



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Eruvin, Daf 71 – Daf 80

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 71--55-----

- A Braisa explains that we extend the boundaries of cities as follows: a rectangular shaped city is left as is; a circle shaped city is extended to make right angles (the square that can hold the circle); a square city is not given corners; a city that is wide on one end and narrow on the other is given a boundary as if it is equally as wide on both sides; if the city has a house that protrudes like a tower, or 2 houses that so protrude, we make the boundary as if the entire city extends to the distance of the protruding house; a city shaped like a bow (or a “U”) or like an upside down and backward “L”, we view the cities as if the empty spaces in the middle are filled with houses and we measure 2,000 amos from the edge of the imaginary filled-in middle.
 - **Q:** Obviously a rectangular shaped city is left as is!? **A:** We would have thought to extend it to make it into a square.
 - **Q:** Obviously a square city is not given corners!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing a square city whose sides are not aligned with the direction of the world (i.e. it is not a square when looking at it north to south, but is rather a diamond). We would think to enclose the diamond in a square that is aligned with the directions of the world. The Mishna teaches that we do not do so.
 - **Q:** If when one house protrudes we extend the boundary of the entire city, when 2 houses protrude we will obviously do so!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing where a house protrudes on 2 sides of the city. We would think that the boundary may only be extended on one side, but not on 2. The Mishna teaches that it is extended on both sides.
 - **R' Huna** said, if the distance between the 2 ends of the bow (the ends of the “U”) is less than 4,000 amos, we measure the techum for this city from the imaginary bow string that would go across the bow. If it is more than 4,000 amos, the techum begins at the boundary of the actual city.
 - **Q: Rav Huna** says elsewhere that if the middle of a city was destroyed so that in effect it has become 2 cities with a gap in between, if the gap is 141 and 1/3 amos or less, it is still considered one city. More than that makes them be considered 2 separate cities. How can it be that here he allows up to 4,000 amos!? **A: Rabbah bar Ulla** said, in the case of the destroyed section, there is a space through and through. In the case of the bow shaped city, the city is still attached.
 - **Q:** If so, **R' Huna** is teaching there that each city is allowed an open area of 70 and 2/3 amos at the edge of its boundary (a “karfaf”) and it is still considered part of its boundary. But he has already once taught that in a Mishna, that an area of 2 karfafs may exist between 2 cities and the cities would still be considered as one for techum purposes!? **A:** Both rulings of **R' Huna** are necessary. If he would only say the case of the destroyed section of the city, we would say that only there it is allowed because initially it was one city. If he would only say the case of 2 separate cities, we would say that in that case they use that area for storage and therefore it is considered part of the cities, but in the case of the destroyed section, it was never used for storage, so maybe it should separate them into 2 cities.
 - **Q:** How much space may there be between the imaginary bow string and the bow? **A: Rabbah bar R' Huna** said, there may be up to 2,000 amos. His son **Rava** said, there can even be more than 2,000 amos.
 - **Abaye** said, **Rava's** view makes sense because a person can anyway walk around the bow to the edge of the city and avoid walking through it, so it would make no sense to say that more than 2,000 amos in the middle is problematic.

HAYU SHAM GEDUDIYOS GEVOHOS ASARAH TEFACHIM...

- **R' Yehuda** says, the ruins referred to in the Mishna have at least 3 walls, but have no roof.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** What if a ruin has 2 walls but has a roof, would that extend the city's boundaries? **A:** A Braisa lists many things that do and many that do not extend the boundary of a city. One listed as not extending the boundary is a building in a cemetery that is missing 2 opposite walls. Presumably this means it has 2 walls and a roof, and yet we see that it does not extend the boundary.
 - This is not a valid proof, because it could be that the Braisa is referring to a building that has no roof.
 - **Q:** The Braisa says that a single house on an island extends the boundary of a nearby city. What can such a house be used for (people would not live on an island alone)!? **A: R' Pappa** said, it is a house used for storing a ship's utensils when they are not in use.
 - **Q:** The Braisa said that a cave does not extend a city's boundaries. **R' Chiya** taught a Braisa that it does!? **A: Abaye** said, **R' Chiya's** Braisa is discussing a case where there is a building at the opening of the cave. That is why it extends the boundary.
 - **Q:** If so, the Braisa should say that the boundary gets extended on account of the building!? **A:** The case is where the building is not 4x4 amos unless you take the cave into account as well.
- **R' Huna** said, people who live in huts start counting the 2,000 amos for their techum from right outside their hut (the fact that there may be a hut community does not make it into a "city").
 - **Q: R' Chisda** asked, the encampment of the Yidden in the Midbar encompassed an area of more than 2,000 amos. When one needed to relieve himself, he had to walk to the back of the encampment. Given that they lived in temporary dwellings in the Midbar, the techum should have started at their doors, in which case they could not go relieve themselves on Shabbos!? **A: Rava** said, since the encampments moved and stopped only when Hashem said so, they were considered significant and therefore the techum started from outside the encampment.
 - **R' Chinina bar R' Kahana in the name of R' Ashi** said, if the hut community has 3 courtyards with 2 permanent houses in each, then the entire community becomes a "city" for techum purposes.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, people who live in huts and people who travel in deserts, their lives are not lives and their wives and children are not theirs. **Eliezer Ish Biriya** says this very similarly in a Braisa.
 - **Q:** Why are their children considered to be illegitimate? **A: Ulla** says because the men have to travel far to get to a bathhouse, and when they do, their wives are violated by men, since there are no men left in the community during those times to save them. **R' Yochanan** says, since there are no local mikvaos, the women travel to the mikvah in a group. This results in people knowing about this and immoral men following them to possibly violate them.
 - The difference between these reasons is where there is a river nearby that can be used as a mikvah.
- **R' Huna** said, a talmid chachom may not live in a city that does not have vegetables readily available (they are healthy and inexpensive, which allows him to spend more time learning).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, there are 3 foods that increase excrement, cause a person to hunch over, and take away 1/500 of a person's eyesight. They are: bread made from inferior flour, fresh beer, and vegetables. We see vegetables are not healthy!? **A: R' Huna** was referring to garlic and leek, the Braisa is referring to all other vegetables. Like a Braisa says, garlic is a healthy vegetable, leek is half as healthy, and radishes are like medicine.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that radishes are poisonous!? **A:** Radish leaves are poisonous, but the vegetable itself is not. Even the vegetable part of the radish is only healthy in the summer, because it cools down the body.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, a city that has a lot of hills and valleys cause the people and animals who live there to die halfway through their normal lives.
 - **Q:** Can we say it actually causes them to die? **A: Rav** meant that it causes them to age very young.
 - **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** said, the steep roads of Biri and Narash have caused me to age young.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 11--56-----

