



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Eruvin, Daf ןל – Daf ןג

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf ןל--48-----

V'CHACHOMIM OMRIM EIN LO ELAH ARBAH...

- **Q: R' Yehuda**, who says that he can choose the direction that he wants the 4 amos to be, seems to be saying exactly like the **Chachomim** (the T"K)!? **A: Rava** said, the **Chachomim** give this person an area of 4 amos in each direction (8x8 amos), whereas **R' Yehuda** gives an area of 4x4 amos.
 - A Braisa confirms this. It quotes **R' Meir** as saying that this person gets a total of 8x8 amos.
 - **Rava** said, the area of 8x8 amos is the area in which he is allowed to walk. However, all agree that he may not carry beyond 4 amos.
- **Q:** What is the source for giving an area of 4 amos to someone who has gone beyond his techum? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk says that Moshe Rabbeinu told the people who had gone beyond their techum to "shivu ish tachtav" (each person should sit in his place). We learn that he must stay in an area that is like "tachtuv" – the space underneath him. **R' Meir** says, a person's body is 3 amos and we allow him a 4th amah to stretch his hands and legs. **R' Yehuda** says, his body takes up 3 amos and we give him a 4th amah so that he can take something that is at his feet and bring it to his head.
 - The difference between these two is that **R' Meir** allows a "larger" 4 amos and **R' Yehuda** allows exactly 4 amos.
 - **R' Mesharshiya** told his son, when you go to **R' Pappa**, ask him whether the 4 amos we give a person is based on his amah (the distance between the elbow and the fingertip is called an "amah"), or on the standard amah (which is 6 tefachim). If he tells you that we use the standard amos, ask him how a large person will be able to exist in the 4 amos. If he tells you we use the person's amah, ask him why this halacha wasn't mentioned in the Mishna that lists the instances where measurements vary based on the individual. When he went to **R' Pappa**, **R' Pappa** told him that we use the person's own amah measurement. The reason it is not listed in that Mishna is because there are times when we don't use his measurement and we use the standard amah measurement – for a person of normal height with very short limbs.

HAYU SHNAYIM, MIKTZAS AMOSAV SHEL ZEH...

- **Q:** Why does **R' Shimon** compare the case of overlapping 4 amos to the case of adjoining chatzeiros? What is he trying to teach? **A: R' Shimon** brought down the example to ask the **Rabanan** a question. He asked, why do you disagree in the case of the 3 chatzeiros and you prohibit the outer chatzeiros to carry items into the middle chatzer, but you allow the 2 outer people in the case of the 3 people with 4 amah areas to eat in the overlapping area of the middle person? The **Rabanan** answer, in the case of the 3 chatzeiros there are many people involved (there can be multiple people in each chatzer) and there is more of a chance that items from one outer chatzer will make its way to the other outer chatzer (which is prohibited). However, in the case of the 3 people, because there are so few people, we need not be concerned that items from one of the outer 4 amah areas will be brought over to the other outer 4 amah area.

U'SHTAYIM HACHITZONOS...

- **Q:** Why is it assur to carry from one outer chatzer to the other? Since an eiruv was made between each outer chatzer and the middle, they are joined via the middle chatzer and should be considered one!? **A: R' Yehuda** said, the case is where the middle chatzer placed an eiruv into each outer chatzer, so there is not one place that joins all chatzeiros. **A2: R' Sheishes** said, it may be discussing where the 2 eiruvim were placed in the center chatzer, but it still does not join the 3 together because we are discussing where the 2 eiruvim were placed in separate houses in the middle chatzer.
 - **Q: R' Sheishes** seems to only follow **B"Y**, because a Braisa says that **B"Y** say, an eiruvei chatzeiros that is placed into 2 separate keilim is not a valid eiruv, because the eiruvim do not join, but **B"H** say that it does

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

join and it is an effective eiruv!? **A:** It could be that **B”H** would agree that if the eiruv would be in 2 separate houses it would not be viewed as one. In this Braisa it is in 2 separate keilim, but is in the same house.

- **Q: R’ Acha the son of R’ Avya** asked **R’ Ashi**, there is a difficulty with **R’ Yehuda’s** answer and with **R’ Sheishes’s** answer. With regard to **R’ Yehuda’s** answer, once he makes an eiruv with one outer chatzer, the middle chatzer and that outer chatzer become one. When the middle chatzer then goes and places an eiruv in the other outer chatzer, it is as if it is being placed there on behalf of the middle and the first outer chatzer!? With regard to **R’ Sheishes’s** answer, since each outer chatzer placed an eiruv in the middle chatzer, it is as if they live there. However, since they have not joined into one eiruv, it is like a case where not all the residents of a chatzer have joined an eiruv, in which case the halacha is that it is assur to carry in the entire chatzer!? **A: R’ Ashi** answered that both questions are not problematic. With regard to **R’ Yehuda’s** answer, since the middle chatzer made a separate eiruv with each outer chatzer but did not make one joint eiruv, it is as if they are explicitly saying that they don’t want to be joined, and the placing of the second eiruv therefore does not join all 3 chatzeiros together. With regard to **R’ Sheishes’s** answer, the halachic concept of viewing people who don’t actually live in the chatzer as if they do live in the chatzer is a concept that we use to be meikel (to allow carrying between the chatzeiros) but is not used to be machmir (like in your question where viewing them as living in the middle chatzer would prohibit all carrying in the middle chatzer).
- **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** says, **R’ Shimon** permits the carrying between the middle and each outer chatzer. However, the **Chachomim** say that the middle chatzer may not carry items into each outer chatzer (however the outer chatzeiros may carry into the middle chatzer).
 - **R’ Yehuda** said that **Shmuel** said the view attributed to the **Chachomim** is actually the view of **R’ Shimon**. The **Chachomim** are actually even more machmir and say that no carrying is permitted between any of the chatzeiros.
 - A Braisa says the machlokes like **Shmuel’s** understanding of the machlokes.
 - **Shmuel** says this idea elsewhere as well. He says, a chatzer that is between 2 muvaos: if it makes an eiruv with each mavoi, it is assur to each mavoi (this is the same concept as the way **Shmuel** learned the machlokes between **R’ Shimon** and the **Chachomim**). **Shmuel** said further, if this chatzer did not make an eiruv with either mavoi, the other chatzeiros in the muvaos may also not carry between the chatzeiros because there is one chatzer which has not joined. However, if this middle chatzer typically only uses the access of one of those mavois, and not the other, if the chatzer doesn’t join in either eiruv only the mavoi that it typically uses will become assur to carry in, because we say it is only part of that mavui, and not the other one.

