

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the Mishnah

Rava rules that one is permitted to establish his residence at a place in the distance only if he could reach that spot if he were to rush.

Abaye unsuccessfully challenges this ruling.

An incident involving Rabbah and R' Yosef related to this topic is recorded.

A source for using two thousand amos to measure the techum is cited.

2) The shape of the techum

The Gemara questions the position of R' Chanina ben Antigonus that the techum is configured as a circle. If he holds of the previously cited gezeirah shavah it should be a square and if he rejects the gezeirah shavah what is the source that the techum is two thousand amos.

The Gemara explains how R' Chanina ben Antigonus understands the pasuk to indicate that the techum will be a circle, and how Chachamim understand the pasuk differently.

R' Acha bar Yakov ruled: Liability for transporting an object four amos is measured by the diagonal of a four amah square, i.e. $5 \frac{3}{5}$ amos.

R' Pappa, in response to a question posed by Rava also ruled that a post standing in a public domain qualifies as a private domain only if it forms a four tefach by four tefach square.

3) Clarifying the dispute at the end of the Mishnah

R' Nachman and R' Chisda disagree on the point of dispute in the Mishnah. According to R' Nachman the dispute is in a case where the traveler declared his residence where he was without the use of food. According to R' Chisda the dispute is in a case where the traveler declared his residence at a different place.

A Baraisa is cited that supports R' Nachman's understanding. R' Ashi finds support for R' Nachman from our Mishnah.

Rav instructed R' Chiya bar Ashi to teach his son that the halachah follows R' Yehudah's opinion in the Mishnah. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why did Rabbah quote a ruling from R' Yosi if R' Yosi never made such a ruling?
2. Does a gezeirah shavah require exactly similar words?
3. What is the primary way to make an eruv; with bread or by foot?
4. According to Rashi, according to which understanding of R' Yehudah did Rav follow?

Gemara GEM

The workings of a gezeirah shavah

זו היא שיבה זו היא ביאה

Our Gemara seeks the source that a person may not walk beyond a 2000 amos perimeter of where he has established his station for Shabbos. The source is identified to be the verse in Shemos (16:29), where Moshe warned the people that they should "Stay in their place...no one may leave his place on Shabbos day." A relatively elaborate gezeirah shavah is presented, and it concludes by proving that "one's place" is 2000 amos. One of the key points is that the word "חֹץ" appears in Bamidbar 35:27 and also in Bamidbar 35:5, the latter of the pesukim being the verse which lists the limit of 2000 amos. Although the word "חוצה" appears in the verse immediately prior to this verse (in verse 4), and there the distance of 1000 amos is listed, the Gemara notes that a gezeirah shavah is a better match when the linked words are the same (חֹץ-חֹץ), and not when they are similar (חֹץ-חוצה).

At this point in its analysis of which words may be used for a gezeirah shavah, it is common for the Gemara to note an example where two completely different words are associated and a lesson learned. In regard to plagues on houses, the Torah tells us if a kohen notices a spot which is tamei, he quarantines the house for seven days (Vayikra 14:38). On the seventh day, the kohen returns (verse 39 ושב הכהן). If he sees that the blemished mark has spread, he instructs that the affected stones be removed and cast outside the camp. The spot in the wall is then scraped, and the spot is repaired with new mortar and plaster. Another week is given, and the kohen returns (v. 44 ובה הכהן). If the blemish has returned, even at its original size, the house must be demolished. If, after the first week, the blemish had remained constant and had not spread, a second week of quarantine is given. If after a second week the spot spreads, the stones are removed and the spot is scraped and replastered. The rule of how to deal with a blemish after the second week is not detailed in the verse, but it is derived from the law of a blemish which spreads after the first week, using a gezeirah shavah between the words "וּבַהּ הַכֹּהֵן וּשְׁבַח הַכֹּהֵן."

The Gemara explains that in general, when we have similar words to compare we do not associate dissimilar words. However, in the case of the plagued house, we have no other choice. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
As a zechus for my wife, Hadasa Miriam
and children Meir Simcha, Tzipora Rochel,
Ahuva Chaya, Batsheva Tova and Mordechai Boruch

HALACHAH Highlight

Falsely attributing a ruling to a Torah scholar

אלא כי היכי דליקבל לה מיניה

In order that he should accept the ruling from him

The Gemara relates that Rabbah taught R' Yosef a Baraisa in the name of R' Yosi even though R' Yosi was not the author of the Baraisa. The reason he misrepresented the author of the Baraisa was so that R' Yosef would accept the Baraisa's ruling and he chose to attribute the Baraisa to R' Yosi since we generally follow R' Yosi's rulings. Magen Avrohom¹ infers from this that if one hears a halachic ruling that appears correct, it is permitted to cite the ruling in the name of a great rabbi so that the ruling should be accepted even though the rabbi did not issue the ruling. He then proceeds to question this inference from the Gemara in Berachos (27b) that teaches that one who cites a ruling in the name of a Torah scholar from whom he did not hear the ruling causes the Divine Presence to leave the Jewish People.