- A Braisa says, when squaring the boundary of a city, we make the square according to the directions of the world (i.e. one side facing north, another south, etc.). The way to determine the directions of the world is by knowing that the constellation of “eglah” is in the north and of “akrav” is in the south. **R’ Yose** says, another way to determine how to make the square of the city is by following the location of sunrise and sunset during the different seasons of the year. If one were to draw a line from where the sun rises to where it sets on the longest day of the year, that would be north, and the north side of the square should be drawn parallel to it (in the summer the sun rises and sets more to the north, and in the winter it rises and sets more to the south, although at all times it takes a path that goes southerly around the world by day and back up north at night). If one were to draw a line from where the sun rises to where it sets on the shortest day of the year, that would be south, and the south side of the square should be drawn parallel to it. On the days of the spring and fall equinoxes, the sun rises in the middle of the eastern sky and sets in middle of the western sky, and therefore east and west can be determined from this as well.
 - **R’ Mesharshiya** said, the sun never rises or sets in the true north or south, so it cannot be used as a guide to determine its proper location.
 - **Shmuel** said, based on the fact that a year is 365 and $\frac{1}{4}$ days, that means each solar event will happen one day and 6 hours later in the week than it happened the year before. Given that the sun was placed into Creation (the spring equinox) at the beginning of the night (at 6:00PM), every spring equinox will happen either at the beginning of the night, at midnight, at the beginning of the day (6:00AM) or at midday.
 - Also, based on the fact that each season is 13 weeks and 7.5 hours long, every season will begin 7.5 hours in the day later than the last one began. Therefore, the summer solstice can begin either at 1:30 AM, at 7:30 AM, at 1:30 PM, or at 7:30PM.
 - The fall equinox can begin at either 9:00AM, at 3:00PM, at 9:00PM or at 3:00AM.
 - The winter solstice can begin at either at 4:30PM, 10:30PM, 4:30AM, or 10:30AM.
 - Also, in the order of the 7 mazalos that change every hour, each season will begin a half hour further into that cycle than the last season began (because it begins 7.5 hours later in the day than the last season).
 - **Shmuel** also says, if the spring equinox begins during the mazal of “tzedeck”, all the trees get ruined. If the winter solstice begins in the mazal of “tzedeck” the seeds all dry out. This is all only if the “new” moon of that month appeared in the hour of the mazal of “levanah” or “tzedeck”.
- A Braisa says, one who squares the boundary of a city for techum purposes (it will later become clear that the Braisa is discussing a round city with a 2,000 amah diameter), makes it like a square board. He then goes and squares the techum as well (effectively making a square of 2,000x2,000 amos to all 4 sides of the city). However, when he is measuring the 2,000 amos, he should not measure 2,000 amos in a diagonal from the corner, because that will lead to the lines straight north, south, east and west being less than 2,000 amos. Rather, he measures the straight lines as 2,000 amos (thereby making squares on each side of the city), and then adds an additional square of that same size to the 4 corners of the city. The result (assuming a round city of 2,000 amos) is that the squaring of the city’s boundaries increased the boundaries by 400 amos from the city to the corner of the square, and 2,800 amos from the corner of the boundary to the corner of the techum (which is an addition 800 amos more than the 2,000 amos the techum should normally get). Thus, there is a total gain of 1,200 amos because of the “squarings” that were done.
 - **Abaye** explains, the gains in these amounts are true for a city that is a circle with a 2,000 amah diameter.
- **R’ Eliezer the son of R’ Yose** says in a Braisa, the Levi’im were given an additional area of 2,000 around their cities. The area of 1,000 amos around the city was to be left empty, which would be $\frac{1}{4}$ of the entire area, and the remaining could be used for planting fields and vineyards.
 - **Rava** says, this is learned from a pasuk, that 1,000 amos should be left empty.
 - **Q:** The area left open in $\frac{1}{2}$ the area, not $\frac{1}{4}$!?

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **A1: Rava** says, this can be explained with a city that is 2,000x2,000 amos. The area given to the Levi'im at each side of the city is also a square of 2,000x2,000 amos. Squares of equal size are then added to each corner. The resulting size of the entire area belonging to the Levi'im is 6,000x6,000 amos (36 million square amos). The initial added area around the city (4 squares of 2,000 amos each) is 16 million sq amos. The corner squares are also equal to 16 million sq amos. Out of this, 12 million sq amos were left empty (4 areas of 1,000x2,000 amos along each side, and 4 areas of 1,000x1,000 amos at each corner).
 - **Q:** According to this explanation, the open areas equal 12 million sq amos out of a total of 32 million sq amos of the area outside the city. That is more than a third, and definitely not the fourth that the Braisa says that it is!? **A:** The Braisa meant to include the area of the city itself as part of the total.
 - **Q:** Even so, that makes it 12 million sq amos out of 36 million sq amos. That is a third, not a fourth!? **A:** The Braisa is discussing a circular city, which therefore gets a circular area of 1,000 amos of empty space. The general rule is that a circle is $\frac{1}{4}$ less than the square that can enclose the circle. If so, the 12 million sq amos of empty space is actually only 9 million sq amos of empty space. 9 million of the total 36 million sq amos is exactly one fourth, as stated in the Braisa.
- **A2: Abaye** says, the Braisa may be discussing a city that is 1,000x1,000 amos. The additional area will be rectangles of 2,000x1,000 amos on each side of the city (or 2 million sq amos each, for a total of 8 million sq amos). The squares needed to fill in the corners are 2,000x2,000 amos (or 4 million sq amos each, for a total of 16 million sq amos for all the corners, for a grand total of 24 million sq amos for the entire area added to the city). The amount of area left empty is 8 million sq amos (squares of 1,000x1,000 at each end of the city and the same size squares at each corner).
 - **Q:** 8 million out of 24 million is one third, not one fourth!? **A:** The Braisa is discussing a circular city. The general rule is that a circle is $\frac{1}{4}$ less than the square that can enclose the circle. Therefore, the empty space is actually 6 million sq amos, which is exactly one fourth of the total additional area of 24 million sq amos.