-----Daf טז-----49-----

- **Rabbah bar R’ Huna** said, if the chatzer that is between 2 mavois joins in the eiruv of the mavoi that it typically does not use for access, the other mavoi (the one it typically uses for access) can make an eiruv without this chatzer and the eiruv will be effective.
- **Rabbah bar R’ Huna in the name of Shmuel** said, if the mavoi that the chatzer in the middle typically uses for access has made their own eiruv (leaving out that middle chatzer), and the other mavoi has not made any eiruv at all, we say that the middle chatzer is part of the mavoi that has not made an eiruv, in this way allowing the eiruv that was made by the other mavoi to be effective.
- **R’ Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, if one of the members of the eiruv is particular about the bread that he gave and does not want anybody else eating it, it is not an effective eiruv, because the word “eiruv” means it is one mixture, which this is not. **R’ Chanina** said it is a valid eiruv, although these people are to be known as stingy people.
 - **R’ Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** also said, if one of the members of the eiruv keeps his bread in a separate keili, it is also not an effective eiruv.
 - **Q:** This seemingly only follows **B”S**, who say that when an eiruv is split up into two keilim it is not a good eiruv. However, **B”H** say that it is good even if it is split up into 2 keilim!? **A: B”H** only

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

allow it when it is split up because it didn't fit into one keili. Here we are discussing where one sets his eiruv food apart because he doesn't want it comingled with the others.

- **Shmuel** needed to say both of these halachos, because if he would just say the first one we would say only there it is not effective because he doesn't let anyone share in his food, but in the second case, where he does, it would be effective. And, if he would only say the second halacha, we would say only there it is not effective because it is in a separate keili, but in the first case it would be effective.
- **Q: R' Abba** asked **R' Yehuda**, **Shmuel** says that the owner of the house in which the eiruv is kept does not need to give bread for the eiruv. Presumably this is because he has bread in his house and that bread can be considered as if joined, even though it is in a different keili?! **A: R' Yehuda** answered, the reason he doesn't need to give bread is not because he has other bread in his house. It is because since it is being kept in his house, and he truly lives in his house, he is considered to be living in his house along with all the other members of the chatzer.
- **Shmuel** said, an eiruv works because by giving the bread it is as if the giver has purchased a piece of the house where the eiruv is. The reason why money can't be used for this is because people don't have money handy on Erev Shabbos, so the **Rabanan** instituted that bread should be used. They even said that if money is used it will not be effective, because they didn't want people thinking that money is the ideal way to create an eiruv. If people would believe that, and wouldn't have money handy, they would stop creating eiruvim, which is something the **Rabanan** wanted to prevent from happening. **Rabbah** says that an eiruv works because by placing bread the person has established a residence in that house.
 - The difference between **Shmuel** and **Rabbah** is if one gives a keili for an eiruv (it can effect an acquisition but would not create a residence), or bread less than a peruta (it can't be used for an acquisition but can create a residence), or allowing a minor to collect and place the eiruv (a minor cannot make an acquisition, but can simply place down the food to act as a residence).
 - **Q: Abaye** asked **Rabbah**, your view and **Shmuel's** view are difficult. A Braisa teaches that if a chatzer made an eiruv and one person of that chatzer takes bread to join with another chatzer as well, the entire first chatzer is deemed joined with the second chatzer. However, it is only this one person who has made the acquisition or established the dwelling!? **A: Rabbah** answered, this one person is doing the "shlichus" for the rest of the chatzer.
- **Rabbah in the name of R' Chama bar Gurya in the name of Rav** paskens like **R' Shimon** (in the case of the 3 chatzeiros).

MISHNA

- If one is travelling home on Friday evening but finds himself still beyond the techum of his house at the onset of Shabbos, and he sees a tree or fence that is within 2,000 amos from where he is currently standing and is also within 2,000 to his house (from the other side of the tree): if he says, "My residence should be under that tree", he has said nothing; if he says, "My residence should be at the tree trunk", it is effective and he can walk the 2,000 to the tree and then the 2,000 additional amos to his house.
- If he doesn't recognize any tree or other landmark, or even if he does, but he is unaware of the halacha that allows him to use the landmark as his eiruv, he can establish his Shabbos residence in the place that he is, and he gets 2,000 amos in every direction.
 - **R' Chanina ben Antignos** says the 2,000 amos are measured as a circle with him as the center and a diameter of 2,000 amos. The **Chachomim** say he gets a square large enough to hold the circle of **R' Chanina**, thus gaining the corners of the square.
- This is what the **Chachomim** meant that a poor person may make an eiruv with his physical presence.
 - **R' Meir** said only a poor man may do that. **R' Yehuda** said even a rich man may do that. The allowance to use bread was a kula that was instituted so that people can make an eiruv without being physically present.

