



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

Some of the men of Kekunai once came to Rav Yosef and said to him, ‘Send with us a man who might prepare an eiruv for our town’.<sup>1</sup> ‘Go’, he said to Abaye, ‘and prepare the eiruv for them but see that there is no outcry against it at the schoolhouse’.<sup>2</sup> Proceeding immediately he observed that certain houses opened on to the river.<sup>3</sup> ‘These’,<sup>4</sup> he said: ‘might serve as the excluded section of the town’. Changing his mind he said: ‘We learned: no single eiruv may be provided for all the town, from which it follows that if it were desired,<sup>5</sup> they could all join in one eiruv’.<sup>6</sup> I would, however, provide for them, windows,<sup>7</sup> so that if desired they could be joined in the general eiruv of the town through those windows’.<sup>8</sup> Then he said: ‘This is not necessary, since Rabbah bar Avuha in fact provided separate eiruv for each row of mavois throughout all Machuza on account of the cattle ditches that intervened between the rows, where<sup>9</sup> each row served as the statutory excluded section for the other<sup>10</sup> though these could not join one another in a common eiruv even if they had wished to do so’.<sup>11</sup> Then again he said: ‘The two cases are really’ unlike, since there one could if desired prepare the eiruv by way of roofs while these could not

possibly join in one general eiruv: consequently let us provide for them windows’. Finally, however, he said: ‘Windows are not necessary either, for Mar bar Pophidasa of Pumbedisa had a store of straw which he set aside for Pumbedisa as the statutory section that was to be excluded’.<sup>12</sup> ‘It is on account of this [group of houses]’, Abaye remarked: ‘that the Master warned me: See that there is no outcry against it at the schoolhouse’. (60a)

UNLESS A SECTION OF IT OF THE SIZE OF THE TOWN OF CHADASHAH . . . IS EXCLUDED. It was taught: Rabbi Yehudah related, ‘There was a town in Judea whose name was Chadashah which had fifty inhabitants, men, women and children, by means of which the Sages determined [the statutory size of the sections to be excluded]; and this town itself served as the excluded section [of a larger town].

The question was raised: What was the procedure in Chadashah itself?<sup>13</sup> — Since Chadashah served as the excluded section of the large town the latter also obviously served as the excluded section of the smaller town; the

<sup>1</sup> Which belonged originally to one man and was now the possession of many.

<sup>2</sup> On account of the requirement for a certain section to be excluded from the provisions of the general eiruv of the town.

<sup>3</sup> That flowed behind the town, the houses having possessed no other doors opening towards the town.

<sup>4</sup> Which, owing to the position of the doors, could not in any case be included in the general eiruv of the town.

<sup>5</sup> To include those that were once excluded, and to exclude instead other houses.

<sup>6</sup> As the houses by the river, however, could not in any case be included in the town’s eiruv they could not obviously be set aside as the statutory section to be excluded.

<sup>7</sup> That will face the town, and the size of each of which would be four handbreadths by four.

<sup>8</sup> And consequently night well serve also as the statutory section to be excluded.

<sup>9</sup> Since many alleys in each row were allowed to join in one eiruv despite the fact that the town that belonged to one man belonged once to many.

<sup>10</sup> For if that had not been the case each mavois would have required a separate eiruv to itself and a side-post air cross-beam.

<sup>11</sup> On account of intervening cattle ditches which cut off the approaches between the various rows. Similarly in the case of the houses by the river, though they could not be included in the provision of the general eiruv of the town, they might serve as the statutory section to be excluded.

<sup>12</sup> As the exclusion of this store-house satisfied the statutory requirements so should the houses by the river.

<sup>13</sup> Sc. could all the inhabitants of Chadashah join in one eiruv?

question rather is: What is the procedure in a town that is similar in size to Chadashah?<sup>14</sup> — Rav Huna and Rav Yehudah differ on this point — One holds that a section of it must be excluded while the other maintains that none need be excluded. (60a)

**RABBI SHIMON RULED: THREE COURTYARDS** etc. Rav Chama bar Goria citing Rav stated: The halachah is in agreement with Rabbi Shimon. Rabbi Yitzchak ruled: Even one house and one courtyard [are sufficient]. ‘One courtyard!’ Is this conceivable?<sup>15</sup> — Rather say: One house in one courtyard. Said Abaye to Rav Yosef: ‘Is that ruling of Rabbi Yitzchak a tradition or a logical deduction?’ — ‘What’, the other retorted: ‘does this matter to us?’ — ‘Is then’, the first replied. ‘the study of Gemara to be a mere sing-song?’<sup>16</sup> (60a)

