MISHNA How does one extend the boundaries of cities in order to ensure that all its protrusions are included within the borders of the city? He extends a straight line across the edge of the city, and if a house is recessed and another house protrudes, or a turret \[pagan\] is recessed and another turret protrudes from that line, and similarly, if there were remnants of walls ten handbreadths high, and bridges and monuments over graves in which there is a residence, one extends the measure of that side of the city as though there were other structures opposite them in the adjacent corner of the city. And prior to measuring the Shabbat limit, one renders the city like a square tablet so that it gains the corners, although there are actually no houses in those corners.

GEMARA The Gemara cites a dispute with regard to the mishna’s terminology. Rav and Shmuel disagreed: One taught that the term in the mishna is me’abberin, with the letter ayin, and one taught that the term in the mishna is me’abberin, with the letter alef.

The Gemara explains: The one who taught me’abberin with an alef explained the term in the sense of limb \[ever\] by limb. Determination of the city’s borders involves the addition of limbs to the core section of the city. And the one who taught me’abberin with an ayin explained the term in the sense of a pregnant woman \[eiver\] whose belly protrudes. In similar fashion, all the city’s protrusions are incorporated in its Shabbat limit.

Apropos this dispute, the Gemara cites similar disputes between Rav and Shmuel. With regard to the Machpelah Cave, in which the Patriarchs and Matriarchs are buried, Rav and Shmuel disagreed. One said: The cave consists of two rooms, one farther in than the other. And one said: It consists of a room and a second story above it.

The Gemara asks: Granted, this is understandable according to the one who said the cave consists of one room above the other, as that is the meaning of Machpelah, double. However, according to the one who said it consists of two rooms, one farther in than the other, in what sense is it Machpelah? Even ordinary houses contain two rooms.

Rather, it is called Machpelah in the sense that it is doubled with the Patriarchs and Matriarchs, who are buried there in pairs. This is similar to the homiletic interpretation of the alternative name for Hebron mentioned in the Torah: “Mamre of Kiryat Ha’Arba, which is Hebron” \(\text{Genesis 35:27}\). Rabbi Yitzhak said: The city is called Kiryat Ha’Arba, the city of four, because it is the city of the four couples buried there: Adam and Eve, Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rebecca, and Jacob and Leah.

HALAKHA Extending cities – עיבורים רעים: A city’s Shabbat limits are not measured from each house separately. Rather, they are measured from the city’s borders, which are established as a straight line that incorporates all structures that are part of the city \(\text{Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 398:6}\).

LANGUAGE Me’abberin with an ayin and me’abberin with an alef – עיבורים רעים: The Arukh explains the word me’abberin with the letter alef as follows. Just as a person’s limits \[eiver\] protrude from his body, so too, extra, protruding sections are added to a city. The Meri explains the word me’abberin with the letter ayin to mean that just as a pregnant woman \[eivar\] contains an addition to her body in the form of a child, so too, the additions to a city’s structures are added to the city’s borders.

NOTES Me’abberin with an ayin and me’abberin with an alef – עיבורים רעים: The Arukh explains the word me’abberin with the letter alef as follows. Just as a person’s limits \[eiver\] protrude from his body, so too, extra, protruding sections are added to a city. The Meri explains the word me’abberin with the letter ayin to mean that just as a pregnant woman \[eivar\] contains an addition to her body in the form of a child, so too, the additions to a city’s structures are added to the city’s borders.
Because he caused the entire world to rebel – שוחרר את כל עולם, it is written: “And it came to pass in the days of Amraphel” (Genesis 14:1). Rav and Shmuel both identified Amraphel with Nimrod. However, one said: Nimrod was his name. And why was his name called Amraphel? It is a contraction of two Hebrew words: As he said [amar] the command and cast [hippit] our father Abraham into the fiery furnace, when Abraham rebelled against and challenged his proclaimed divinity. And one said: Amraphel was his name. And why was his name called Nimrod? Because he caused the entire world to rebel [himred] against God during his reign.

They also disagreed about this verse: “There arose a new king over Egypt, who knew not Joseph” (Exodus 1:8). Rav and Shmuel disagreed. One said: He was actually a new king, and one said: He was in fact the old king, but his decrees were new.