GEMARA

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** What does the Mishna mean that “he has said nothing”? **A: Rav** says it means that he has no techum whatsoever and must remain within his 4 amos. By stating that he wants his residence “under the tree” he says that he does not want to make his residence at his current location. Therefore, he has no residence at all. **Shmuel** says his residence takes effect under the tree, but he may not walk the remaining 2,000 amos from the tree to his house, because we are unsure where exactly his residence is (since the area under the tree is larger than 4 amos), and he must be machmir and count the 2,000 amah techum towards his house from the part of the tree that is away from his house (thus creating a distance of more than 2,000 amos and making it impermissible to walk to his house).
 - **Rabbah** explains the reason of **Rav** to be that because he did not single out a 4 amah area, it cannot become his Shabbos residence. Another version of **Rabbah** says, the reason of **Rav** is that by saying that he wants his residence in an area with multiple 4 amah areas, it is as if he is trying to make them all his residence. Since one cannot make multiple residences one after another, he also can’t do so simultaneously.
 - The difference between these versions would be if he says he wants his residence to be in “4 out of the 8 amos”. According to the first version, since he has still not singled out a place, he has not made a residence. According to the second version, since he did not try to make more than one 4 amah area as his residence, it will be effective.

-----Daf 50-----

- **Rabbah** said, anything that cannot take effect if done consecutively, will also not take effect if done simultaneously.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says, if one separates more than a tenth of his produce as ma’aser, the leftover produce may be eaten but the full amount that he separated as ma’aser may not be eaten (because any amount over 10% that is separated does not have a din of ma’aser, and at the same time is not considered to be part of the leftover produce for which ma’aser was given, therefore it remains “tevel” and is forbidden to eat). Why is this the halacha? If a person separates 10% and then tries to separate additional produce as ma’aser, the additional amount will not receive the ma’aser designation. If so, according to **Rabbah**, since it cannot be done consecutively, it should not be able to be done simultaneously and the entire designation should be invalidated!? **A:** The case of ma’aser is different because one may designate parts of individual fruits as ma’aser without designating the entire fruit. Therefore, when he designates more than 10%, we assume he meant that only parts of each fruit should become ma’aser, equaling to a total of 10% of the produce. For designation of a Shabbos residence, one cannot designate half of a 4 amah area. Therefore, designating 8 amos will not work.
 - **Q:** When one gives ma’aser from his animals he may not designate part of an animal, and yet **Rabbah** says that if 2 animals exit the pen at the same time (these 2 being the 10th and 11th of his count), and he calls them both “number 10”, they both get kedusha. The 11th would not get kedusha simply by calling it “number 10” if it walked out after the 10th animal, so why does it get kedusha when it walks out together with the 10th animal?! **A:** Animal ma’aser is different, because there are times when number 11 does get kedusha (in a case when he mistakenly calls number 10 as 9, and then calls number 11 as 10). Therefore, when done simultaneously it will get kedusha as well.
 - **Q:** If one brings a korbantodah which requires 40 challos to be brought, and he is “makdish” 80 challos, if it is done mistakenly, they do not become kadosh, and if it is done intentionally, but consecutively (first 40 then another 40) it is also not kadosh. Yet, if all 80 are done at once, **Chizkiya** says that 40 out of the 80 do become kadosh!? **A:** Even **Chizkiya** says that if he clearly states “I want all 80 to be kadosh”, none of them will become kadosh. That case is discussing where he brings the 80 without saying anything. **Chizkiya** feel that we assume he is bringing 80 only so that he has 40 as a backup in case something happens to the first 40. That is why the kedusha is effective on 40 out of the 80.
- **Abaye** said, when **Rav** said on the Mishna that the person who designates “under the tree” as his residence, does not get any residence or techum and must remain in his 4 amos, that is only if the area under the tree is at least 12 amos. If, however, the area is less than 12 amos, his statement is effective and his residence is under

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

the tree. The reason for this is because by choosing the middle 4 amos under the tree, at least part of the remaining areas on both sides of that middle will be overlapped by the middle 4 amos. Therefore, by choosing the middle 4 amos he has inevitably singled out at least part of the entire area under the tree.

- **Q: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** asked, why do we say he meant the middle 4 amos under the tree? Maybe he meant 4 amos to one side, in which case it does not overlap any other 4 amah area under the tree!? **A:** He therefore says, **Rav** only said his din when the area under the tree is 8 amos or more. However, if it is less than 8 amos, then no matter which 4 amah area he meant, it overlaps any other 4 amah area.
- A Braisa says like **Rav**, that the reason his saying “under the tree” won’t be effective is because he has not singled out a single, 4 amah area. **Shmuel** would learn this Braisa as discussing a case where the 2,000 amos from where he is currently standing only gets him to within 4 amos of the tree. Therefore, the only residence designation that can work is on the side of the tree facing his current position. Being that he did not designate any area, he may have meant the area on the other side of the tree, which is beyond the 2,000 amos from where he is now, and therefore cannot be his residence. That is why the Braisa says the area under the tree does not become his residence.
- A Braisa says like **Shmuel**, that when one makes 2 eiruvim, he is bound by the stricter limitations of each. **Rav**, who is considered to be a Tanna, must argue on this Braisa.

-----Daf 51-----

OMAR SH'VISASI B'IKARO MEHALECH MIMAKOM RAGLAV...

- **Rava** says, this is only effective if he could reach the tree before dark if he had run to the tree.
 - **Q: Abaye** asks, our Mishna says “it was getting dark” which seems to mean that he could not reach the tree before dark!? **A:** It was getting dark and he wouldn’t be able to make it to *his house* before dark, but he could make it to the tree. **A2: Rava** said it means it was getting dark so that he couldn’t reach the tree if he went slowly, but would be able to reach the tree if he had run.
- **Rabbah and R' Yosef** were traveling on a Friday evening. **Rabbah** suggested that they make their Shabbos residence under a particular palm tree that was about 2,000 amos from where they were at bein hashamashos. **R' Yosef** replied that he is not familiar with that tree, and therefore cannot designate it as his residence for Shabbos. **Rabbah** said, you can rely on me and I can make the designation for us both. **Rabbah** said that **R' Yosef** taught in a Braisa that this may be done.
 - In truth, that Braisa was not taught by **R' Yosef**. **Rabbah** said that it was so that **R' Yosef** would accept it as being authoritative in halacha.

