

15 Tishrei 5781
Oct. 3, 2020



Eiruv Daf 55

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

It is important to establish memory devices to remember one’s learning.

The Gemora says that this is alluded to in the verse regarding Torah, “It is not in heaven...nor overseas.” This implies that if it were, we would have to go there to get Torah knowledge, despite the fact that it requires extra effort. The effort to create memory devices (such as making an acronym to remember four consecutive laws, as is often found in parentheses in the Gemora) to remember Torah learning is included in this verse.

Rava expounded: *It is not in heaven*; it (Torah scholarship) is not to be found with him who, because he possesses some knowledge of it, towers in his pride like the heavens. [Neither is it beyond the sea] It is not found with him who, because of some knowledge of it, is as broad in his self-esteem as the sea.

Rabbi Yochanan expounded: *It is not in heaven*; it (Torah scholarship) is not to be found among the arrogant. *Neither is it beyond the sea*; it is not to be found among merchants or dealers. (54b – 55a)

¹ Sc. the circumference of the town is deemed to be enclosed in an imaginary square and the Shabbos limits are measured from the sides of that square, the townspeople thus gaining the benefit of longer distances through the angles of the square.

² The southern boundary is deemed to be extended in both directions to the same length as the northern one, and the extremities of this imaginary line are deemed to be joined to the extremities of the northern boundary.

³ If the projecting house, for instance, was in a corner on the northern side of the town, an imaginary line, parallel to the town

Our Rabbis taught: How are the Shabbos boundaries of towns extended? [If a town is] long the Shabbos limits are measured from its normal boundaries. If it is round corners are added to it.¹ If it is square no corners are added to it. If it was wide on one side and narrow on the other it is regarded as if both its sides were equal.² If one house projected like a turret, or if two houses projected like two turrets, they are to be treated as if a thread had been drawn beside them in a straight line, and the two thousand cubits are measured from that line outwards.³ If the town was shaped like a bow or like a gamma, it is to be regarded as if it had been full of houses and courtyards, and the two thousand cubits are measured from the imaginary boundaries outwards.⁴

The Master said: ‘[If a town is] long the Shabbos limits are measured from its normal boundaries’. But is this not obvious? — The ruling is required in a case where it was long but narrow. Since it might have been presumed that the width should be regarded as equal to its length, we were informed [that the law was not so].

‘If it is square shaped no corners are added to it’. Isn’t this obvious? — This was only required in a case where it is square shaped but the sides of the square are not parallel with the

in wall, is drawn across the northern side of the house towards the western side of the town, and this line is deemed to represent the boundary of the town for the purpose of measuring the Shabbos limits. The respective positions of the ‘two houses projected’ is discussed presently.

⁴ Every townsman man, irrespective of the position of his house, is entitled to walk two thousand cubits distance from the imaginary, as well as from the actual boundaries.



four directions of the world. As it might have been presumed that it should be deemed to be enclosed in an imaginary square whose sides are parallel with the four directions of the world, we were informed [that this is not permitted].

'If one house projected like a turret, or if two houses projected like two turrets'. Now that you said that the law applied to one house, was it also necessary to mention two houses? — The ruling was necessary in that case only where the two houses were respectively on two sides of the town. As it might have been presumed that we apply the law only where a projecting house was on one side but not when houses were projecting on two sides, we were informed [that the law is applied to the latter case also].

'If the town was shaped like a bow or like a gamma, it is to be regarded as if it had been full of houses and courtyards, and the two thousand cubits are measured from its imaginary boundaries'. Rav Huna laid down: If a town is shaped like a bow, then, if the distance between its two ends is less than four thousand cubits,⁵ the Shabbos limits are measured from the bow-string,⁶ otherwise measuring must begin from the arch.⁷ - But could Rav Huna have laid down such a ruling?⁸ Didn't Rav Huna in fact rule: If a breach was made in a town wall,⁹ [the houses on both sides of the breach are regarded as belonging to the same town if the distance between them is] no more than a hundred and forty-one and a third

⁵ So that the Shabbos limit from the one end overlaps with the Shabbos limit from the opposite end.

⁶ Outwards; and the whole town, as far as its inhabitants are concerned, is regarded as no bigger than four cubits within which they may freely move on the Shabbos in addition to the two thousand cubits distance beyond the town in all directions.

⁷ Every inhabitant may move no further than two thousand cubits from his own house in any direction.

⁸ That two sections of a town are regarded as one where the distance between them is less than four thousand cubits.

⁹ Sc. a breach that completely severed the town in two distinct sections, no houses intervening.

