabbanan did not make such stringencies regarding a karmelis.

4. If a person lives adjacent to a body of water, he can possibly get water from his porch or window.

The Mishna states that if a person lives adjacent to the water, he can make “hanging walls” that are four handsbreaths wide and ten handsbreaths tall next to his window. He can lower a pail through that space and bring water up. This is because we consider the “hanging walls” to extend below (a leniency mainly applied when it comes to water), and it is as if he is filling up water in his own private domain.



5. Fruits do not become fit to accept impurity from wet things packed around them if the owners are not doing so for the wetness.

Rabbi Chananya ben Akavya permitted three things for the people of Teverya (see INSIGHT below). One of them was regarding the law that fruits become able to accept impurity if they come in contact with something wet that their owner wants them to come in contact with. Rabbi Chananya permitted the people to take the parts of the legumes that would not be eaten from the field and store their fruits in them, even though they were wet from the morning dew. Being that they were busy people, and would have done so even if it wasn't wet, and they could only do so in the morning as they had to go to work, he ruled that the fruit does not become able to accept impurity. This is despite the fact that it may be beneficial to the fruit for it to become wet.

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

The explanation above (#5) is based on Rashi's explanation of the Gemora. However, the Ritva has difficulty with Rashi's explanation, and says instead that the people of Teverya were generally affluent and did not have to go to work. They merely liked to get up early.

Rather, the Ritva says, the Gemora is merely implying that the fruits were so good they did not even need the dew, and this is why they did not become able to accept impurity. [It seems difficult to understand how the Ritva fits his explanation into the words of our Gemora.]

The Netziv in Megilah (6a) uses the fact that the people of Teverya were rich to explain the Gemora there as well. The Gemora states that Rekes was a name for Teverya. Why? The Gemora explains that this hints to the fact that even the "Reikanim" -- "empty ones" in Teverya were full of mitzvos like a pomegranate.

The Netziv asks that this Gemora sounds like the description of the empty people of Bnei Yisroel, who are often said to be full of mitzvos like a pomegranate. Why does the Gemora single out the people of Teverya for this, and therefore call Teverya "Rekes?"

The Netziv answers that Teverya is known for its therapeutic hot springs. Being that the people there are generally wealthy and enjoying the hot springs, they are not known to be extremely spiritual. However, because they are wealthy, poor people come to collect money there, and are indeed given donations by these wealthy people. This is why it is known as "Rekes." It is a place where even though the people are usually enjoying themselves, they are full of the mitzvah of giving charity to the poor.