IHM EINO MAKIR OY SHE'EINO BAKI...

- **Q:** Where do we find the concept of 2,000 amos? **A:** Moshe Rabbeinu told the Yidden, “Ahl yeitzei ish mimkomo” (no man should leave his place). **R' Chisda** said, we learn a gezeirah shava using the word “makom”, which leads to another using the word “nisa”, which leads to another using the word “gevul”, which leads to another using the word “chutz”, which pasuk gives the measurement of the areas surrounding the cities of the Levi'im, as 2,000 amos.
 - **Q:** There is another pasuk which uses the word “chutza” which refers to an area of only 1,000 amos!? **A:** The gezeirah shava was from a pasuk that used the word “chutz”, so we won’t learn it out from a pasuk that says “chutza”.
 - **Q:** We find that a gezeirah shava can be made with totally different words (that mean or refer to the same thing)!? **A:** We only do that when there is no exact word that can be used for the gezeirah shava. If there is, we use the pasuk with the exact word.

ALPAYIM AMAH AGULOS

- **Q:** The pasuk with the area around the cities of the Levi'im refers to a square area, not a circle. If so, how does **R' Chanina ben Antigonus** say that the area of a techum is a circle?! **A:** The pasuk regarding the Levi'im says “zeh” (this), which teaches that only the area by the Levi'im should be squared, but the measurements given for Shabbos are not to be squared.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The **Rabanan** (who say the techum area is squared) say that the word “zeh” teaches that all Shabbos measurements should be “like this” (like by the Levi'im) and should be squared as well.
 - Based on this, **R' Acha bar Yaakov** says, one who carries 4 amos in reshush harabim is only chayuv if he carries the length of the diagonal of a 4 amah square.
 - **R' Pappa** said, **Rava** would test us by asking: a pillar which is in the reshush harabim and which is 10 tefachim tall and 4 tefachim wide, does it have to be a square, or even a circle with a diameter of 4 tefachim is enough? We answered, this is what **R' Chananya** said in a Braisa that all Shabbos measurements must be squared.

V'ZEH HU SHE'AMRU HE'ANI M'AREIV B'RAGLAV...

- **R' Nachman** said, the machlokes in the Mishna is regarding an eiruv with physical presence. In that case **R' Meir** says that since the main institution of eiruv was to use bread, physical presence was a kula that was allowed only for a person who had no bread available. **R' Yehuda** says, the main institution of eiruv was to use physical presence, and it can therefore be done by all people. The allowance of creating an eiruv by placing bread was a kula to make it easier for people to make an eiruv without having to be present during bein hashmashos.
- **R' Chisda** says, the machlokes in the Mishna is regarding making an eiruv at a landmark without being physically present and without having placed bread there. **R' Meir** says only someone without bread may make such an eiruv. **R' Yehuda** says even one with bread may make such an eiruv. However, **R' Chisda** says, with regard to making an eiruv with physical presence, all agree than anyone may make such an eiruv.
- A Braisa supports **R' Nachman's** interpretation of the machlokes by stating the machlokes between **R' Meir** and **R' Yehuda** exactly as **R' Nachman** had explained the machlokes to be.
 - **R' Ashi** says, the next Mishna supports **R' Nachman's** view as well. As explained by the Gemara that follows it, the Mishna says that **R' Yehuda** only allows one who does not have bread to create an eiruv at a landmark in the distance. That is how **R' Nachman** explained the shita of **R' Yehuda** as well.
 - **Rav** paskened like **R' Yehuda** according to **R' Nachman** (that all may make an eiruv with physical presence).
 - **Rabbah bar R' Chanan** would travel on Shabbos by relying on an eiruv that he made at a landmark without physical presence or the placement of bread. **Abaye** said, you think you are allowed to rely on that because of **R' Chisda's** version of **R' Yehuda**? **R' Nachman** said that **R' Yehuda** holds this may not be done (because **Rabbah bar R' Chanan** was home and had bread), and a Braisa supports **R' Nachman's** view!? **Rabbah bar R' Chanan** retracted his ruling and no longer relied on such an eiruv.
- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked, the **Rabanan** say that one who establishes an eiruv with physical presence gets an area of 4 amos in addition to his 2,000 amos. If one makes an eiruv by placing down bread, does he get the additional 4 amos as well? **A: Rava** said, the Mishna said that establishing an eiruv with bread was instituted as a kula. If he doesn't get those additional 4 amos, how can it be considered a kula?!
 - The Gemara says this is not a valid answer, because it could be that even if he doesn't get the additional 4 amos it is still considered to be a kula because it prevents him from having to walk out to the place of the eiruv and remain there for the duration of bein hashmashos.

-----Daf 52-----

MISHNA

- One who sets out on Friday to travel to another city which can be reached from his current city if he were to establish an eiruv on the way, but his friends convinced him not to travel on Friday and to return home, and he and other people from his city designate a landmark as an eiruv with the thought to use that to travel to the other city on Shabbos, **R' Yehuda** says, the individual who had originally set out on Friday may go to the other city on Shabbos. The other people of his city may not.
- **R' Meir** says, whoever is able to make an eiruv, but does not and instead designates a landmark as his eiruv, not only is his designation invalid, but he is now limited to the overlapping techum area of his house and the place that he attempted unsuccessfully to designate as his dwelling.