The Gemara explains. The one who said he was actually a new king based his opinion on the fact that it is written in the verse that he was new. And the one who said that his decrees were new derived his opinion from the fact that it is not written: And the king died, and his successor reigned, as it is written, for example, with regard to the kings of Edom (Genesis 36).

The Gemara asks: And according to the one who said that his decrees were new, isn’t it written: “Who knew not Joseph”? If it were the same king, how could he not know Joseph? The Gemara explains: What is the meaning of the phrase: “Who knew not Joseph”? It means that he conducted himself like one who did not know Joseph at all.

The Gemara cites a mnemonic of key words from a series of traditions cited below: Eighteen and twelve⁸ we studied, with regard to David, and he will understand.

Rabbi Yoĥanan said: I spent eighteen days with Rabbi Oshaya the Distinguished [Beribbi],¹ and I learned from him only one matter in our Mishna. In the phrase: How does one extend cities, the word meʻabberin is spelled with an alef.

The Gemara asks: Is this so? Didn’t Rabbi Yoĥanan say: Rabbi Oshaya the Distinguished had twelve students, and I spent eighteen days among them, and I learned the heart of each and every one, i.e., the nature and character of each student, and the extent of the wisdom of each and every one? How could Rabbi Yoĥanan say that he learned only one matter?

The Gemara answers: It is possible that he learned the heart of each and every one and the wisdom of each and every one, but he did not learn substantive tradition. And if you wish, say instead: From the students themselves he learned many things; from Rabbi Oshaya himself he did not learn anything beyond that one matter. And if you wish, say instead: Rabbi Yoĥanan meant to say that he learned only one matter in our Mishna from Rabbi Oshaya, but he learned other matters from him based on baraitot and other sources.

The Distinguished [Beribbi]. This honorific title for a great person was added to the names of several Sages. The word is probably a contraction of the two words bar and Rabbi, which together means the son of a Sage. It was first used as a label for Sages who were sons of Sages. Its meaning was later broadened to refer also to great scholars who did not have distinguished fathers.
Rabbi Yoḥanan said about his teacher: Rabbi Oshaya the Distinguished was as great in his generation as Rabbi Meir was in his generation: Just as with regard to Rabbi Meir, in his generation his colleagues were unable to fully grasp the profundity of his thinking due to the subtlety of his great mind, so it was with Rabbi Oshaya; his colleagues were unable to fully grasp the profundity of his thinking.

Similarly, Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The hearts, i.e., the wisdom, of the early Sages were like the doorway to the Entrance Hall of the Temple, which was twenty by forty cubits, and the hearts of the later Sages were like the doorway to the Sanctuary, which was ten by twenty cubits. And we, i.e., our hearts, are like the eye of a fine needle.

He explains: The term early Sages is referring to Rabbi Akiva, and the term later Sages is referring to his student, Rabbi Elazar ben Shamua. Some say that the term early Sages refers to Rabbi Elazar ben Shamua and that the term the later Sages refers to Rabbi Oshaya the Distinguished. And we are like the eye of a fine needle.

On the topic of the steady decline of the generations, Abaye said: And we, as far as our capabilities are concerned, are like a peg in the wall with regard to Torah study. Just as a peg enters a wall with difficulty, our studies penetrate our minds only with difficulty. Rava said: And we are like a finger in wax with regard to logical reasoning. A finger is not easily pushed into wax, and it extracts nothing from the wax. Rav Ashi said: We are like a finger in a pit with regard to forgetfulness. Just as a finger easily enters a large pit, similarly, we quickly forget our studies.

The Gemara continues the discussion relating to study and comprehension, and cites that which Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: With regard to the people of Judea, who were particular in their speech and always made certain that it was both precise and refined, their Torah knowledge endured for them; with regard to the people of the Galilee, who were not particular in their speech, their Torah knowledge did not endure for them.

The Gemara asks: Is this matter at all dependent on being particular with one’s language? Rather, with regard to the people of Judea, who were precise in their language and who would formulate mnemonics for their studies, their Torah knowledge endured for them; with regard to the people of the Galilee, who were not precise in their language and who would not formulate mnemonics, their Torah knowledge did not endure for them.

Like a peg in the wall – קירוס ולעך טהור קלח: Rabbeinu Hananel explains further that just as a peg in a wall does nothing to strengthen the wall, our studying is also ineffective.

