

20 Iyar 5773
April 30, 2013



Eiruvin Daf 53

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

The *Mishna* asks: How are the *Shabbos* boundaries to cities extended (*as a way of determining their techum, for one is allowed to walk on Shabbos two thousand amos outside of the city – even without preparing an eiruv*)? The *Mishna* answers: If one house (*on the city border*) recedes and another projects, or (*in a city surrounded by a wall*) if one tower recedes and another projects, or if there were ruins ten *tefachim* high (*extending from one of the corners of the city*), or bridges, or tomb monuments that contain dwelling places, the boundary of the town is extended to include them. [*If a projection was at one point, the boundary line is drawn along the outer side of that projection in a straight perpendicular line, to both extremities of that side of the city.*]

The *Shabbos* limits (*of a city - that are drawn at a distance of two thousand amos from the boundaries of the city*) are to be shaped like a square tablet in order that the use of the corners might be gained. [*This is in a case where the boundary line of the town had the shape of a square. If it had that of a rectangle, the Shabbos limits, drawn parallel to it at the prescribed distances of two thousand amos, assume also a similar shape. By ‘square,’ the circular shape only is intended to be excluded.*]

Rav and Shmuel disagree. One learned that the word in the *Mishna* is *me’abrin* (*with an ‘ayin’*), and the other learned *me’abrin* (*with an ‘alef’*).

The *Gemora* notes: He who learned *me’abrin* (*with an ‘alef’*) explains it as ‘adding a limb’ (*another projection is assumed to have been added to the one already existing, so that the entire side may represent a straight and continuous boundary line*), and he who learned *me’abrin* (*with an ‘ayin’*) explains it in the same sense as that of ‘a pregnant woman’ (*whose body is enlarged*).

There is an argument regarding the definition of “Me’aras Hamachpeilah.”

The famed cave which is the resting place of Adam, Avraham, Yitzchak, Yaakov, and their wives (Leah for Yaakov) is called the “Me’aras Hamachpeilah” -- “the double cave.” There is an argument between Rav and Shmuel regarding why it deserves this name. One says that it is like one cave within another cave. According to this opinion, “double” alludes to the four pairs of people are buried there. Another says that it is built like a house with an attic or upper floor.

Mamreh the city of Arba. Rabbi Yitzchak had said: It is called the City of Four because four couples



were buried there: Adam and Chava, Avraham and Sarah, Yitzchak and Rivkah, and Yaakov and Leah.

And it came to pass in the days of Amraphel. Rav and Shmuel disagree. One holds that his name was Nimrod; and why was he called Amraphel? It was because he ordered our father Avraham to be cast into a burning furnace. But the other holds that his name was Amraphel; and why was he called Nimrod? It was because in his reign, he led the entire world in rebellion against himself.

It is written [Shmos 1:8]: *And a new king arose over Egypt.* Rav and Shmuel disagree as to the meaning of this verse. One of them says that it was actually a new king. The other one said that the meaning of the verse is that his decrees were new.

The one who understands the verse to mean that his decrees were new derives it from the fact that the Torah never wrote that the king died and a new one took over.

The verse states: ...*who did not know Yosef.* He made it as if he didn't know Yosef (*and he issued harsh decrees against the Jewish people*).

[Mnemonic: Eighteen, and twelve, we learned, in his generation, their heart.] Rabbi Yochanan stated: I spent eighteen days at Rabbi Oshaya Beribi, and learned from him only one word regarding our *Mishna* - that 'How are the *Shabbos* boundaries to cities extended' is to be read as *me'abrin* - with an 'alef'.

The *Gemora* asks: But surely, this is not correct, for didn't Rabbi Yochanan state: Rabbi Oshaya Beribi had twelve disciples, and I spent eighteen days among them and gained a knowledge of everyone's

cleverness and of everyone's wisdom? Now, is it likely that he gained a knowledge of every one's cleverness and of every one's wisdom and yet did not learn any *Gemora*?

The *Gemora* answers: If you like I may reply that he may have learned much from them, but from him (*Rabbi Oshaya Beribi*) he did not learn (*more than the one word*).

And alternatively I might reply that he meant to say that regarding our *Mishna* he learned only one word.

Rabbi Yochanan further stated: When we were studying Torah at Rabbi Oshaia, eight of us used to sit in the space of one amah.

Rebbe stated: When we were studying Torah at Rabbi Elozar ben Shamua, six of us used to sit in one amah.

Rabbi Yochanan further stated: Rabbi Oshaya Beribi in his generation was like Rabbi Meir in his generation. As was the case with Rabbi Meir in his generation that his colleagues could not fathom the depth of his knowledge, so was it with Rabbi Oshaya that his colleagues could not fathom the depth of his knowledge.

Rabbi Yochanan further stated: The minds of the earlier generations were like the entrance of the Ulam (*the Hall in the Temple – 20 amos*), but that of the last generations was like the entrance of the Heichal (*the Chamber in the Temple – 10 amos*), but ours is like the eye of a fine needle.