GEMARA

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Why does **R' Yehuda** say that he is allowed to travel but the others are not? **R' Huna** says, the Mishna is discussing where the person had a second house in the other city, which was about 4,000 amos from his first house in the first city. Therefore, since he originally set out on Friday, he gets the din of an “ani” and is allowed to designate a landmark as his eiruv. The others never left home and therefore have the din of “ashirim”, who are not allowed to designate a landmark as their eiruv without being there or placing bread there.
 - A Braisa is a proof to **R' Huna**. The Braisa says, if one has 2 houses – one in each of 2 cities, which are 4,000 amos from each other, **R' Yehuda** says, as soon as he sets out to travel, he may designate an eiruv without actually being there or placing food there. **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** says even more, that even if after he set out he is convinced not to travel on Friday, the next day he may get up and travel.
 - **Rabbah** said, both agree that he must verbally designate the location of his dwelling place. The machlokes is whether he must set out on Friday. **R' Yehuda** says he must actually begin to travel on Friday, and **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** says that even if he just planned to travel on Friday, he may designate an area to be his dwelling if it is done verbally.
 - **R' Yosef** says, all agree that he must set out on Friday. The machlokes is whether he needs to verbally designate the place. **R' Yehuda** says it is necessary, and his son **R' Yose** says that it need not be made verbally.
 - **Q:** Who does the following statement of **Ulla** follow: **Ulla** said, if one set out on Friday to travel to the second city and he was convinced to return and wait till Shabbos to travel, he is considered to have returned, but is considered to have set out. [**Q:** How can he be considered to have left and still considered to have returned? **A:** He means that although he has returned, he is considered to have left.] **A:** The statement of **Ulla** must follow **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** according to **R' Yosef**, because the designation of the dwelling is effective even though no verbal designation was made.
 - **R' Yehuda bar Ishtasah** brought a basket of fruit to **R' Nosson bar Oshaya** on a Friday afternoon (**R' Yehuda** travelled more than the techum and would have to designate an eiruv in order to return to his house on Shabbos). **R' Nosson** walked **R' Yehuda** out, let him go down one step and then told him to stay over for the night and travel back the next day (Shabbos). Presumably he held like **R' Yosef's** version of **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda**, that the dwelling could be made without verbal designation as long as he set out on Friday (which is why he let him take that one step). The Gemara says, it could be that a verbal designation was made by **R' Yehuda Ishtasah**, and **R' Nosson** was therefore following the view of **Rabbah's** version of **R' Yehudah**.

R' MEIR OMER, KOL SHEYACHOL L'AREIV...

- **Q:** **R' Meir** already once said that a doubtful eiruv causes the stricter limitations of each techum to take effect. Why say it again here!? **A:** **R' Sheishes** said, **R' Meir** is saying, not only is that the case for a doubtful eiruv, but even in a case like here, where it is clearly NOT an effective eiruv, still he is limited to the stricter limitations of the attempted eiruv and his current location.

MISHNA

- If one leaves the techum, even by one amah, he may not reenter the techum. **R' Eliezer** says, if he is within 2 amos of the techum, he may reenter the techum. If he is further than that, he may not.

GEMARA

- **R' Chanina** said, we learn from a pasuk that if a person has one foot within the techum and one foot out of the techum, he may not reenter the techum.
 - **Q:** A Braisa say that in that case one may reenter the techum!? **A:** The Braisa follows the shita of the **Acheirim**.
 - **Another version** of **R' Chanina** is that he said in this case one may reenter the techum. The Gemara then asks that a Braisa says one may not reenter!? The Gemara answers that **R' Chanina** follows the shita of the **Acheirim** who allow one to reenter in this case.

R' ELIEZER OMER SHTAYIM YIKANES SHALOSH LO YIKANES

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Eliezer** allows one to reenter when he is one amah out, but not when he is 2 amos out!? **A:** The Mishna is referring to one who has gone further than the one amah and is still within the second amah. The Braisa is referring to where he had already gone beyond the second amah and is now standing in the 3rd amah. However, both agree that one may reenter when he is up to 2 amos out.
- **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Eliezer** does not allow one to reenter when he is just one amah out!? **A:** That Braisa is discussing a person who created a 2,000 amah techum from where he was travelling and that techum ended one amah outside the techum of his city. In that case, since even if his techum gets him into his city he may not travel beyond his techum, here too, he may not travel beyond his techum to enter the techum of his city.

MISHNA

- One who was outside the techum of his destination by even one amah and Shabbos began, he may not enter the techum. **R' Shimon** says, even if he is as much as 15 amos outside the techum of the destination, he may enter, because the people who measure and place the markers which mark the techum of the city, place the markers closer to the city than the actual techum to prevent people from mistakenly going beyond the techum (therefore, if he is within 15 amos of the techum, he is actually within the techum).

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, they place the markers closer to the techum so that people measuring on their own do not mistakenly go beyond the techum.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK MI SHE'HOTZI'UHU!!!

-----Daf ל]--53-----

PEREK KEITZAD M'AVRIN -- PEREK CHAMISHI

MISHNA

- **Q:** How does one extend the boundaries of a city (to determine where to start counting the techum from)? **A:** If one house protrudes more than others at the city boundary, or if one round tower in the city's wall protrudes more than the others, or if there are ruins with walls 10 tefachim high that extend at one side of the city's boundaries, or bridges with a dwelling place that extend beyond the boundary, or buildings at the cemetery outside the city, one makes a straight line from the outermost protrusion, creating an area which treats all of the city's boundary on that side as if it would reach to the area of the protrusion, and from there one begins counting 2,000 amos for the city's techum.
 - In addition, the other boundaries of the city are extended as necessary to create a square or rectangle around the city, and from there the techum is measured. Measuring in this way results in the techum gaining the corners as well.