-----Daf ת]---57-----

- **A3: Ravina** says, the Braisa is discussing a square city which is 2,000x2,000 amos. However, the only area that must be left open is the 1,000x2,000 rectangle on each side of the city – nothing need be left open on the corners. Based on that, the entire area to be left open is 4 rectangles, each with an area of 2 million sq amos (for a total of 8 million sq amos). The area of the entire added area is 32 million sq amos (see yesterday's daf). Therefore the open area is exactly $\frac{1}{4}$ of the entire added area.
- **A4: R' Ashi** says, the only area that must be left open is at the corners surrounding the city. The size of the corner left open is 1,000x1,000 amos (1 million sq amos, for a total of 4 million sq amos). Each entire corner is 2,000x2,000 sq amos (4 million sq amos, for a total of 16 million sq amos). Therefore, the amount left open is exactly $\frac{1}{4}$ of the corners.
 - **Q: Ravina** asked, the pasuk says the open area should be "saviv" (around), so how can you say it is only at the corners!? **A: R' Ashi** answers, the pasuk means that it should be around the corners. We see this concept where the pasuk says to sprinkle the blood of a korban "around the Mizbe'ach" and yet we know it means to sprinkle it only on the corners.
- **Q:** In the answers of **Rava and Abaye**, they had suggested that the open areas were left as a circle around the city. **R' Chavivi M'Chuzna'ah** asked, the corners of the city jut out into that circle!? **A: R' Ashi** said, the case being discussed is where the city is circular as well.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** But we square off the city!? **A:** We view it as squared off, but it is not so in actuality. Therefore, the empty area remains as an empty area around the actual city, which adds to the beauty of the city.
- **Q: R' Chanilai** asked, the difference between a circle and square is equal to a third of the circle. In other words, the difference between the length of the diameter of a circle and the length of the diagonal of the square that encompasses that circle will be a third of the length of the diameter. If so, the added length of the corner for the squared off techum is 666 and 2/3 amos, not the 800 mentioned earlier in the Gemara!? **A: R' Ashi** said, that ratio of an additional third is true when calculating the *area* of the circle and square. However, when calculating the length of the diagonal, the ratio is more than that, and is about 1.4 times greater than the diameter of the circle.

MISHNA

- **R' Meir** says we give a city a “karfaf” (an area of 70 and 2/3 amos) around its border before beginning the count of 2,000 amos. The **Chachomim** say we only give an area of a “karfaf” in between 2 cities, meaning that if there is an area of 141 and 1/3 amos between two cities, we view it as if each one has a karfaf and the 2 cities are considered to be one city for techum purposes.
- Similarly, in the case of 3 villages near each other, if there are 141 and 1/3 amos between the outer 2 villages, the 3rd village causes all 3 of them to be considered one for techum purposes.

GEMARA

- This concept of adding a karfaf to the boundary of a city is learned from the pasuk which discusses the cities of the Levi'im. The pasuk says “m'kir ha'ihv v'chutzah”. The Torah is saying to give an outside area to the city, and begin counting the techum from there.

V'CHACHOMIM OMRIM LO AMRU...

- **R' Huna** said, the **Chachomim** allow the area of a karfaf for each city. **Chiya bar Rav** says they allow the area of one karfaf for both cities combined.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna says, “The **Chachomim** say the rule of adding a karfaf only exists when there are 2 cities”. This seems to be a proof to **Chiya bar Rav**!? **A:** The Mishna is referring to the concept of karfaf, but in actuality, an area of 2 karfafs is granted. This makes sense because the Mishna says “If each city has an area of 70 and 2/3 amos next to it (for a total space of 141 and 1/3 amos), we consider them as one city for techum purposes”. We see that a karfaf is granted to *each* city.
 - **Q:** This seems to refute **Chiya bar Rav**!? **A:** He will answer that **R' Meir** is the Tanna who says that part of the Mishna.
 - **Q: R' Meir** already said this in the beginning of the Mishna. Why would he repeat it again!? **A:** It was necessary for **R' Meir** to say it in both cases. If he would just say what he says in the beginning of the Mishna, we would say that only one karfaf is granted, whether we are dealing with one city or two. If he would only say the statement made later in the Mishna we would have said, when we are dealing with 2 cities and the cramped area in between them, we give them 2 karfafs which makes the area usable. However, in the case of a lone city, where there is no cramping of space, maybe we don't even allow them to have one karfaf of additional space.
 - **Q:** The Mishna says that where there are 3 villages with 141 and 1/3 amos between the outer villages, the middle village makes them be considered one. Presumably we are discussing where they are all in a row, and the placement of the middle village makes it one because it makes that there is less than one karfaf area between any two villages. Clearly a space of 2 karfafs is not allowed!? **A: R' Huna** would answer, our Mishna has been explained as referring to where the 3 villages are situated in a triangular formation. The Mishna is saying that even if the 2 outer villages are more than 141 and 1/3 amos away from each other, if the 3rd village is located above and in between the other two, we view the third village as being in between the other two and therefore making it be considered as if there is no more

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

than 141 and 1/3 amos between any two villages. In that way, they are all considered to be one for techum purposes.