Like a finger in wax – בירה תלתא מלקתה: Rabbeinu Hananel explains that this is referring to a finger inserted into very soft wax. As soon as one removes his finger, the depression he created disappears.
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did them mischief, “ whereas King David’s teachings were in accordance with the accepted halakha. However, Saul’s opinions were not in accordance with the accepted halakha, as indicated by the verse subsequently quoted in the Gemara, “And wherever he turned himself he did them mischief” whereas King David’s teachings were in accordance with the accepted halakha.

Furthermore, with regard to the people of Judea, who studied from one teacher, their Torah knowledge endured for them, as their teacher provided them with a consistent approach; however, with regard to the people of the Galilee, who did not study from one teacher, but rather from several teachers, their Torah knowledge did not endure for them, as it was a combination of the approaches and opinions of a variety of Sages.

Ravina said: With regard to the people of Judea, who would publicly disclose the tractate to be studied in the coming term so that everyone could prepare and study it in advance (ge’onim), their Torah knowledge endured for them; with regard to the people of the Galilee, who would not disclose the tractate to be studied in the coming term, their Torah knowledge did not endure for them.

The Gemara relates that King David would disclose the tractate to be studied in advance, whereas Saul would not disclose the tractate to be studied. With regard to David, who would disclose the tractate, it is written: “Those who fear You will see me and be glad” (Psalms 119:74), since all were prepared and could enjoy his Torah. With regard to Saul, who would not disclose the tractate to be studied, it is written: “And wherever he turned himself he did them mischief” (1 Samuel 14:47).

The Gemara concludes the mention of Saul on a positive note. And Rabbi Yohanan said: From where is it derived that the Holy One, Blessed be He, forgave him for that sin, the massacre of Nov, the city of priests? As it is stated that the spirit of Samuel said to him: “And the Lord will also deliver Israel with you into the hand of the Philistines, and tomorrow shall you and your sons be with me” (1 Samuel 28:19); the phrase “with me” means within my partition together with me in heaven, i.e., on the same level as the righteous prophet Samuel.

The Gemara returns to the earlier question with regard to the correct reading of the word me’abberin. Rabbi Abba said: If there is anyone who can ask the people of Judea, who are precise in their language, whether the term in the mishna that we learned is me’abberin with an alef or me’abberin with an ayn, he should ask them. Similarly, with regard to the blemishes of a firstborn animal, was the term meaning its hindquarters that we learned in the mishna akkuzo with an alef, or did we learn akkuzo with an ayn? They would know.

The Gemara answers: One asked the people of Judea, and they said to him: Some teach me’abberin with an alef, and some teach me’abberin with an ayn. Some teach akkuzo with an alef, and some teach akkuzo with an ayn. Both versions are well founded and neither one is erroneous.

Having mentioned that the people of Judea are precise in their speech, the Gemara asks: What is the meaning of this? The Gemara answers with an example: As in the case of a certain person from Judea who said to those within earshot: I have a cloak to sell. They said to him: What color is your cloak? He said to them: Like beets on the ground, providing an exceedingly precise description of the exact shade of the cloak, the green tint of beet greens when they first sprouted.
The Gemara returns to the people of the Galilee, who are not precise in their speech. What is the meaning of this? The Gemara cites examples: As it was taught in a baraita that there was a certain person from the Galilee who would walk and say to people: Who has amar? Who has amar? They said to him: Foolish Galilean, what do you mean? Galileans did not pronounce the guttural letters properly, so it was unclear whether he sought a donkey [hamor] to ride, or wine [hamar] to drink, wool [amar] to wear, or a lamb [imar] to slaughter. This is an example of the lack of precision in the Galileans’ speech.

The Gemara cites another example of the lack of linguistic precision of the Galileans: There was a certain woman who wanted to say to her friend: My neighbor, come and I will feed you milk [ta’i de’okkikh helba]; however, due to the imprecise articulation of her words, she said to her: My neighbor, may a lioness eat you [tokkikh layva].

The Gemara cites another example of the ignorance and incivility of the Galileans: There was a woman who came before a judge intending to say: Master, sir [Mari kiri, spelled with a kaf]; I had a board, and they stole it from me [tavla havet li ugenavu mineni]. But instead she said to him: Master, servant [Mari kiri; spelled with a kaf], I had a beam and they stole you from me [ta’fa havet li ugenavuk min]. And it was so large, that when they would hang you upon it, your feet would not reach the ground.

