The Gemara objects: Wasn’t it taught as animal in one baraita, and wasn’t it taught as camel in the other baraita? The implication is that this law applies not only to camels, but to other animals as well.

The Gemara answers: Were these two baraitot taught next to each other? Had both of these baraitot been taught together, we would indeed expect the tanna not to teach the same law using different formulations. However, since these two baraitot come from different sources, it is possible that one of the tanna’im referred to a camel with the generic term animal, and hence no proof can be brought from here. This same idea that a camel is different was also taught in another baraita: Rabbi Eliezer prohibits this in the case of a camel, since its neck is long.

Rabbi Yitzhak bar Adda said: Upright boards surrounding wells were only permitted to Festival pilgrims. The Gemara raises a difficulty: Wasn’t it taught in a baraita that boards surrounding wells were permitted only for cattle? The Gemara answers: What is the cattle mentioned here? It means the cattle of festival pilgrims. However, a person

must climb up and climb down into the well, and drink there.

The Gemara examines the baraita cited in the course of the previous discussion. Returning to the matter itself, the statement quoted above: Upright boards surrounding wells were permitted only for cattle, but a person must climb up and climb down into the well and drink there. But if the wells were too wide for him to climb, they are permitted for a person as well. A person may not fill a bucket with water and hold it before his animal on Shabbat, but he may fill it and pour it out into a trough, and the animal drinks of its own accord.

Rav Anan strongly objects to this explanation: If so, what purpose do the boards surrounding a well serve? The Gemara immediately expresses its surprise: How can he ask what purpose do they serve? They allow people to draw water from the wells, which would otherwise be prohibited.

Rather, Rav Anan’s question should be understood as follows: What purpose is served in requiring that the enclosed area be large enough for the cow’s head and most of its body, if in any case the cow may not be given to drink straight from the bucket?
A manger—one end of it interposes into the area between the upright boards surrounding a well—אֵנֵי בּוּרְגָּנִין וּ׳ַּסֵּי בֵירָאוֹת.

This is referring to the case of a feeding trough located in the public domain, with one end extending into the area between the upright boards surrounding a well. The manger is ten handbreaths tall and four handbreaths wide, i.e., it constitutes a private domain, and one end of it interposes into the area between the upright boards surrounding a well. In such a case, the Sages prohibited one to fill a bucket with water in the area enclosed by the upright boards and hold it before his animal; they were concerned that the manger might become damaged, and one might come to carry the bucket from the private domain into the public domain or vice versa while fixing the damaged manger.

It is prohibited to walk more than two thousand cubits from a city on Shabbat. However, if there are small watchmen’s huts in Babylonia outside the city that are relatively close together, they are considered part of the city, and consequently the two thousand cubit limit is measured from the last such hut. Rav Yirmeya bar Abba said that Rav said: The law with regard to these huts does not apply in Babylonia, nor does the allowance with regard to upright boards surrounding a well apply outside of Eretz Yisrael.

The Gemara explains: The law with regard to huts does not apply in Babylonia because floods are common there; and since the huts are liable to be swept away by the floodwaters, they are not regarded as dwellings. The allowance with regard to upright boards surrounding a well does not apply outside of Eretz Yisrael, because yeshivot are not common there, and the allowance was only granted to those traveling for the sake of a mitzva such as Torah study. But we do say the opposite, i.e., we apply the law of huts outside of Eretz Yisrael and we apply the allowance of upright boards surrounding a well in Babylonia.

The Gemara cites an alternative version of the previous discussion. Some say that Rav Yirmeya bar Abba said that Rav said: The laws with regard to huts and upright boards surrounding a well apply neither in Babylonia specifically, nor outside of Eretz Yisrael generally. The Gemara explains: The law with regard to huts does not apply in Babylonia, because floods are common there. It also does not apply outside of Eretz Yisrael, because thieves who steal from such huts are common there; therefore, people do not regard the huts as dwellings.