- **Q: Rava** asked **Abaye**, how far away can that upper village be and still be viewed as being in between the other 2 villages? **A: Abaye** said, up to 2,000 amos.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, you yourself said that in the case of the city shaped like a bow (a "U") there can be even more than 2,000 amos from the bow to where the imaginary string is!? **A:** In that case there are houses all along the bow. Here, there is empty space between the villages, so it is limited to a maximum of 2,000 amos.
- **Q: Rava** asked **Abaye**, how far can the two bottom villages be from each other and still be considered one? **A:** He answered, there is no limit, even 4,000 amos.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, **R' Huna** said that in the case of the bow shaped city, the two ends must be less than 4,000 amos apart!? **A:** In the case of the villages we have the third village which we are viewing as filling up the empty space, so it makes no difference how far apart they are. In the case of the bow shaped city, we can't say that.
- **Q: R' Safra** asked **Rava**, there are 2 cities, one on either side of the Tigris River, that consider themselves as one for techum purposes. How can they do that when the river itself separates the cities by more than 141 and 1/3 amos!? **A: Rava** showed **R' Safra** that there were wall remnants still standing in the River (from walls that had apparently since fallen), which extend the boundary of the cities. Therefore, the river did not act as a separation of more than 141 and 1/3 amos.

-----Daf 71--58-----

MISHNA

- When measuring a techum, strings of 50 amos each are used to measure, not more or less. The people measuring hold the string at heart level.
- If the techum includes a valley or a fence of stones which has collapsed into a heap, but which people walk over, he should measure across the valley without descending into it, and over the heap without climbing over it, without taking into account the distance of the descents and ascents, and then "returns to his measurement". The same would be for measuring a mountain. He does this as long as he doesn't have to leave the techum to measure in this way.
- If he is not able to measure in this way over the mountain or valley (e.g. they are more than 50 amos wide, etc.), "in this case" **R' Dustai bar Yannai in the name of R' Meir** says, "I heard that we pierce mountains" (by measuring as if through the mountain and not taking the slopes of the mountain into account).

GEMARA

- **Q:** From where do we learn that a 50 amah string is used to measure? **A: R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, the pasuk regarding the chatzer of the Mishkan says "*v'rochav chamishim ba'chamishim*" ("fifty by fifty"). This teaches us that a 50 amah string is to be used.
 - **Q:** The Gemara earlier had said that those words teach that the chatzer should be square!? **A:** We can learn that from the words "chamishim, chamishim". The "*ba'chamishim*" teaches that a string of 50 amos is used to measure.

LO PACHOS V'LO YOSER

- A Braisa says, it can't be less than 50 amos because it may be pulled and stretched, resulting in an excessive measure, and it cannot be longer than 50 amos, because the string would be too heavy and would sag, thereby resulting in a diminished measure.
- **R' Assi** says one must use a string of "Afsakima" to measure. **R' Abba** explains, Afsakima is "Nargila". **R' Yaakov** explains that Nargila is a vine that grown around a palm tree.
 - **Others say** that they argue with regard to the meaning of Afsakima: **R' Abba** says it is Nargila and **R' Yaakov** says it is the vine from around a palm tree.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, **R' Yehoshua ben Chananya** says, the best thing to use for measuring would be iron chains. However, a pasuk says “u'viyado chevel midah” (“in his hand was the measuring string”). We see that strings are to be used for measuring.
 - **Q:** A pasuk also says “and in the person’s hand was a measuring stick”!? **A:** That is used for measuring the width of the gates (a small measurement).
- **R' Yosef** taught a Braisa that strings of reeds are used when tying the parah adumah, strings of peeled willow branches are used for tying a sotah’s clothing, and strings of flax are used to measure for the techum. This argues on **R' Assi**.

HAYA MODED V'HIGIYA

- The Mishna says “he returns to his measurement”. This must mean, that if he is measuring and comes upon a valley which he can’t measure across (it is larger than 50 amos), but further away from the city it gets narrower and he could measure it across with a 50 amah string, he measures it there and continues measuring there until he is at a point that he could return to measuring directly opposite the city.
 - A Braisa says clearly that this is what is done. The Braisa then says, if the valley curves to another side of the city and narrows there, one may not measure the valley on that second side for use in his measurement of the first side (because people looking at the first side will assume that he measured the valley with a string longer than 50 amos, which may not be done). Therefore, he must climb down into the valley and measure while “piercing” the decline, measure the valley, and again measure the incline via “piercing” on his climb back up. The Braisa then ends off, if he reaches a wall, he can simply estimate the width of the wall, and then continues measuring.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna said he must measure above a heap of stones. Why does the Braisa allow an estimation of the wall?! **A:** The Mishna is discussing a heap that people walk over. Therefore, it must either be measured above or “pierced”. The Braisa is discussing a wall with a height and slope over which people will not walk. Therefore a simple estimation is allowed.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, the only time the slope of a valley or mountain must be measured by “piercing” is if the bottom of the slope is not straight down from where the slope begins (in other words, it is not a straight drop down). However, if it is a straight drop, he climbs down (or up), ignores the measurement of the slope, and just measures the distance of the valley or mountain.
 - **Q:** How deep can the valley be with still allowing us to simply measure across the top? **A:** **R' Yosef** says, up to 2,000 amos.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says that if a valley is 100 amos deep and 50 amos wide it may be measure across the top. If not, it may not be!? **A:** **R' Yosef** holds like the **Acheirim** who say in a Braisa, the valley may be so measured if it is as deep as 2,000 amos.
 - **Another version** of the Gemara says that **R' Yosef** said it may be so measured even if more than 2,000 amos deep.
 - **Q:** He doesn’t follow the first Braisa or the **Acheirim**!? **A:** The Braisos are discussing a case where the inclines of the valley do not drop straight down, therefore we are more machmir (since they are somewhat usable) and if they are more than 100 amos deep they cannot be measured across the top. **R' Yosef** is discussing a case where the incline dropped straight down. Therefore, even if it is more than 2,000 amos deep, it may be measured straight across.
 - **Q:** How far can the bottom of the slope come out from the top of the slope and it still be considered a “straight drop”? **A:** **Avimi** says, up to four amos. **Rami bar Yechezkel** taught this in a Braisa as well.