¹⁰ A distance representing the length of two karpafs of seventy and two thirds cubits each (which each town is allowed in addition to the Shabbos limit of two thousand cubits). But if the distance was greater, the two sections are regarded as two different towns. How then could it be said that Rav Huna permitted any distance within four thousand cubits?

cubits?¹⁰ — Rabbah bar Ulla replied: This is no difficulty, since the former deals with a case where the gap was only on one side while the latter deals with one that had breaches on two sides. Then what does he inform us? That a karpaf is allowed for each section.¹¹ But didn't Rav Huna once lay down such a ruling, as we learned: A karpaf is allowed for every town;¹² these are the words of Rabbi Meir, but the Sages ruled: A karpaf was allowed only between two towns,¹³ and in connection with this it was stated: Rav Huna laid down: A karpaf is allowed for each town, while Rabbi Chiya bar Rav held: Only one karpaf is allowed for both towns?¹⁴ — Both rulings were required. For if we had been informed only of the ruling here, it might have been presumed [to apply to this case only] because originally all the town was a permitted domain, but not to the case there. And if we had been informed of the ruling there only, it might have been presumed [to apply to that case alone] because [one karpaf is] too cramped for the use of two towns, but not here where the space of one karpaf would not be too cramped.¹⁵ Hence both rulings were required.

And¹⁶ what perpendicular distance is allowed between the [middle of the imaginary] bow-string and the arch?—Rabbah

¹¹ In the same manner as one is allowed for each of two adjacent towns which are thereby combined to form one town for the purposes of Shabbos movements.

¹² Its Shabbos limit being measured from the outward boundary of that karpaf.

¹³ That were adjacent to one another and that, on account of the karpafs, joined to form one town.

¹⁴ As two sections of one town could not in this respect be subject to greater restrictions than two independent towns that are adjacent to one another, what need was there for Rav Huna's ruling in respect of one town that was only severed in two on account of a breach?

¹⁵ Since originally, when the area of the gap was occupied by houses, the inhabitants in either section did not have the use of even one karpaf.

¹⁶ Where the distance between the two ends of the bow is less than four thousand cubits, in which case it was laid down that the Shabbos limit is measured from an imaginary line joining the two ends.



son of Rav Huna replied: One of two thousand cubits.¹⁷ Rava the son of Rabbah son of Rav Huna replied: Even one greater than two thousand cubits. Said Abaye: Logical reasoning is in agreement with Rava the son of Rabbah son of Rav Huna, since any person can, if he wishes, go around by way of the houses.¹⁸ (55a – 55b)

IF THERE WERE RUINS TEN HANDBREADTHS HIGH etc. What is meant by ruins? — Rav Yehudah replied: Three walls without a roof on them.¹⁹ The question was raised: What is the ruling in the case of two walls upon which there was a roof? Come and hear: The following are included in the Shabbos boundary of a town. A tomb building of the size of four cubits by four,²⁰ a bridge or a cemetery that contains a dwelling chamber, a synagogue that has a dwelling-house for the sexton, a heathen temple that contains a dwelling-house for its priests, horse-stalls or storehouses in open fields, to which dwelling-chambers are attached, watchmen's huts in a field, and a house on a sea island.²¹ All these are included in the Shabbos boundary of a town. The following, however, are not included in it: A tomb building that was broken on two sides, the gap extending from one end to the other, a bridge or a cemetery that contains no dwelling-chamber, a synagogue that had no dwelling-house for the sexton, a heathen temple that contained no dwelling-house for its priests, horse-stalls or storehouses in open fields, to which dwelling chambers are not attached, a pit, a ditch, a cave, a

¹⁷ There must be no more than a Shabbos limit between any of the houses in the arch and the imaginary bow-string.

¹⁸ Without touching the empty space between the cord and the arch. As in this manner it is possible for any townsman to pass from one end of the bow-shaped town to the other end and then to proceed also along the imaginary cord that joins these ends, the entire area enclosed by the arc and cord is deemed to be occupied by houses and courtyards.

¹⁹ If there was a roof on them they would be regarded as a house and would in any case be included in the town boundary in accordance with a previous ruling in our Mishnah.

²⁰ Such a monument is usually provided with a dwelling-chamber for its watchman. It has, therefore, the status of a dwelling-house even though no one lives in it.

²¹ Within seventy and two thirds cubits from the town.