GEMARA

- **Rav and Shmuel** argue as to the use of the word "m'avrin" in the Mishna. One said the word was written in the Mishna with an "aleph", and refers to the protrusion of the cities as limbs ("eivarim"). The other says it was written with an "ayin" and refers to the city protruding like an expectant woman ("ubara").
 - They also argue regarding the meaning of the words "me'aras hamachpeila". One says it means there were 2 rooms inside, one in front of the other. The other says it was a 2 level cave. According to this second view, the word "machpeila" ("doubled") refers to the 2 floors. According to the first view, the "double" refers to the fact that 4 couples were buried there.
 - They also argue as to the true name of the king Amrafel. One says his true name was Nimrod and he was called Amrafel because he commanded to have Avram thrown into the fire. The other says his true name was Amrafel, and he was called Nimrod because he caused the world to rebel against Hashem.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- They also argue as to meaning of the pasuk that says “A new king arose over Mitzrayim”. One says it was truly a new king (the pasuk says “chadash”). The other says it was the same king but he had new decrees (if it meant an actual new king the pasuk would have said that the old king died).
 - **Q:** If it was the same king, what does it mean when the pasuk says “he didn’t know Yosef”? **A:** He acted as if he did not know of Yosef, by passing harsh decrees on the Yidden.
- **R’ Yochanan** said:
 - I spent 18 days with **R’ Oshaya BiRibi** and learned only one thing from him about our Mishna – that the proper version of the word “m’avrin” is with an “aleph”.
 - **Q:** **R’ Yochanan** said elsewhere that he spent 18 days with the talmidim of **R’ Oshaya BiRibi** and learned how smart each one was and the knowledge that they had (which means he learned a lot more than the correct version of our Mishna)!? **A1:** The only substantive thing he learned was the Mishna. **A2:** He only learned one thing from **R’ Oshaya BiRibi** himself. **A3:** He only learned one thing with regard to our Mishna (but learned many other items regarding other things).
 - When I learned by **R’ Oshaya**, we sat 4 people to an amah.
 - **Rebbi** said, when I learned by **R’ Elazar ben Shamuah**, we would sit 6 people to an amah.
 - **R’ Oshaya BiRibi** in his generation was like **R’ Meir** in his generation. Just like the **Chachomim** of the time could not fully grasp **R’ Meir’s** reasoning, the same was true for **R’ Oshaya BiRibi**.
 - The hearts (i.e. minds) of the early **Chachomim** were like the opening of the Ulam (which was huge). The hearts of the later **Chachomim** were like the opening of the Heichal. Our hearts are like the eye of a sewing needle.
 - “The early” ones refers to **R’ AKiva**. “The later” ones refers to **R’ Elazar ben Shamuah**. Others say “the early ones” refers to **R’ Elazar ben Shamuah** and “the later” ones refers to **R’ Oshaya BiRibi**.
 - **Abaye** said, for us, understanding what we are taught is like forcing a peg into a small hole.
 - **Rava** said, for us, reasoning is as hard as pushing a finger into hard wax.
 - **R’ Ashi** said, for us, it is as easy to forget as it is to stick a finger into a ditch.
- **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** says, the people of Yehuda who were particular with their speech were able to retain their learning. The people of the Galil who were not particular were not able to retain their learning.
 - **Q:** Does being particular lead to retaining one’s learning? **A:** The people of Yehuda who were exact in their speech and had “simanim” to aid memory, therefore retained their learning. The people of Galil who were not exact and did not have “simanim” did not retain their learning.
 - The people of Yehuda who learned from one rebbi, retained their learning. The people of Galil who learned from many rabbeim did not.
 - **Ravina** said, the people of Yehuda who taught their learning to others (or delved for a full understanding), retained their learning. The people of Galil who did not teach their learning, did not retain their learning.
 - **R’ Abba** said, if one would ask the people of Yehuda, who are exact in their wording, whether the word “m’avrin” is spelled with an aleph or an ayin, and whether the word “akuzo” is spelled with an aleph or an ayin, they would know the answer. People asked the people of Yehuda and were told that some say it is spelled with an aleph and others say it is spelled with an ayin.
 - An example of how exact the people of Yehuda are with their wording – when selling a cloak and asked what color it was, the person of Yehuda answered “It is the color of a beet on the ground” (we see how specific and exact he was).
 - An example of how inexact the people of Galil are – a person of Galil asked “Who has ‘amar” (a word with no real meaning). The people responded to him, are you referring to a donkey? Wine? Wool clothing? A sheep to shecht?
 - The Gemara brings 2 more examples of women who, because of unclear speech, said things with meanings that were totally different than they had intended.
- The Gemara gives examples of people who spoke in code to get a point across.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The maidservant of **Rebbi**, when she wanted the talmidim to leave the table after eating, she would say, “The ladle is hitting the barrel” – there is no more wine, “the eagles should fly to the nest” – it’s time to go home. When she wanted them to stay, she would say “a piece will be removed from her” – the stopper will be removed from the barrel, “the ladle will float in the barrel like a ship at sea” – there is a lot more wine.
- **R’ Yose bar Asyan** would speak in code when asking to prepare beets with mustard, and when asking regarding the welfare of an innkeeper and his wife.
- **R’ Avahu** would speak in code when asking to prepare coals to be warmed by and to roast roosters upon.
- The **Rabanan** asked **R’ Avahu** where they could find **R’ Illai**. He answered them with a code that either meant that he had gotten remarried and was with his wife, or that he was learning a new Mesechta.
- The **Rabanan** asked **R’ Illai** where to find **R’ Avahu**. He answered them in code that he had gone to learn by the **Rabanan** in the South.
- **R’ Yehoshua ben Chananya** said, I was never bested in a verbal exchange except for one I had with a woman, a young boy and a young girl.
 - When at an inn, he ate his entire plate of beans the first and second days, but did not eat it on the 3rd day because it was over-salted. When the woman innkeeper asked why he didn’t eat he said it was because he had already eaten earlier. She asked, if so why did you eat the bread? She asked, maybe it is because you forgot to leave over some of your food on the plate the last 2 days (which is what a person is supposed to do as a tip for the one who is serving him) so you are leaving over a lot now?
 - When travelling on the road, he saw a shortcut through a field and decided to take it. A little girl said to him, isn’t this a private field? He answered that from the fact that it looks very trampled upon, it shows that the public has rights to it. She said, maybe it was thieves like you who trampled on this private field and made it look like this.
 - Once when travelling he arrived at a crossroads and asked a young boy which road leads to the city. The boy responded, “This road is short and long, and the other road is long and short”. He took the “short and long road” and arrived at the city in an area in which it was impossible to enter the city. He went back and asked the boy why he had said this road was short. The boy said, “Didn’t I tell you it was long?!” He kissed the boy on his head and said Klal Yisrael is lucky for they are all wise, from the old to the young.