HIGIYA L'HAR MAVLIO V'CHOZER L'MIDASO

- **Rava** says, this may only be done for a mountain that is steep to the point that it gets to a height of 10 tefachim within 4 amos of lateral distance. However, if it only reached such a height within 5 amos of lateral distance, it must be measured with regular 50 amah strings, which will cause it to lose some of its lateral distance because it is taking the height of the slope into account.
 - **R' Huna the son of R' Nosson** says that **Rava** was more lenient. **Rava** said that measuring above the valley or mountain may be done when a height of 10 tefachim is reached within 5 amos of lateral

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

distance. However, if it is steeper, so that a height of 10 tefachim is reached within 4 amos of lateral distance, he may simply estimate the width without any real measurement.

U'VILVAD SHELO YEITZEI CHUTZ L'TECHUM

- If he measures beyond the techum we are concerned that people may see him and think that the techum reaches to that point.

IHM EINO YACHOL LEHAVLIO

- A Braisa explains how “piercing” a slope is done. One person measuring stands down the slope holding the string at his heart, and the second person measuring stands higher up on the slope and holds the string at his feet. This is done again and again until the entire slope is measured. In that way, much of the height of the slope is not counted in the measurement.
 - **Abaye** said, we have a kabalah that only a 4 amah long rope may be used for “piercing”.
- **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** said, we do not measure via “piercing” when measuring for purposes of an “eglah arufah” or for the techum of the “arei miklat”, because those are D'Oraisa halachos.

-----Daf 59-----

MISHNA

- Only an expert in the field may measure for the techum.
- If the measurement on one side ends up being longer than another side, we use the longer measurement for techum purposes.
- If one side was longer than the other, we use the longer side (the Gemara will explain this as referring to the measurements of 2 experts).
- Even a slave is believed to say what point the techum reaches. The **Chachomim** are lenient with techum.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna seems to say that one may only use the side of the longer measurement!? **A:** It means that one may even use the side of the longer measurement up to the longer point, and can surely use the side of the shorter measurement up to the amount of the longer measurement.

RIBAH L'ECHAD U'MIAT L'ECHAD...

- **Q:** The Mishna seems to be repeating the statement twice!? **A:** The second statement refers to where 2 experts measured and one of them determined the techum to be at a further point. In that case we also follow the more expansive techum measurement.
 - **Abaye** said, we may do this if we can explain how the shorter measurement was erroneous (e.g. the shorter measurement was because the expert measured 2,000 amos on the diagonal from the corner, when in fact the diagonal should be 2,800 amos). If the discrepancy is more than that, we will not be able to do that, and both measurements can't be trusted.

SHELO AMRU CHACHOMIM ES HADAVAR L'HACHMIR ELAH L'HAKIL

- **Q:** A Braisa says that the **Chachomim** are machmir with the concept of techum!? **A:** **Ravina** said, the concept of techum is a chumra of the **Rabanan**. However, within the concept, the **Rabanan** are meikel.

MISHNA

- A private city (a city with less than 600,000 people) which became a public city (it now has 600,000 people, but does not have a true reshus harabim running through it) may still be joined together into one eiruv (between all the courtyards and mavois, thereby making it mutar to carry in the entire city). However, if a city was a public city and now became a private city, the city may still not be joined together into one eiruv (it may again become a public city and we don't want such a city being joined with one eiruv, since it may cause people to forget the halachos of a reshus harabim), unless they leave an area out of the eiruv. **R' Yehuda** says the area left out of the eiruv must be the size of the city of “Chadasha” of Yehuda, which had 50 residents. **R' Shimon** says, the area left out can be as small as 3 chatzeiros, which have 2 houses in each.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

GEMARA

- **Q:** What is a case of a private city that has become public? **A: R' Yehuda** says, like the private city of the Reish Galusa, which became public.
 - **Q: R' Nachman** asked, why are you using that specific example? Is it because it is a place where a lot of people gather and therefore they will remind each other that the city used to be private and that is why one eiruv is allowed for the entire area? If so, all places have people gathering on Shabbos mornings in shul, and they will similarly remind each other of the halachos!? **A: R' Nachman** therefore said, an example of such a city is the private city of Natazui (i.e. any private city would be the same, and it need not have belonged specifically to the Reish Galusa).
- A Braisa asks, if a private city became a public city, and a true reshus harabim runs through it, how can we adjust the eiruv so that the city can be joined with one eiruv? We make a lechi or a korah on each end of the reshus harabim, and if the city is then joined in one eiruv, carrying would be permitted throughout the entire city. Such a city may not be divided among two eiruvim – either it is all joined in one or each mavoi must be joined into separate eiruvim. If a public city has only one entrance, it may be joined into one eiruv.
 - **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** says, only **R' Yehuda** allows the adjusting of a reshus harabim in this manner. The **Chachomim** would not allow it.
 - **R' Pappa** said, when the Braisa says that we may not split the city into two eiruvim, that is only if the city is split along its length (along the reshus harabim that leads to the entrances of the city), because both sides of the city need access to the road to get in and out. However, if it is split along its width, which gives each half of the city access to the road and an entrance, without having to enter the other half of the city, the city may be joined in 2 separate eiruvim.
 - **Q:** This seemingly cannot follow **R' Akiva**, because **R' Akiva** says that even if an inner and outer chatzer have each made their own eiruvim, since the inner chatzer has rights through the outer chatzer, the outer chatzer's eiruv is considered to be passul, because it does not include the people of the inner chatzer. Similarly, in the Braisa, where each half of the city has rights of access to the other half, the eiruvim should be passul!? **A: R' Akiva** only says his din in the case of an inner chatzer, which has no access to the street besides going through the outer chatzer. However, in the case of the city, where each half can exit the city on their side of the split, he would agree that the eiruvim would be good.
 - **Q:** The Braisa said that the city must either be joined in one eiruv, or each mavui must make an eiruv for themselves. If the city can't be split into two eiruvim, how can each mavui make an eiruv for itself!? **A:** The Braisa is discussing a case where each mavui made its own entrance at the end of the mavoi, thereby showing that it is separating itself from the rest of the city. Therefore, it is treated separately and can make its own eiruv.