²² That was not stationary, but moved sometimes within and sometimes without seventy and two thirds cubits from the town.

wall or a dove-cote in a field, and a house in a ship.²² All these are not included in the Shabbos boundary of a town. It was here taught, at least: 'A tomb building that was broken on two sides, the gap extending from one end to the other'. Doesn't this refer to a case where there was a roof on top?²³ — No, it may be a case where there was no roof on top.

Of what use is a 'house on a sea island'? — Rav Pappa replied: The reference here is to a house into which a ship's tackle is moved.

But isn't a 'cave' included in the Shabbos boundary of a town? Didn't R. Rabbi Chiya in fact teach: A cave is included in the Shabbos boundary of a town? — Abaye replied: He referred to a cave at the entrance of which was a built structure. Might not then its inclusion be inferred solely on the ground of the structure? — The ruling was required only in a case where the cave supplemented the prescribed size.²⁴ (55b)

Rav Huna ruled: For those who dwell in huts the Shabbos limits are measured from the very doors of their huts.²⁵ Rav Chisda raised an objection: And they pitched by the Jordan, from Beis-Hayeshimos..., in connection with which Rabbah bar Bar Chanah stated: 'I myself saw the place and it measured three parsa by three'.²⁶ Now was it not taught: When they attended to their needs they turned neither front nor sideways but backwards?²⁷ — Rava answered him: You

²³ Which allows that two walls with a roof on top are not regarded as a 'ruin' that is included in the Shabbos boundary of a town.

²⁴ Of four cubits by four. In the absence of such a ruling it might have been presumed that, as the structure was less than the minimum size prescribed, neither it nor the cave may be included in the Shabbos boundary of the town.

²⁵ Sc. even if a camp consisted of hundreds of such frail huts it does not assume the character of a town the residents of which may freely move within it (however large its area) and two thousand cubits beyond it in all directions. Each hut is regarded as a single unit.

²⁶ Which establishes the fact that the Israelites' camp in the wilderness occupied an area of three parsa by three.

²⁷ Sc. behind the rear of the camp. An Israelite occupying a hut or a tent in the front lines of the camp had consequently to walk for the purpose a distance of three parasas. How since this long walk, far exceeding a Shabbos limit, was permitted, it follows



... speak of the divisions in the wilderness! Since about them it is written: At the commandment of Hashem they encamped and at the commandment of Hashem they journeyed, they could well be regarded as constituting a permanent settlement.²⁸ Rav Chinena bar Rav Kahana ruled in the name of Rav Ashi: If among the huts there are three courtyards of two houses each, all the encampment assumes the characteristics of a permanent settlement. (55b)

Rav Yehudah citing Rav remarked: Dwellers in huts and travelers in the desert lead a miserable life, and their wives and children are not really their own. So it was also taught: Eliezer of Biriya remarked: Those who dwell in huts are like those who dwell in graves, and concerning their daughters Scripture says: Cursed be he that lies with any manner of animal. What is the reason? Ulla explained: Because they have no bath houses;²⁹ and Rabbi Yochanan explained: Because they [allow each other to] perceive the times of their ritual immersion.³⁰ What is the practical difference between them? — The case where a river is near the house.³¹

Rav Huna said: No scholar should dwell in a town where vegetables are unobtainable.³² This then implies that vegetables are wholesome, but was it not taught: Three kinds of food increase One's excrements, bend one's stature and take away a five hundredth part of the human eyesight, viz. black bread, new beer and vegetables? — This is no difficulty, one [statement referring] to garlic and leek while the other [refers] to other vegetables; as it was taught: Garlic is a vegetable, leek is a semi-vegetable; if radish appears a life-giving drug has appeared. Was it not, however, taught: If radish appears a drug of death has appeared? — This is no contradiction, the latter might deal with the leaves while the former with the roots, or the latter might refer to the summer while the former might refer to the winter.

that an encampment consisting of huts also assumes the character of a town. An objection against Rav Huna.

²⁸ In consequence of which they were well entitled to the privileges of a town.

²⁹ When the men leave their homes to bathe in a distant place the women remaining behind are exposed to the temptations of the unscrupulous.

³⁰ Depraved men are thus in a position to follow the women when they leave the camp for their ritual bathing.

Rav Yehudah citing Rav said: In a town which abounds with ascents and descents men and animals die in the prime of their lives. 'Die'! Can one really think so? — Rather say: They age in the prime of life.

DAILY MASHAL

Difficulty Learning

People often have difficulty learning, and attribute it to one of two things. Either they personally are not smart enough to learn Torah, or the subjects of Torah are too deep to grasp properly.