-----Daf 71--54-----

- **R’ Yose Haglili** met **Brurya (R’ Meir’s wife)** on the road and asked her, “Which is the road we take to Lud”? She answered him, “The **Chachomim** say one should not speak excessively with a woman! You should have only asked ‘Which to Lud!’”
- **Brurya** saw a talmid learning quietly. She kicked him and said that we learn from a pasuk, Torah is only retained when learned aloud.
 - **R’ Eliezer** had a talmid who would learn quietly and therefore forgot all his learning after 3 years.
 - **R’ Eliezer** had a talmid upon whom death was decreed from Heaven. In the “Beis Din Shel Ma’alah” it was then said he should not die, because he would serve a great person – **R’ Eliezer**.
 - **Shmuel** told **R’ Yehuda**, make sure to learn out loud so that you retain your learning and live a long life.
 - **Shmuel** told **R’ Yehuda**, spend your money while you can enjoy it, because life is short.
 - **Rav** told **R’ Hamnuna**, if you have money, spend it, because there is no benefit to money after death. To leave money for an inheritance is also pointless, because who says your inheritors will hold onto the money.
- **R’ Yehoshua ben Levi** said, a pasuk teaches that learning Torah is an effective form of protection for one travelling alone. It is also effective to heal a headache, throat pain, stomach pain, bone pain, and any pain of the entire body.
 - **R’ Yehuda the son of R’ Chiya** said, people make medicines that can treat one ailment but are harmful in other ways. Hashem gave us the Torah which is an effective cure to any and all ailments and sicknesses.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Ami** quoted a pasuk that teaches that the words of Torah are sweet when they are retained by a person, which is accomplished by learning aloud.
 - **R' Zeira** quoted a pasuk that teaches, a person gets joy from his learning when he is able to answer the questions that are posed to him. Another understanding of the pasuk is that a person gets joy when learning the halachos of the appropriate time (i.e. the halachos of Yom Tov around the time of that Yom Tov).
 - **R' Yitzchak** said, a pasuk teaches that the Torah is close to us and is therefore retained, when it is spoken out loud.
 - **Rava** learns this concept from a different pasuk.
 - **Rava** asked, this pasuk that he quotes says that Hashem gives a person the desire of his heart, and then says that Hashem doesn't hold back what a person asks for from his mouth. Does he have to say it from his mouth or not? He answers that if a person is zoche, he need not even ask for what he wants.
- A Braisa was taught in the yeshiva of **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov**, from psukim we see that the words "netzach", "selah", and "vaed" mean forever.
- **R' Elazar** said, a pasuk compares Torah to a necklace, to teach, if a person is easygoing (like a loose necklace) and is not seen a lot outside, but is rather in Beis Medrash learning (a necklace is not always seen), he will retain his learning.
 - **R' Elazar** also said, the pasuk says "his cheeks are like a bed of spices". This teaches, if a person makes himself like this bed which is always trampled upon (he is humble), and like a spice that makes others smell good (he teaches others), he will retain his learning.
 - **R' Elazar** also said, the pasuk says "luchos ehven" – if a person makes his cheeks like stone in that they don't become tired from reviewing and teaching, he will retain his learning.
 - **R' Elazar** also said, the pasuk says "charus ahl haluchos" – if the first luchos would not have been broken, Torah would never be forgotten by Klal Yisrael.
 - **R' Acha bar Yaakov** said, it teaches that no nation would have had control over the Yidden (there would have been "cheirus" - freedom)
 - **R' Masna** says, the pasuk said, "U'Mimidbar Matana" – if one treats himself like the desert, which is stepped on by everybody, he will retain his learning.
 - **Rava the son of R' Yosef bar Chama** slighted **R' Yosef**. On Erev Yom Kippur he went to ask for his forgiveness. **R' Yosef** made him explain this entire pasuk, which stresses the importance of humility.
- **R' Huna** said, a pasuk compares the Yidden to animals to teach that if we act like animals who kill their prey and eat it immediately (i.e. we learn and immediately review what we have learned), or animals that get dirty when eating (i.e. we humble ourselves to learn), then we will retain our learning. If we do so, Hashem Himself prepares the "meal" (Hashem teaches us the Torah).
- **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the pasuk compares Torah to a fig tree – "the one who guards the fig tree will eat the fruit" – to teach that just like every time you touch the tree you find more figs, so too, the more you learn, the more you find flavor in the Torah.
- **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini** said, the pasuk compares Torah to a female deer to teach, just like a female deer is always desirable to her mate, so too Torah is always desirable to those who learn it, and the Torah brings "chein" on those who learn it. The pasuk continues and compares Torah to the animal's breasts to teach that just like a baby can always find milk, so too a person always finds flavor in the Torah whenever he learns it. The pasuk ends off "may you always be crazy in love" with the Torah. This is seen by **R' Elazar ben Pedas** who would forget his coat in the market when he was engrossed in learning. Someone once attempted to steal it, but a poisonous snake was laying on it to protect it.
- **R' Anan's yeshiva** taught a Braisa that explained a pasuk: "those who ride donkeys" – these are the talmidei chachomim who travel from city to city to teach Torah, "white" – they make the Torah clear like the mid-day sky, "who sit in judgment" – that judge cases properly, "and travel" – those who learn Tanach, "on the road" – those who learn Mishna, "speak" – those who learn Talmud.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Shizbi in the name of R' Elazar ben Azarya** explained a pasuk to mean, if someone tricks people into thinking he is a talmid chachom, he will not live long.