HUYSA SHEL RABIM V'HAREI HEE...

- **R' Zeira** made one eiruv for the entire city of **R' Chiya** (although it was a public city) without leaving any neighborhood out of the eiruv. **Abaye** asked, why did you allow this? **R' Zeira** said, the elders of the city have told me that **R' Chiya bar Assi** joined the city in one eiruv, so this must be a city that was once private and became public (or else he wouldn't have done so). **Abaye** said, the elders of the city have explained to me that this city was always a public city. The reason it was once joined in a single eiruv was because there used to be a garbage heap that blocked an entrance, leaving the city with only one entrance (in which case even a public city may be joined in one eiruv). However, the garbage heap has since been cleared and there are now two entrances to the city, making it unable to be joined in one eiruv. **R' Zeira** said, I was not aware of this.
- **R' Ami bar Adda Harpana'ah** asked **Rabbah**, if a city has one entrance, and at the other end it has a ladder that allows one to climb over the wall, is the city considered to have one entrance or two entrances? He said, **Rav** said a ladder is considered to be an entrance. **R' Nachman** said, do not listen to that, because **R' Adda in the name of Rav** said that a ladder has the status of an entrance and of a wall, depending on whichever status will create a leniency. In the case of this city, it will have the status of a wall and will therefore allow the city to be joined in one eiruv. A ladder would have the status of an entrance when a ladder which is 4 tefachim wide is

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

placed on the wall separating 2 chatzeiros. In that case, it joins them to allow them to make one joint eiruv, but does not *require* that one joint eiruv be made.

- **Q:** We find that **R' Nachman in the name of Shmuel** said, if there is a 2 level structure, where the people of the upper floor have access to the chatzer via a ladder, and they must access the chatzer to exit to the street, if the people of the upper level do not join in the eiruv with the other people of the chatzer, if there is a small entrance 4 tefachim high around the ladder, they are considered to be separate from the chatzer and don't passul the eiruv that the people made. However, if no such entrance is made, no one may carry in the chatzer. According to what **R' Nachman** said above, we should view the ladder as not creating an entrance into the chatzer and therefore not requiring the people of the upper level to be joined in the chatzer!? **A:** This case is discussing where the upper level is less than 10 tefachim off the chatzer, and therefore is considered as part of the chatzer even without the ladder.
 - **Q:** If the upper level is not 10 tefachim high, how does a small entrance around the ladder separate the upper level from the chatzer!? **A:** The case is where, although less than 10 tefachim high, the upper level is enclosed, with an opening of less than 10 amos. Therefore, if a small entrance is made at the base of the ladder, they are showing that they have separated themselves from the chatzer.

-----Daf 60-----

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, if a wall separating 2 chatzeiros had ladders lined up against it, even if the ladders span an area greater than 10 amos, the wall can still be considered a wall, and the 2 chatzeiros need not join in a common eiruv if they don't want to.
 - **Q:** **R' Bruna** asked **R' Yehuda**, we find that **R' Nachman in the name of Shmuel** said, if there is a 2 level structure, where the people of the upper floor have access to the chatzer via a ladder, and they must access the chatzer to exit to the street, if the people of the upper level do not join in the eiruv with the other people of the chatzer, if there is a small entrance 4 tefachim high around the ladder, they are considered to be separate from the chatzer and don't passul the eiruv that the people made. However, if no such entrance is made, no one may carry in the chatzer. According to what **Shmuel** said above, we should view the ladder as not creating an entrance into the chatzer and therefore not requiring the people of the upper level to be joined in the chatzer!? **A:** This case is discussing where the upper level is less than 10 tefachim off the chatzer, and therefore is considered as part of the chatzer even without the ladder.
 - **Q:** If the upper level is not 10 tefachim high, how does a small entrance around the ladder separate the upper level from the chatzer!? **A:** The case is where, although less than 10 tefachim high, the upper level is enclosed with an opening of less than 10 amos. Therefore, if a small entrance is made at the base of the ladder, they are showing that they have separated themselves from the chatzer.
- The people of Kakunai asked **R' Yosef** to provide them with someone who could make a proper eiruv for them. **R' Yosef** asked **Abaye** to go make an eiruv, but to do so in a way that no one will come and complain about the way in which it was done. Given that this was a public city, **Abaye** intended on making an eiruv that left out some houses.
 - He saw that there were houses at the edge of the city that only opened to the river, and not to the city. He thought to leave those houses out of the eiruv and thereby make the rest of the eiruv permissible.
 - He then said, from the Mishna it seems that the houses left out of the eiruv must be houses that could otherwise have been joined in the eiruv, but which we intentionally leave out. However, these houses at the river could not join the eiruv because they were not open to the city! Therefore, **Abaye** thought to make windows into the walls of those houses facing the city. In that way they would be allowed to join the city's eiruv, and specifically leaving them out would be effective.
 - He then said, there is no need to make windows, because even if they don't have the ability to join the eiruv, specifically leaving them out should be enough. We find that **Rabbah bar Avuha** made separate eiruvim in each neighborhood of Mechuza, even though each could not have joined with the next

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

(because of deep pits that separated them). He did so because each eiruv encompassed less than the entire city. If so, leaving over the houses at the river should be effective even without opening windows in their walls.