Rabbi Akiva is classed among the 'earlier generations'; Rabbi Elozar ben Shamua among the

'last generations.' Others say: 'Rabbi Elozar ben Shamma' is classed among the earlier generations,' and Rabbi Oshaya Beribi among the 'last generations.' 'But ours is like the eye of a fine needle.' And we, said Abaye, are like (*forcing*) a peg in a wall in respect of *Gemora* (*for it is so difficult for us*). And we, said Rava, are like a finger in wax regarding logical argument (*for a finger can be inserted only partially into a lump of hard wax*). We, said Rav Ashi, are like a finger in a pit - regarding forgetfulness (*for it is so easy for us to forget*).

Rav Yehudah stated in the name of Rav: The Judeans who were particular regarding (*the refinement of*) their language retained their learning, but the Galileans, who were not particular regarding (*the refinement of*) their language, did not retain their learning.

The *Gemora* asks: But does this depend on whether one is particular regarding (*the refinement of*) their language?

The *Gemora* answers: Rather say: The Judeans who were exact in their language, and who laid down mnemonics for their aid, retained their learning; but the Galileans, who were not exact in their language, and who laid down no mnemonic as an aid, did not retain their learning.

The *Gemora* offers other reasons as well: The Judeans who learned from one teacher retained their learning, but the Galileans, who did not learn from one teacher, did not retain their learning.

Ravina said: The Judeans who made their studies accessible to the public retained their learning, but the Galileans, who did not make their studies

accessible to the public, did not retain their learning. [*Rashi suggests another explanation as well.*] David made his studies accessible and Shaul did not make his studies accessible. Of David who made his studies accessible it is written in Scripture: *Those that fear You shall see me and rejoice*; but of Shaul, who did not make his studies accessible to the public, it is written: *And wherever he turned himself, he acted wrongly*.

And Rabbi Yochanan said: And how do we know that Heaven had forgiven him (*Shaul, for killing the Kohanim in the city of Nov*)? It is because it is written: *And Shmuel said to Shaul ... Tomorrow you and your children will be with me*, 'With me' means, in my enclosure (*in Gan Eden*; and if Shaul was destined to be there together with Shmuel the righteous, obviously, his sins were forgiven).

Rabbi Abba requested: Is there anyone who would enquire of the Judeans who are exact in their language whether we learned *me'abrin* (*with an 'alef'*), or *me'abrin* (*with an 'ayin'*), and whether we learned *akuzo* (*with an 'alef'*; *this is a certain type of blemish that renders an animal unfit to be offered as a sacrifice*), or *akuzo* (*with an 'ayin'*), for they would know (*the correct spelling*)? When they were asked, they replied: Some authorities learn *me'abrin* (*with an 'alef'*), while others learn *me'abrin* (*with an 'ayin'*), and some learn *akuzo* (*with an 'alef'*), while others learn *akuzo* (*with an 'ayin'*).

'The Judeans were exact in their language.' The *Gemora* cites an example: A Judean once announced that he had a cloak to sell. He was asked, "What is the color of your cloak?" He replied, "It is like that of beet on the ground."

'The Galileans who were not exact in their language'. The *Gemora* cites an example: A certain

Galilean once went about enquiring, “Who has an ‘amar’? Who has an ‘amar’?” “Foolish Galilean,” they said to him, “do you mean a ‘donkey’ for riding, ‘wine’ to drink, ‘wool’ for clothing, or a ‘lamb’ for slaughtering?”

The *Gemora* relates: A woman once wanted to say to her friend, “Come, I would like to give you some fat to eat,” but (*since she did not speak distinctly*) that what she actually said to her was, “Shelochti, may a lion devour you.”

A certain woman once appeared before a judge and addressed him as follows (*wanting to say that a large tablet had been stolen*), “My master slave, I had a beam, and they stole you from me, and it is of such a size that if they hang you upon it, your feet would not reach the ground.” (52b – 53b)

DAILY MASHAL

There is an argument between Rav and Shmuel regarding the real name of Nimrod. Was it Nimrod or Amrafel? The *Toras Chaim* asks, what is the difference what his real name was?

The *Toras Chaim* answers that the difference could be regarding the well know law that one should not name a child after an evildoer. In abstaining from doing so, we fulfill the verse, “And the name of the evildoers should rot.” If his real name was Nimrod and the Torah merely alludes to a teaching by calling him Amrafel, one cannot name his son Nimrod but may name him Amrafel, as there was never an evil person by that name. The opposite is also true. If his real name was Amrafel, it would be permitted to call one’s son Nimrod. [This is a “limud zechus” --

“teaching of merit” upon those secular Israelis who call their son Nimrod, not a totally uncommon name in Israel.]

However, being that it is not clear, it would clearly be better for someone to change his name if he was named Nimrod or any other name known to be that of an evildoer. This is known to be the advice of R’ Chaim Kanievsky and many other Gedolei Yisroel.