The Maharsha explains that the verse quoted above, “It is not in heaven...nor overseas” is preceded by the verse, “It is not too wondrous for you, nor is it far,” because they correspond to each other. “It is not wondrous for you,” addresses people who think that it is not possible for them personally to understand Torah. Regarding them the verse says not to think that the Torah is in Heaven. It is here for every single person to study. Additionally, “it is not far...overseas” alludes to people who think that it is something that a person must travel long and hard for mentally, as it is difficult to grasp the true meaning of Torah. The Torah therefore says that this is incorrect, and it is “in your mouth and heart to do it.” If we put our minds and hearts to it, we too can understand the true meaning of the concepts of the Torah.

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Walking from Bnei Brak to Tel Aviv on Shabbos

³¹ Ritual immersion can well be performed in the river and the women are under no necessity to go far from their homes. The men, however, would still be leaving their homes in quest of a warm bath. Ulla's reason is, therefore, applicable in such a case also while that of Rabbi Yochanan does not apply.

³² Rashi explains that being that vegetables are healthy and usually cheap, they enable a Torah scholar to sustain himself on very little and still be able to study Torah.

As we know, each city has a *t'chum* Shabbos, a boundary of two thousand *amos* from the city's outer limit, past which it is forbidden to walk. If cities were shaped like squares or rectangles with straight lines for borders, the *t'chum* would be easy to determine. However, most cities have irregular boundaries, which stretch out far away from the city center at some points, and draw close at others (52b). The *t'chum* is then calculated based on the principle of *ribu'ah ha'ir*, "squaring the city." The farthest points of the city in each direction are located, and a square or rectangle is drawn around the city, with these points on the perimeter. The *t'chum* is then drawn from this square, and not from the city's actual border.

This procedure is a general rule, to which there are many exceptions. One such exception is discussed in our Gemara, in the case of a city shaped like a bow. Furthermore, it is often questionable how to align the square around the city (see Kiryat Ariel chs. 5 and 7, where the principles used to determine these boundaries are discussed in depth).

In addition to the complicated halachos involved in measuring a *t'chum* Shabbos, it is often difficult to determine the actual border of the city. The city limits as they appear on maps are not always applicable to our halachic concept of a city. For example, industrial zones are often located on the outskirts of a city and included in its limits. However, in regard to *t'chum* Shabbos a city is measured only by its residential areas (ibid p. 117).

Greater Tel Aviv: The principles of *ribu'ah ha'ir* are of particular interest in regard to the area of Greater Tel Aviv, which includes the neighboring city of Bnei Brak. The Gemara states that each city is surrounded by a *karfaf* of roughly seventy *amos*. If the *karfafs* surrounding two cities overlap, they are judged as one city in regard to *t'chum* Shabbos. Thus, in practice, if there are less than one hundred and forty *amos* between two cities, it is permitted to walk from one city to the other and another two thousand *amos* past it.

The question then arises whether the seventy *amos* which may overlap are measured from the actual border of the city, or from the *ribu'ah ha'ir* discussed above. In essence, this

question depends upon a precise definition of *ribu'ah ha'ir*. Did our Sages define the halachic boundary of the city as the square drawn around its outermost points? If so, the seventy *amah* *karfaf* should also be measured from this square. Or perhaps the boundary of the city is defined according to the actual location of the houses, and *ribu'ah ha'ir* is simply a leniency which our Sages applied to measuring the *t'chum* Shabbos, but does not necessarily apply to overlapping *karfafs*.

R' A. Bockwold (Kiryat Ariel ch. 6) discusses this question at length, and concludes that according to most Rishonim *ribu'ah ha'ir* does not apply to the *karfaf* around a city. Therefore the seventy *amos* that may overlap to combine two cities must be measured from the actual border of the city, and not from the square discussed above.

At the request of the current Kozhnutzer Rebbe, this question was addressed to R' Elyashiv. The Kozhnutzer Beis Midrash is located in northern Tel Aviv. Since the Ayalon Highway divides Tel Aviv in two, it is questionable whether one may walk from Bnei Brak to northern Tel Aviv on Shabbos. If we would apply the principles of *ribu'ah ha'ir*, the *karfafs* of the two sides of Tel Aviv would overlap, and one would be permitted to walk from one side to the other. However, R' Elyashiv ruled that *ribu'ah ha'ir* should not be applied in determining the overlapping *karfafs*. If a person wishes to walk from Bnei Brak to the Kozhnutzer Beis Midrash in Tel Aviv, he should best set an *eiruv t'chumin* (Kobetz Beis Aharon V'Yisrael 101, 118).