- He then said, in Mechuza, the rooftops were connected, so the houses could have all been joined in one eiruv, and maybe that is why leaving some out was effective. However, the houses by the river could not join in the eiruv of the city, and therefore leaving them out would not be effective unless windows were made into their walls!
- He then said that windows were not necessary, because we find that **Mar bar Puhidasa** from Pumbedisa left out a storehouse as the area to be left out of an eiruv, even though a storehouse is not someplace that needs to be joined in an eiruv.
- **Abaye** said, given all these difficulties, this is what **R' Yosef** must have meant when he said to make an eiruv without causing people to complain (had he made windows unnecessarily, the people would have been angry).

ELAH IHM KEIN ASAH CHUTZAH LAH K'IHR CHADASHA

- A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** said, Chadasha was the name of a city in Yehuda, which had 50 residents, including men, women and children, and this city was used as the area to be left out of a larger eiruv.
 - **Q:** When making an eiruv in Chadasha itself, does an area need to be left out?
 - **Q:** What's the question? The same way Chadasha is left out of the larger city's eiruv, the larger city is left out of Chadasha's eiruv!? **A:** The question is, does a stand-alone city with 50 residents need to exclude some houses from its eiruv (if it used to be a public city)?
 - **A: R' Huna and R' Yehuda** argue. One says it needs to exclude some houses and one says it does not.

R' SHIMON OMER SHALOSH CHATZEIROS...

- **R' Chama bar Gurya in the name of Rav** says we pasken like **R' Shimon**. **R' Yitzchok** says one only needs to exclude a single chatzer or house.
 - **Q:** Can it be that a single chatzer with no house is considered to be "left out" of an eiruv!? **A:** He means one house in one chatzer.

MISHNA

- If one was to the east of his house when Shabbos began, but he had told his son to establish an eiruv for him to the west of his house, or visa-versa, if he is 2,000 amos away from his house, and the eiruv is further than that, he takes on the techum of his house, and not of his eiruv. If he is 2,000 amos away from the eiruv, and his house is further than that, he takes on the techum of the eiruv, and not of his house.
- If one places an eiruv in the extended boundaries of his city, he has accomplished nothing (because even without the eiruv he does not begin counting his 2,000 amos until he has gone beyond the extended boundaries).
- If one places his eiruv beyond the techum by even one amah, what he gains in one direction he loses in the other.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna said that if he is on one side of his house when Shabbos began and the eiruv is on the other, he takes on the eiruv of either his house or the eiruv, whichever is within his 2,000 amos. How can it be that his eiruv is within 2,000 amos but his house is not!? **A: R' Yitzchak** said, when the Mishna says "he is to the east" and "he is to the west", it doesn't mean to the east or west of his house. It means to the east or west of his son. So it is quite possible that he is closer to the eiruv than to his house. **A2: Rava bar R' Shila** says, the Mishna may be saying that he is east or west of his house, and the eiruv is on the opposite side of his house. However, the Mishna is discussing where his position, his house and the eiruv create a triangle. Therefore, it is possible that he is closer to his house with regard to east-west, but still closer in total to his eiruv.

HANOSEN EIRUVO B'TOCH E'BURAH...

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The Mishna discusses the placing of his eiruv out of the techum. Such an eiruv would not be effective!? **A:** The Mishna means that the eiruv was placed outside the extended boundaries of the city, but within the techum.

MAH SHE’NISKAR HU MAFSID

- **Q:** The Mishna says that if he places the eiruv one amah out of the extended boundary, the amah he gains in one direction he loses in the other. This is not correct, because he will be losing a lot more! A Braisa says, if he places an eiruv outside the boundaries of a city, the city is no longer considered to be “4 amos”, and he will have to count 2,000 amos even when walking towards and into the city. However, if his dwelling place for Shabbos is in the city, the entire city is considered to be “4 amos” and he doesn’t even begin counting until he leaves the city’s boundaries. If so, he is losing a lot more than one amah in the Mishna’s case!? **A:** When one’s 2,000 amah techum ends in middle of the city, the city is not considered to be only “4 amos”. However, if one’s 2,000 amah measurement allows him to go through the entire city, in that case the city would be considered as being only “4 amos”.
 - **R’ Idi** said this concept as well in the name of **R’ Yehoshua ben Levi**. **R’ Idi** said, this concept is not logical, but we accept it because it was said by **R’ Yehoshua ben Levi**. Why should there be a difference if one’s techum ends in middle or at the end of a city!?
 - **Q: Rava** asks, we see this concept in a Mishna, so why did **R’ Idi** say there is no basis for this concept!? The next Mishna says, that when a large city neighbors a small one, the people of the large city may walk across the entire small city, but those of the small city may not walk across the entire large city. Presumably this is because the techum measurement of the large city takes them all the way to the end of the small city, but the techum measurement of the small city does not get them across the large city! **A: R’ Idi** says that the proper version of the Mishna states that the people of each city may walk across the length of the other city. The reason is because the Mishna is discussing a case where an eiruv was placed in the other city.
 - **Q:** We still find this concept in a Mishna that says that if one’s techum ends in middle of a cave, he may not walk in the cave beyond the limit of his 2,000 amah techum. Why did **R’ Yehoshua ben Levi** have to repeat this concept!? **A:** He wanted to teach the din that if his 2,000 amos take him through the entire city, the city is considered to be only 4 amos, and the remaining of his 2,000 amos may be used to take him beyond the city in that direction.