In contrast to the speech of the Galileans, which indicates ignorance and loutishness, the Gemara cites the examples of the clever phraseology of the inhabitants of Judea and the Sages: The maidservant in the house of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, when she would speak enigmatically, employing euphemistic terminology or in riddles, she would say as follows: The ladle used for drawing wine from the jug is already knocking against the bottom of the jug, i.e., the wine jug is almost empty. Let the eagles fly to their nests, i.e., let the students return home, as there is nothing left for them to drink.

And when Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi wanted them to sit, she would say to them: Let us remove the stopper from another jug, and let the ladle float in the jug like a ship sailing in the sea.

The Gemara also relates that when Rabbi Yosei bar Asyan would speak enigmatically, he would say: Prepare for me an ox in judgment on a poor mountain. His method was to construct words by combining words from Aramaic translations of Hebrew words or Hebrew translations of Aramaic words. Ox is tor in Aramaic; judgment is din. Combined they form teradin, beets. Mountain in Hebrew is har, which they pronounced bar; poor is dal. Together it spells hardal, mustard. Thus, Rabbi Yosei bar Asyan was requesting beets in mustard.

And when he would inquire about an inn, he would say as follows: This man here is raw; what is this good that there is? The phrase “this man here is raw” is used in a similar syllable-by-syllable translation: Man in Hebrew is ish; here is po; this is zeh; and raw is na. All together, they sound like ushpazikhna, i.e., an innkeeper (Rabbeinu Hananel). In other words, Rabbi Yosei bar Asyan was asking after the innkeeper.

When Rabbi Abbahu would speak enigmatically, he would say as follows: Make the coals the color of an etrog; beat the golden ones, i.e., spread out the coals, which reddened like gold when they glow; and make me two speakers-in-the-dark, i.e., roosters, which announce the dawn when it is still dark. Some say a slightly different version: And they shall make me in them, on the coals, i.e., roast for me on top of the coals, two speakers-in-the-dark.

NOTES

1. From the Greek kurie, keyrios, meaning enslaved or a servant. The woman apparently used the word kiri, spelled with the letter kaf, rather than the honorific term kurie, spelled with the letter kuf. The word kiri with the letter kuf is from the Greek kurio, kure, meaning sir.

2. The maidervant in the house of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi – בַּכַּד יִדְאוּן יִשְׁרַיָּא לְיִירוֹן. Rabbeinu Hananel had a slightly different version of this text, which led him to offer a different interpretation. He explains that these statements were made by the maidservant to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi himself when the wine in the barrel was finished. She wished to ask in cryptic fashion whether the students should be told to conclude their visit, or whether a new barrel should be opened and they should stay.

3. Speak enigmatically – מִסְכֵּן. Rabbi Abbahu used these clever turns of phrase so that not everyone would understand what was being said. Apparently, the hints with regard to beets in mustard and the preparation of roosters were so that the speaker would not appear glutinous.

4. With regard to the innkeeper mentioned earlier in the Gemara, the Maharsha explains that Rabbi Yosei was inquiring after the health of the innkeeper’s wife, and since this was unusual for him, he did so discreetly.

5. The Arukh explains that these verbs should be read as hanigo, which means to hit, break, beat, and hankiu, move it outside under the sky [rakia].

6. The maidservant in the house of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi – מִמְּשַׁמְתָּא לְכִירִי מַאי רִיא וּגְבוּךְ מִין. But instead, due to the imprecise articulation of her words, she said to him: Master, sir I had a board, and they stole it from me [tavla havet li ugenavu mineni].
A remainder in the pot —[ipas]: Etiquette does not require one to leave anything in the pot, as not everyone sees what is left in it, whereas all can see what a person leaves on his own plate.

A remainder in the pot — [ilpas]: —

There are two ways to understand this cryptic statement: Some say it refers to a woman, i.e., he married a young girl from a priestly family [Aharonic], who is his second [latter] wife, from a village [eritan], and he is sleeping now because she kept him awake during the night.