The allowance with regard to upright boards surrounding a well does not apply in Babylonia, because water is common there. Babylonia has many rivers and canals, and therefore wells are not essential there. Outside of Eretz Yisrael in general it also does not apply, because yeshivot are not common there.

Rav Hisda said to Marei, son of Rav Huna, son of Rav Yirmeya bar Abba: People say that you walk from the city of Barnish to Daniel’s synagogue, which is a distance of three parasangs on Shabbat. Upon what do you rely? Do you rely on the huts located at the city’s outskirts that extend the Shabbat boundary toward the synagogue? Didn’t your father’s father say in the name of Rav: The law of huts does not apply in Babylonia?

Abaye said: In fact, it is permitted to give the animal to drink in any manner in the area enclosed by the boards surrounding the well. With what are we dealing here? We are dealing with a special case, with a manger or trough that stands in the public domain, and is ten handbreaths high and four handbreaths wide, i.e., it constitutes a private domain, and one end of it interposes into the area between the upright boards surrounding a well. In such a case, the Sages prohibited one to fill a bucket with water in the area enclosed by the upright boards and hold it before his animal; they were concerned that the manger might become damaged, and one might come to carry the bucket from the private domain into the public domain or vice versa while fixing the damaged manger.

A bucket...one end...interposes into the area...between...upright...boards...

This is referring to the case of a feeding trough located in the public domain, with one end extending into the area between the upright boards surrounding a well. The manger is ten handbreaths tall and four handbreaths wide, the size of a private domain. It is prohibited to fill the trough for his animal with water from the well, even inside the area enclosed by the upright boards, because he might fix the trough if he notices it is broken and thereby end up carrying from one domain to another, as stated by Abaye (Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhat Shabbat 17:3).

Huts—בּוּרְגָּנִין: Watchmen’s huts, which are permanent dwellings located on the outskirts of a town, are regarded as part of the town with regard to measuring the Shabbat boundary. However, in a locale where thieves or floods are common, they are not taken into account, because they are not used as permanent dwellings (Ber Yosef, Tur; Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayim 368:6).

**BACKGROUND**

Huts—בּוּרְגָּנִין: These huts were small watchmen’s booths. Some of the huts were no more than temporary, flimsy booths, whereas others were well-built and served almost as military fortresses. Watchmen living in these huts were entrusted with guarding fields and delivering messages to military authorities.

**NOTES**

Babylonia and outside of Eretz Yisrael—כוּץ...לָא...אֲבּוּהּ...בּוּרְגָּנִין. This halakhic statement, like many other sources, demonstrates that the Sages placed Babylonia in an intermediate level of sanctity and importance between Eretz Yisrael and other countries. Babylonia’s large Jewish population, its many towns and villages where the majority of the inhabitants were Jews, and its Torah learning and Torah academies, were some of the factors that raised Babylonia to a level above all other countries outside of Eretz Yisrael.

**LANGUAGE**

Huts—בּוּרְגָּנִין: Possibly from the German burg, meaning a fortress or small settlement; some say it derives from Greek. The word was used by Roman soldiers stationed as guards at various spots along the German border. From there it spread to other parts of the Roman Empire and to the language of the Sages.

Parasang—παρασαγγης: Probably from the Greek παρασαγγης, parasangos, which was borrowed from early Iranian languages.
Rav Hisda said: Mari bar Mar interpreted homiletically: What is the meaning of that which is written: “I have seen a limit to every purpose; but Your commandment is exceedingly broad” (Psalms 119:96)? This idea with regard to the breadth of the Torah was stated by David, but he did not explain it; it was stated by Job, but he too did not explain it; it was stated by Ezekiel, but he also did not explain it, until Zechariah, son of Berechiah, son of Iddo, came and explained it.

Rav Hisda explains: This idea was stated by David, but he did not explain it, as it is written: “I have seen a limit to every purpose; but Your commandment is exceedingly broad,” i.e., he stated that the Torah is exceedingly broad, but he did not explain how broad. And likewise this idea was stated by Job, but he too did not explain it, as it is written: “Its measure is longer than the earth” and broader than the sea” (Job 11:9).