-----Daf נ"ו---61-----

- The Gemara said that there are 2 versions of the next Mishna. One version says that people of a large town may walk through the entire neighboring small town, but those of the small town may not walk through the entire large town. The other version says that both are permitted.
 - **R’ Nachman** said, both versions are correct. The second version is discussing a case where the small town placed an eiruv in the large town. Therefore the people are considered to be living there and may walk through the entire town. The first version is discussing where no eiruv was made and the 2,000 amah techum measurement of the small town ends in middle of the large town. Therefore, they may not go beyond their techum.
- **R’ Yosef in the name of Rami bar Abba in the name of R’ Huna** said, with regard to a city that is situated on a deep river bank, if a 4 amah tall fence is erected to protect from falling into the river, the techum of the city will begin at the fence. If there is no fence, the techum for each person begins at the entrance to his house.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, all over we only require a fence of 4 tefachim to establish a separation. Why do we require 4 amos in this case? **A: R’ Yosef** said, this fence is not just a legal separation, it is to alleviate the danger of falling into the river. If they can’t alleviate the fear, they will not use the area and the gathering of homes will therefore not be given the status of a city.
 - **R’ Yosef** brings a proof from a Braisa. The Braisa says that **Rebbi** allowed the people of Geder to walk down the mountain and through the town of Chamsan, but not visa-versa. Presumably this was because the people of Geder had a protective fence around the town, thus giving it a status of a city, meaning the techum began at the fence, thereby allowing it a farther reaching techum, and allowing it to get

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

through Chamsan. The town of Chamsan did not have a protective fence and therefore had a techum that began at the entrance of their houses, thus not providing them enough distance to make it through Geder. We see this concept of **R' Yosef**.

- **R' Dimi** said, the reason for **Rebbi's** psak had nothing to do with a protective fence. It was because the people of Geder would physically attack the people of Chamsan. To prevent that from happening he said that the people of Chamsan should not even go to Geder at all. The reason why this was instituted specifically on Shabbos was because intoxication was more prevalent on Shabbos.
 - **Q:** Why did he allow the people of Geder to go to Chamsan? Wouldn't they attack the people of Chamsan there? **A:** People are not as tough when they are off their home turf.
 - **Q:** Why not be concerned that the people of Chamsan would attack the visiting people of Geder? **A:** Even when off their home turf, the people of Geder would instill enough fear to prevent being attacked.
- **R' Safra** says, Chamsan was a city shaped like a bow, whose ends were more than 4,000 amos apart, which means that their techum began at every point along the bow, and not at an imaginary bow string. Geder was nearby. The entire Chamsan was within the techum of the edge of Geder. Therefore, **Rebbi** allowed the people of Geder to travel there. However, parts of Geder were not within the techum of Chamsan, and therefore **Rebbi** prohibited their travelling to points beyond their techum.
- **R' Dimi bar Chininah** says, these two towns were a situation of a small city (Chamsan) and a large city (Geder), as described previously, and in the next Mishna.

MISHNA

- The people of a large city may walk through the entire neighboring small city, and the people of the small city may walk through the entire neighboring large city. This is so when the residents of one town place an eiruv in the other town. In that case, it is as if they live in that town, to the point that the entire town (where the eiruv was placed) is considered to be only 4 amos, and they may travel 2,000 amos in every direction beyond the town. **R' Akiva** says that they only get 2,000 amos from the place of the eiruv (the entire town is not considered only 4 amos).
 - **R' Akiva** said to the **Rabanan**, you surely agree that when one's eiruv is placed in a cave, the cave is not considered to be only 4 amos. The **Rabanan** responded, the halacha that it is only considered to be 4 amos only applies for an inhabited area (not an uninhabited cave). If the cave was inhabited he would count the entire interior of the cave as 4 amos and would get 2,000 amos beyond the cave as his techum. This would be a case where placing the eiruv inside the cave would lead to a greater leniency than placing it outside, on top of the cave.
 - If one placed an eiruv outside of the inhabited area, and his 2,000 amos end in middle of an inhabited area, in that case the area would not be considered only 4 amos, and he would have to stop walking at his 2,000 amah limit.

GEMARA

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, if one began Shabbos in an uninhabited town, the entire town is treated as 4 amos, and the person's 2,000 amos begin outside the town's boundaries. However, if he began Shabbos elsewhere and had placed an eiruv in the uninhabited town, the town is not treated as only 4 amos. **R' Elazar** says, in both cases the town is treated as 4 amos.
 - **Q:** We see from the Mishna that even the **Rabanan** say that an eiruv placed in an uninhabited area does not make the area to be considered as only 4 amos!? **A:** The **Rabanan** in the Mishna are referring to a place that is not fit to be lived in (it is not fully enclosed). However, if it is fit, even if it is uninhabited, the **Rabanan** would treat the entire area as 4 amos when an eiruv is placed in it.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if one began Shabbos in a large city or large cave (like the cave of Tzidkiyahu Hamelech), the entire area is treated as being only 4 amos, and he gets 2,000 beyond the area.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Presumably the mention of a city and a cave is made to compare the city to the cave. Just like a cave in uninhabited, we are referring to a city that is uninhabited. The Braisa say its din only when he began Shabbos there. It would therefore follow that merely placing an eiruv in an uninhabited area would not produce that same result. This must be following the view of the **Rabanan**, because according to **R' Akiva**, there is no difference between an inhabited and an uninhabited town. This is a proof to **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel!**? **A:** The Braisa means to compare a cave to a city, to teach that this is only the din for an inhabited city and an inhabited cave, and even then only when he begins Shabbos there. However, placing of an eiruv will not result in this din. Based on that, this Braisa only follows the view of **R' Akiva**. The **Rabanan**, however, can possibly agree with **R' Elazar's** view.

- **Q:** How can we say the Braisa is discussing an inhabited cave? The Braisa says “a cave like the cave of Tzidkiyahu”, which was an uninhabited cave!? **A:** The Braisa means that the cave is like Tzidkiyahu's cave in that it is large. However it is unlike his cave because his cave was uninhabited, and the cave under discussion was inhabited.
- **Mar Yehuda** seemed to hold like **R' Akiva** (because he suggested that an eiruv placed in a building would not mean that the building is treated as only 4 amos. **Rava** told him he is wrong, because no one follows this view of **R' Akiva**.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK KEITZAD M'AVRIN!!!