And some say it refers to a tractate. The term girl refers to the tractate; Aharonic indicates that it is a tractate from the order of Kodashim, which deals with the priestly service. The phrase the latter means that it is his latest course of study, and lively alludes to the challenging nature of the subject matter. Since he was awake all night studying, he is presently sleeping.

Having discussed the clever speech of various Sages, the Gemara relates that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Hananya said as follows: In all my days, no person defeated me in a verbal encounter except for a woman, a young boy, and a young girl. What is the encounter in which a woman got the better of me? One time I was staying at a certain inn and the hostess prepared beans. On the first day I ate them and left nothing over, although proper etiquette dictates that one should leave over something on his plate. On the second day I again ate and left nothing over. On the third day she over-salted them so that they were inedible. As soon as I tasted them, I withdrew my hands from them.

She said to me: My Rabbi, why aren’t you eating beans as on the previous days? Not wishing to offend her, I said to her: I have already eaten during the daytime. She said to me: You should have withdrawn your hand from bread and left room for some beans.

She then said to me: My Rabbi, perhaps you did not leave a remainder of food on your plate for the first three days, which is why you are leaving over food today. Isn’t this what the Sages said: One need not leave a remainder in the pot [ipas], but one must leave a remainder on the plate as an expression of etiquette [Tosafot]. This is the incident in which a woman got the better of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Hananya.

What is the incident with a young girl? One time I was walking along the path, and the path passed through a field, and I was walking on it. A certain young girl said to me: My Rabbi, isn’t this a field? One should not walk through a field, so as not to damage the crops growing there. I said to her: Isn’t it a well-trodden path in the field, across which one is permitted to walk? She said to me: Robbers like you have trodden it. In other words, it previously had been prohibited to walk through this field, and it is only due to people such as you, who paid no attention to the prohibition, that a path has been cut across it. Thus, the young girl defeated Rabbi Yehoshua ben Hananya in a debate.

What is the incident with a young boy? One time I was walking along the path, and I saw a young boy sitting at the crossroads. And I said to him: On which path shall we walk in order to get to the city? He said to me: This path is short and long, and that path is long and short. I walked on the path that was short and long. When I approached the city I found that gardens and orchards surrounded it, and I did not know the trails leading through them to the city.
Having discussed wise speech and the wisdom of Jewish women, the Gemara cites the following story: Rabbi Yosei HaGelli was walking along the way, and met Berurya. He said to her: On which path shall we walk in order to get to Lod? She said to him: Foolish Galilene, didn’t the Sages say: Do not talk much with women? You should have said your question more succinctly: Which way to Lod?

The Gemara relates more of Berurya’s wisdom: Berurya came across a certain student who was whispering his studies rather than raising his voice.

**NOTES**

**Short and long – อรูคีอรุกิ:** Rabbi Yehoshua thought the young boy meant that while one path is shorter than the other, it is still a very long road, whereas the other road is actually longer than the first, but is also called short, as it is not that much longer than the first (Maharsha).

**Keen scholar [shinnana] – ผู้เฉียบ:** According to many commentators, Rashi among them, shinnana means sharp, and it is an honorific that Shmuel conferred upon his most prominent student. However, the gebirim explain, based on old Aramaic vernacular, that shinnana means the one with the large teeth, and that was Rav Yehuda’s nickname.

**Grab and eat – อาหารอย่างทันท่วง:** The Arukh explains: Eat and drink quickly so that you can return to Torah study, as the pleasures of this world are transient and pass quickly.

I will leave for my children, who told you the law – ภรรยา ท่าน: It appears that Rashi and the Arukh explain the word law (חָלוּק) to mean sustenance. Therefore, the statement can be understood as follows: If you say, I will leave sustenance for my children, who will tell you in the netherworld how your food is being used?

**Blossom and wither – ดอกซรับซ่าน:** Some explain this statement as emphasizing that every person has his own source of livelihood and does not need to rely on his father, just as grass in a field flourishes without being sown (Geber Yosef).

**LANGUAGE**

**Perek V**

**Daif 54 Amud a**

I went back and met the young boy again and said to him: My son, didn’t you tell me that this way is short? He said to me: And didn’t I tell you that it is also long? I kissed him on his head and said to him: Happy are you, O Israel, for you are all exceedinglywise, from your old to your young.