And similarly, it was stated by Ezekiel, but he also did not explain it, as it is written: “And He spread it,” the scroll, “before me, and it was written inside and outside; and in it was written laments, and melody [hegeh], and woe [vahi]” (Ezekiel 2:10).

The Gemara explains: “Lamentations,” this refers to the punishment of the righteous in this world, and so it is stated: “It is a lamentation and they shall make lament with it” (Ezekiel 32:16).

And melody [hegeh],” this refers to the reward of the righteous in the World-to-Come, and the proof that this word is an expression of joy is the verse that states: “Upon an instrument of ten strings, and upon the harp, to the melody [higayon] of a lyre” (Psalms 92:4). And “woe [vahi],” this is the punishment of the wicked in the World-to-Come, and so it states: “Calamity [hova] shall follow upon calamity” (Ezekiel 7:26).

But nonetheless, Ezekiel did not explain the extent of the Torah, until Zechariah, son of Berechiah, son of Iddo, came and explained it, as it is written: “And he said to me: What do you see? And I said: I see a flying [afa] scroll; the length of it is twenty cubits, and the breadth of it is ten cubits” (Zechariah 5:2). Since the scroll was flying, the implication is that it had two equal sides, so that when you open it, it is twenty by twenty cubits. And it is written: “And it was written inside and outside,” i.e., on both sides. And when you peel them apart and separate the two sides, how much is it? Its entire area amounts to forty by twenty cubits, or eight hundred of God’s cubits.

In order to determine the measure of God’s cubit, the Gemara cites a verse that describes the size of the span between God’s thumb and little finger, in a manner of speaking. And it is written: “Who has measured the waters in the hollow of His hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure” (Isaiah 40:12). If the entire world measures one square span, which is a quarter of one square cubit, we find according to this calculation that the entire world is one part in three thousand and two hundred of the Torah.

And Rav Hisda further said: Mari bar Mar interpreted homiletically: What is the meaning of that which is written: “The Lord showed me, and beheld two baskets of figs were set before the temple of the Lord, after Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon had carried away captive Jeconiah, son of Jehoiakim, the king of Judah, and the princes of Judah with the craftsmen and the smiths, from Jerusalem, and had brought them to Babylon. One basket [had] very good figs, like the figs
that are first ripe, and the other basket [dud'] had very bad figs, so bad they could not be eaten” (Jeremiah 24:1-2).

Good figs, these are the full-fledged righteous people; bad figs, these are the full-fledged wicked people. And lest you say that the hope of the wicked is lost and their prospect is void, the verse states, interpreting the word duda'im homiletically: “The mandrakes [duda'im] yield a fragrance” (Song of Songs 7:14), meaning that both of them, the righteous and the wicked, will eventually yield a fragrance.

Rava interpreted the verse cited above homiletically as follows: What is the meaning of that which is written: “The mandrakes [duda'im] yield a fragrance, and at our doors are all manner of choice fruits [megidot],” these are the daughters of Israel who inform [megidot] their husbands about their passageway [pit'heilen], i.e., they tell them when they are menstruating. Another version of this interpretation is: They bind [ogedot] their passageway and save it for their husbands, and do not have relations with others.

“New and old, which I have laid up for you, O my beloved,” the Congregation of Israel said before the Holy One, Blessed be He, and continued: Master of the Universe, I have decreed many decrees upon myself through the enactments and ordinances of the Sages, more than what You decreed upon me in the Torah, and I have fulfilled them. These are the new laws which were added to the old ones stated in the Torah.

It was related that Rav Hisda said to one of the Sages who would arrange the traditions of the aggada before him: Did you hear what the meaning of: New and old is? He said to him: These, the new, are the more lenient mitzvot, and these, the old, are the more stringent mitzvot.