**MISHNAH:** If a man who was in the east instructed his son, ‘prepare for me an eiruv in the west’, or if he was in the west and he instructed his son ‘prepare for me an eiruv in the east’, if the distance between him and his house was no more than two thousand cubits and that between him and his eiruv was more than this, he is permitted to proceed to his house<sup>17</sup> but forbidden to proceed to his eiruv.<sup>18</sup> If the distance to his eiruv was no more than two thousand cubits and that to his house more than this, he is forbidden to proceed to his house but permitted to proceed to his eiruv. If a man deposits his eiruv

within the [Shabbatic] extension of a town,<sup>19</sup> his act is of no consequence.<sup>20</sup> If he deposited it even one cubit only beyond the limit, he loses<sup>21</sup> what he gains.<sup>22</sup> (60a – 60b)

**GEMARA:** Assuming that ‘east’ means the east side of his house and that ‘west’ means the west of his house,<sup>23</sup> one can well understand how it is possible that the distance between him and his house was no more than two thousand cubits and that between him and his eiruv was more than this, since he would reach his house before he could reach his eiruv, but how is it possible that the distance between him and his eiruv should be no more than two thousand cubits and that to his house more than this? — Rabbi Yitzchak replied: Do you think that ‘east’ means east of his house and ‘west’ the west of his house? The meaning in fact is not so; east denotes the east of the position of his son and west denotes the west position of his son.<sup>24</sup> Rava son of Rav Shila replied: one may even explain east as the east of his house and west as the west of his house where, for instance, his house stood in a diagonal direction. (60b)

**IF A MAN DEPOSITS HIS EIRUV WITHIN THE [SHABBATIC] EXTENSION** etc. How can you possibly assume that an eiruv would be deposited ‘beyond the limit’?<sup>25</sup> — Rather read: Outside the Shabbatic extension.<sup>26</sup> (60b)

<sup>14</sup> But which, unlike Chadashah, was not near to a large town.

<sup>15</sup> A courtyard without a house, surely, could not be regarded as a dwelling.

<sup>16</sup> A monotonous droning where no one is interested in sources or origins.

<sup>17</sup> Sc. his house, with whose Shabbos limit he was when the Shabbos had begun is regarded as the place of his Shabbos rest from where he is entitled to walk distances of two thousand cubits in all directions.

<sup>18</sup> Because at the time the Shabbos had begun he was more than a Shabbos limit away from it. The place of an eiruv which one is unable to reach during the Shabbos between this be regarded as one's place of Shabbos rest.

<sup>19</sup> I.e., within the area of seventy and two thirds cubits around the town from which the two thousand cubits of the Shabbos limit are measured.

<sup>20</sup> Lit., ‘he has not done anything’, since in the absence of the eiruv also he is permitted to move within that area as well as a Shabbos limit of two thousand cubits beyond it in all directions on any side of the town; while all the town itself is in this respect regarded as

an area of no more than four cubits by four within which its inhabitants may freely move in addition to the limits mentioned.

<sup>21</sup> In one direction of the town.

<sup>22</sup> In the other direction. If the eiruv, for instance, was deposited at a distance of one thousand cubits in an easterly direction of the town the man, since the eiruv entitles him to walk distances of two thousand cubits from it in all directions, is entitled to walk a total distance of (1000 + 2000 = ) 3000 cubits from the town in an easterly direction but only one thousand cubits in the westerly direction. The entire area of the town itself, as mentioned is, in this respect regarded as no bigger than four cubits by four and, in consequence, is not to be deducted from the extent of the permitted limits.

<sup>23</sup> The house being situated between him on the one side of it and his son on the opposite side.

<sup>24</sup> The position of his house, however, may well have been much further away than that of his eiruv.

<sup>25</sup> Such an eiruv, which is unapproachable on the Shabbos, would surely be useless.

<sup>26</sup> Of seventy and two thirds cubits around the town.