Elya Rabba answers that it is permitted to cite a ruling in the name of Torah scholar who did not issue the ruling only if that is the only means to assure that the ruling would be accepted. If the ruling would be accepted even without the false attribution it is prohibited to falsely attribute the ruling to a Torah scholar. Another resolution is that the allowance to cite a ruling in the name of Torah scholar who did not issue that ruling is when the teaching was originally taught without attribution. If the ruling originated with one Torah scholar it is prohibited to falsely attrib-

Distinctive INSIGHT

A berachah when setting an eruv by foot

רבי יהודה אומר אחד עני ואחד עשיר מערבין ברגל וכו'

When one places food at a station to establish his eruv, he recites a bracha. The poskim discuss whether a person should recite a berachah if he establishes his "residence" by going to the extent of his domain by foot. Magen Avraham (419. M. Z. #7) points out that no berachah is appropriate, because no action is being done by the person. By simply standing at that spot the eruv is affected, and the person does not even have to make any verbal statement to activate it (see Rosh, סימן י"ג; and O.C. 409:7). At that point, the mitzvah is based upon his mind set, which remains דברים שבלב, and no berachah is to be said.

In fact, Beis Yosef (O. C. 432) rules that this is also why no berachah is said at the moment one nullifies his chometz. The decision to consider the chometz as null and void is דברים שבלב, and no bracha is said in this situation.

Nevertheless, see תוספת שבת (415:#10) who holds that a berachah is said when a person establishes an eruv by foot. ■

ute it to another Torah scholar. His third resolution is that the restriction is to present one's own teaching in the name of another Torah scholar but if one heard the ruling from one Torah scholar it is permitted to cite that ruling in the name of another Torah scholar so that the ruling should be accepted. ■

1. מג"א סי' קנ"ו סק"ב.

2. שם סק"ב. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

"Corners"

רש"י עירובין דף נ"א

פיאות כתיב - דכתיב פאת (נגב) ופאת משמע מרובע

The Gemara tells us that the 2000 amos of Techum Shabbos are derived from the 2000 amos that surround the cities of the Levi'im. In this context, the Gemara states that (Bamidbar 35:5): "And you shall measure outside the city, the eastern corner, two thousand amos," teaches us that the "corners" of the 2000 amos square box surrounding a city of the Levi'im are squared, so that the city gains more space at the corners (the diagonal — i.e., 2800 amos). The Gemara then inquires why R' Chanina ben Antigonus, who holds that the 2000 amos of Techum

Shabbos are circular, does not accept the derivation of corners from the cities of the Levi'im and derive that Techum Shabbos is squared.

In explaining the Gemara's question concerning R' Chanina ben Antigonus' position, Rashi, d.h. Pei'os notes: It is written "Corners" — As it is written (the southern) corner, and corner indicates squared. Although some later source emended Rashi and enclosed the southern in parentheses, clearly some version of Rashi did have the southern. The obvious question (that evidently led to the emendation) is, why does Rashi cite the words: the southern corner, while the Gemara itself cites the words the eastern corner?

Teshuvos Beis Efraim (end of Choshen Mishpat §64) in the name of R' Yitzchok HaLevi of Pressburg addresses this question.

In Pesachim (12b) the Gemara states that at noon, the sun is at "the corner." Rashi there explains that although in a circle there aren't four corners, but there can be two corners — i.e., if one divides a circle into two arcs, each arc is a "corner."

Accordingly, Rashi here means to prove that the corners in the context of the city of the Levi'im connote a square. How so? Had the verse just mentioned "corners," we could have understood it to refer to a circle, which can be described as having two corners, each 180 degrees apart from the other — either north and south or east and west. Hence, Rashi stresses that two of the corners mentioned are the one in the Gemara — east and the one he mentions — south. Thus, since the verse mentions corners that are only 90 degrees apart, perforce, it must be referring to a square. ■