Rav Hisda said to him: This cannot be so, for was the Torah given on two separate occasions, i.e., were the more lenient and more stringent mitzvot given separately? Rather, these, the old, are mitzvot from the Torah, and these, the new, are from the Sages.

Rava expounded another verse in similar fashion: What is the meaning of that which is written: “And more than these, my son, be careful: of making many books [sefarim] there is no end; and much study is a weariness of the flesh” (Ecclesiastes 12:12)? My son, be careful to fulfill the words of the Sages [soferim] even more than the words of the Torah. For the words of the Torah include positive and negative commandments, and even with regard to the negative commandments, the violation of many of them is punishable only by lashes. Whereas with respect to the words of the Sages, anyone who transgresses the words of the Sages is liable to receive the death penalty, as it is stated: “And whoever breaches through a hedge, a snake shall bite him” (Ecclesiastes 10:8), taking hedges to refer metaphorically to decrees.

Lest you say: If the words of the Sages are of substance and have such great importance, why were they not written in the Torah, therefore, the verse states: “Of making many books there is no end,” meaning that it is impossible to fully commit the Oral Torah to writing, as it is boundless.
HALAKHA

King Solomon instituted the ordinance of eiruv. King Solomon and his court instituted the rabbinic decree that one may not carry on Shabbat from one private domain into another private domain until an eiruv has been established between them (Rambam Sefer Zeemanim, Hilchos Eruv 1:2).

What is the meaning of the words: “And much study [lahag] is a weariness of the flesh”? Rav Pappa, son of Rav Aha bar Adda, said in the name of Rav Aha bar Ulla: This teaches that whoever mocks [malig] the words of the Sages will be sentenced to boiling excrement, which results from the weariness of the flesh of man.

Rava strongly objects to this explanation: Is it written: Mock [lahag]? “Lahag” is the word that is written. Rather, the verse must be understood in the opposite manner: Whoever meditates [hoge] upon them, the words of the Sages, experiences enjoyment as if it had the taste of meat.

Concerning the significance of observing the words of the Sages, the Gemara relates: The Sages taught in a baraita: It once happened that Rabbi Akiva was incarcerated in a prison, and Rabbi Yehoshua HaGarsi would come to the prison to attend to his needs. Every day his disciples would bring him water in a measured quantity. One day the prison guard met Rabbi Yehoshua HaGarsi and said to him: The amount of your water today is more than usual; perhaps you need it in order to soften the walls and thus undermine the prison. He then poured out half the water, and gave him the other half to take in to Rabbi Akiva.

When Rabbi Yehoshua came to Rabbi Akiva, and the latter saw the small amount of water he had brought, he said to him: Yehoshua, do you not know that I am old, and my life depends on your life? No one else brings me water, so if you bring me less than I need, my life is endangered.

After Rabbi Yehoshua related to him the entire incident, Rabbi Akiva said to him: Give me so much water that I may wash my hands. Rabbi Yehoshua said to him: The water that I brought will not suffice for drinking; how will it suffice for washing your hands? He said to him: What can I do, for transgressing the words of the Sages and eating without first washing hands one is liable to receive the death penalty. And if so, it is better that I should die my own death by thirst, rather than transgress the opinion of my colleagues who enacted that one must wash hands before eating.

They said that he would not taste anything until Rabbi Yehoshua brought him water and he washed his hands. When the Sages heard about this, they said: If in his old age and weakened state he is still so meticulous in his observance of the mitzvot, how much more so must he have been in his youth. And if in prison he is so scrupulous in his behavior, how much more so must he have been when not in prison.

Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: At the time that King Solomon instituted the ordinances of eiruv of courtyards and of washing hands to purify them from their impurity, which are added safeguards to the words of the Torah, a Divine Voice emerged and said in his praise: “My son, if your heart is wise, My heart will be glad, even Mine” (Proverbs 27:11). And it states with regard to him: “My son, be wise and make My heart glad, that I may respond to he who taunts Me” (Proverbs 27:11).