HE LOSES WHAT HE GAINS. Only ‘what he gains’ and no more? Was it not in fact taught: If a man deposits his eiruv within the [Shabbatic] extension of a town, his act is of no consequence. If he deposited it even one cubit only beyond the [Shabbatic] extension of the town, he gains that cubit<sup>27</sup> and loses all the town<sup>28</sup> because the extent of the town is included in the extent of the Shabbos limit?<sup>29</sup> — This is no difficulty, since the latter refers to a case where his measure terminated within the town,<sup>30</sup> while the former deals with one where his measure terminated at the far end of the town;<sup>31</sup> this being in agreement with a ruling of Rabbi Idi who laid down in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi: If a man<sup>32</sup> was measuring [the two thousand cubits distance from his acquired Shabbos abode] and advancing towards a town, and his measure terminated in the middle of the town he is allowed to proceed no further than half the town, but if his measure terminated at the far end of the town, all the town, as far as he is concerned, is regarded as four cubits and the remainder of the Shabbos limit<sup>33</sup> may be made up for him.<sup>34</sup> These, exclaimed Rabbi Idi, are nothing but prophetic utterances; for what is the difference whether the measure terminated in the middle of the town or at the end? — Said Rava: We have learnt both these cases: The people of a large town may walk through the whole of a small town,<sup>35</sup> but the people of the small town may not walk through the whole of a large town. Now what is the reason? Obviously because the measure of the latter terminated in the middle of the former town, while that of the former terminated at the end of the latter town. And Rabbi Idi? — He read in both cases: ‘The people may’ and expounded [the Mishnah cited] as referring to an eiruv that one deposited; but of the case of one who

was measuring, we have there learnt nothing. Have we not indeed? Did we not as a matter of fact learn: And to the measure of whom the Rabbis have spoken a distance of two thousand cubits only is allowed even if the end of his permitted measure terminated within a cave? — His ruling was required in respect of a Shabbos limit that terminated at the far end of a town, a case of which we did not learn. (60b – 61a)

#### DAILY MASHAL

Each night between 8:00 – 8:45 a Daf Yomi shiur takes place in the Avoh Vei’secha shul in Bayit Vegan. One night, the shul made arrangements for a number of speakers to come deliver eulogies on the occasion of the *shloshim* of a neighborhood resident. The ceremony was called for 9:00 PM. Among the speakers invited was Dr. Meir Isaacson, formerly the administrator of the children’s wing at Shaarei Tzedek hospital. He arrived early, and entered the shul in the middle of the Daf Yomi shiur, to which he listened with rapt attention, a noticeable aura of wonder on his face. When the ceremony began, and Dr. Isaacson was called to speak, he began his address with this most amazing tribute to Daf Yomi. “I am certain that R’ Meir Shapira, founder of Daf Yomi, feels great joy in Heaven tonight,” he said. He then explained that he is a regular student of the Daf Yomi shiur in the Sockotchov shul on the other side of Bayit Vegan. That night, he was forced to leave early to deliver his eulogy. He had left his own shiur, only to come to a different shiur which, with amazing *hashgacha pratis*, continued from the very same line he had left off.

<sup>27</sup> On the side of the town where the eiruv was deposited.

<sup>28</sup> When the Shabbos limit from the eiruv across the town in the opposite direction is measured, [the town is included until the extent of the Shabbos limit].

<sup>29</sup> And deducted from it. How then is this to be reconciled with our Mishnah?

<sup>30</sup> Either because the town was very big or because the eiruv lay at a considerable distance from it. In such a case only is the town included in the extent of the Shabbos limit and the man is forbidden to move beyond the far side of the town.

<sup>31</sup> In this case all the town is regarded as being no bigger than four cubits by four, and the Shabbos limit is extended beyond the town to a distance of two thousand cubits minus the distance between the eiruv and the side of the town near it.

<sup>32</sup> Who was overtaken by dusk underway and, being unaware of the proximity of a town, had acquired his Shabbos abode at the spot where he happened to be at the time the Shabbos had set in; (and the same law applies to a man who deposited an eiruv outside his own town).

<sup>33</sup> The difference between two thousand cubits and the distance of the eiruv from the side of the town nearest to it.

<sup>34</sup> By extending the Shabbos limit beyond the far side of the town.

<sup>35</sup> That was situated within its Shabbos limit. Now this must imply that the whole of the small town is regarded as no bigger than four cubits and that the remainder of the Shabbos limit may be made up by extending the limit beyond the far side of the small town, in agreement with Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi’s second ruling.