 - **R' Sheishes** explained the pasuk to mean that one who learns and reviews will live long and will retain his Torah.
 - **R' Dimi** said, learning is compared to a bird catcher. If the catcher breaks the wings of each bird as he catches them, they will not fly away. So too, if one reviews as he learns, he will retain his learning.
- **Rava in the name of R' Sechora in the name of R' Huna** explained a pasuk to mean, if one learns many things at once, he will not be able to review and will forget his learning. If he “gathers by hand” he will retain his learning.
 - **Rava** said, there are **Rabanan** who are guilty of doing this
 - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, I was careful to review what I learned, and I have retained my learning.
- A Braisa explains the process by which Torah She'bal Peh was taught to Klal Yisrael. First, Moshe learned it from Hashem. Then Aharon went to Moshe and learned it from him. When he was done, Aharon sat on Moshe's left side, and Aharon's sons entered and learned it all from Moshe. When they were done they went and sat on the side of Moshe (Elazar on Moshe's right side and Isamar on Aharon's left side, but **R' Yehuda** says Aharon got up and moved to Moshe's right side). The Zikeinim then came in and learned it all from Moshe. They then moved to the side and all of Klal Yisrael then came in and learned it all from Moshe. At this point, Aharon had heard the entire thing 4 times, his sons 3 times, the Zikeinim 2 times and Klal Yisrael once. Moshe then left and Aharon repeated it all to those present. Aharon then left and his sons repeated it all to those present. His sons then left and the Zikeinim repeated it all to Klal Yisrael. The result was that all had learned the entirety of Torah She'Bal Peh 4 times. Based on this **R' Elazar** said, a rebbi must repeat his teachings to his students 4 times. We can learn this from a kal v'chomer. If the great Aharon, who was learning from the great Moshe Rabbeinu, had to hear it 4 times, a regular person learning from a regular rebbi surely must hear it 4 times. **R' Akiva** said, the pasuk says “v'lamda es Bnei Yisrael”. This tells us that a rebbi must repeat what he teaches as many times as is necessary for his students to understand. The pasuk then says “v'sima b'fihem”, which tells us that he must repeat it until it is fluent in their mouths. Another pasuk says “v'eileh hamishpatim asher tasim lifneihem”. This teaches that a rebbi should teach the reasons behind the halachos whenever that is possible.
 - **Q:** Why couldn't everybody learn all 4 times directly from Moshe? **A:** This was done to give honor to Aharon, his sons and the Zikeinim.
 - **Q:** Why couldn't Aharon learn it from Moshe 4 times, then have Aharon teach it to his sons 4 times, then his sons teach the Zikeinim 4 times and then the Zikeinim teach Klal Yisrael 4 times? **A:** Since Moshe learned it directly from Hashem it was proper that all should hear from him.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that if 3 people are walking together, the Rav should be in the center, the greater of the remaining 2 should be on the right, and then the other should be on the left. This seems to only follow **R' Yehuda** of the above Braisa, because he said that Aharon got up to move to Moshe's right when other people joined them!? **A:** Even the **Rabanan** agree with this Braisa, but in the case of Aharon they say that he did not move so as not to burden Aharon.
- **R' Preida** had a talmid who only understood his teaching after hearing it repeated 400 times, and he would therefore repeat it for him 400 times every day. One day **R' Preida** had to go to take care of a mitzvah. Before going he repeated his teachings for this talmid the usual 400 times, but the talmid still did not understand. When asked why he wasn't understanding, he told **R' Preida**, I know that you have to go and I am nervous that you will go at any second, so I have not been able to properly concentrate. **R' Preida** told him, pay attention and I will teach you. He proceeded to repeat it another 400 times. A “bas kol” called out and asked him, would you rather that 400 years be added to your life or that you and your entire generation merit Olam Habah? He replied that he wanted the second option. Hashem said, “Give him both options”.
- **R' Chisda** said, Torah can only be acquired through the help of memory aids and “simanim”, like the pasuk says “simah bifihem”, which can be read as “simana” (make simanim). **R' Avahu** said, we learned this from the pasuk of “hatzivi lach tziyunim” – make for yourself signs. **R' Elazar** learned this from the pasuk that says “u'moda labinah” – make signs for the Torah. **Rava** said that means to make set times to learn Torah.
 - This idea is also taught by **Avdimi bar Chama bar Dosa**. He explained the pasuk “Lo bashamayim hee... v'lo m'eiver layam hee...” (Torah is not in the Heavens or across the seas) as teaching that if the Torah

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

was in the Heavens or across the sea, we would have to figure out a way to get it. We see that one must figure out how to learn and retain Torah. Using simanim is one such way.

- **Rava** said, “Lo bashamayim hee” – Torah is not found by one who thinks his mind is capable of learning without a rebbi, “v’lo m’eiver layam hee” and Torah is not found by one who thinks he is smart enough to easily master it.
- **R’ Yochanan** said, “Lo bashamayim hee” – Torah is not found by one who is arrogant, “v’lo m’eiver layam hee” and Torah is not found by traveling salesmen or local salesmen.