The Gemara cites additional teachings that Rava interpreted homiletically: What is the meaning of that which is written: “Come, my beloved, let us go forth into the field; let us lodge in the villages. Let us get up early to the vineyards; let us see if the vine has flowered, if the grape blossoms have opened, if the pomegranates are in flower; there will I give you my loves” (Song of Songs 7:12–13)?

And much study is a weariness of the flesh — פִּסַּחְכִּים יִתְנַשֵּׁר בִּכְלָלָיו נַשְׁקִים. The Rambam states as follows in his Commentary on the Mishna: The Sages state that whoever mocks the words of the Sages will be sentenced to boiling excrement. There is no greater boiling excrement than the foolishness that induced him to mock the words of the Sages. You will find that the only person who dismisses their words is one who seeks after his lusts, and prefers his sensory pleasures, which do not incline his heart to anything enlightened.

The ordinances of eiruv of courtyards and of washing hands — מִשְׁמֵיה דְּרַב אַחָא בַּר אַדָּא מִשְּׁמֵיה דְּרַב Akiva. In the Sefer Mitzvot Gadol, based on Rav Hai Gaon, it is explained that the period of King Solomon was the first appropriate time for instituting these decrees. The rationale is based on the Gemara at the end of Chapter One, where it is taught that neither the joining of courtyards nor the washing of hands need be observed at a time of war. Until King Solomon’s days there were constant wars, and as a man of peace he was the first who could establish these institutions and safeguards.
With regard to the words: “Come, my beloved, let us go forth into the field,” the Congregation of Israel said before the Holy One, Blessed be He: Master of the Universe, do not judge me like those who reside in large cities where there is robbery and licentiousness, and vain oaths and false oaths, but rather: “Let us go forth into the field,” come and I will show You Torah scholars who work the land but nonetheless engage in Torah study, in poverty and in distress.

With regard to the words, “Let us lodge in the villages,” do not read the phrase as: In the villages [bakefarim], but rather as: By the deniers [bakoferim], meaning, come and I will show You the nations of the world, whom You showered with good, but yet they have denied You.

“Let us get up early to the vineyards,” these are the synagogues and houses of study. “Let us see if the vine has flowered,” these are the masters of Bible, who are proficient in the first stage of Torah study. “If the grape blossoms have opened,” these are the masters of Mishna. “If the pomegranates are in flower,” these are the masters of Gemara. “There will I give you my loves,” means I will show You my glory and my greatness, the praise of my sons and daughters, how they adhere to sanctity.

The Gemara expounds further concerning King Solomon. Rav Hammuna said: What is the meaning of that which is written: “And he spoke three thousand proverbs, and his poems were a thousand and five” (1 Kings 5:12)? This teaches that Solomon pronounced three thousand proverbs for each and every word of the Torah, and one thousand and five reasons for each and every word of the Scribes.

Rava also taught: What is the meaning of that which is written: “And besides being wise, Koheleth also taught the people knowledge; and he weighed, and sought out, and explained each matter by means of something similar to it.

With regard to: “And he weighed [izzen], and sought out,” and set in order many proverbs,” Ulla said that Rabbi Eliezer said: At first the Torah was like a basket without handles [oznayim], until Solomon came and made handles for it. By means of his explanations and proverbs he enabled each person to understand and take hold of the Torah itself, as is written a few verses earlier: “Words of truth written to teach the people knowledge; and he weighed, and sought out, and explained each matter by means of something similar to it.”

With regard to the verse, “His head is as the most fine gold, his locks [kevutzotav] are wavy [taltalim], and black as a raven” (Song of Songs 5:11), Rav Hisda said that Mar Ukva said: This teaches that it is possible to expound from each and every stroke [kotz] of the letters in the Torah mounds upon mounds [tileil tilm] of laws.

Black [shehorot] as a raven [orev] means: In whom do you find the words of Torah? In him.