**HALAKHA**

Set appointed times for Torah study — It is proper to go to a house of study and study Torah for a fixed amount of time every day after prayers (Shuĥan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 155:1).

**HALAKHA**

Set appointed times for Torah study — It is proper to go to a house of study and study Torah for a fixed amount of time every day after prayers (Shuĥan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 155:1).

**NOTES**

Someone who raises his mind and someone who expands his mind — One who raises his mind is one who believes that his mind is so lofty that he no longer needs a teacher. One who expands his mind is one who has studied a topic and now thinks he knows everything there is to know about it (Maharsha).

It is not in heaven or beyond the sea — Torah is not found in one who spends too much of his time on business activities. It is appropriate for one to limit the time he spends on business so that he can study Torah (Rambam Sefer HaMadda, Hilkhot Talmud Torah 3:8).

One creates simulated corners for it — In the case of a round city, one first squares its perimeter and then measures its Shabbat limit. The same rule applies if the city is triangular in shape or if it has an irregular perimeter (Rambam). The Gemara's statement: One does not create additional corners for it, applies only to a city that is already rectangular (Vilna Gaon; Shuĥan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 398:2).

Wide on one side — Wider on one side and narrow on the other. If a city is wide on one side and narrow on the other, it is viewed as though both sides are the length of the longer side, and the Shabbat boundaries are measured from there (Shuĥan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 398:4).

And this idea, that one must exert great effort to retain one's Torah knowledge, is in accordance with what Avdimi bar Hama bar Dosa said: What is the meaning of that which is written: “It is not in heaven... nor is it beyond the sea” (Deuteronomy 31:12–13)? “It is not in heaven” indicates that if it were in heaven, you would have to ascend after it, and if it were beyond the sea, you would have to cross after it, as one must expend whatever effort is necessary in order to study Torah.

Expounding the verse differently, Rava said: “It is not in heaven” means that Torah is not to be found in someone who raises his mind over it, like the heavens, i.e., he thinks his mind is above the Torah and he does not need a teacher; nor is it to be found in someone who expands his mind over it, like the sea, i.e., he thinks he knows everything there is to know about the topic he has learned.

Rabbi Yohanan said: “It is not in heaven” means that Torah is not to be found in the haughty, those who raise their self-image as though they were in heaven. “Nor is it beyond the sea” means that it is not to be found among merchants or traders who are constantly traveling and do not have the time to study Torah properly.

After the lengthy aggadic digression, the Gemara returns to the topic of the mishna, extending the outskirts of a city. The Sages taught in the Tosefta: How does one extend the boundaries of cities? If the city is long, in the shape of a rectangle, the Shabbat limit is measured from the boundary as it is. If the city is round, one creates simulated corners for it, rendering it square, and the Shabbat limit is measured from there. If it is square, one does not create additional corners for it. If the city was wide on one side and narrow on the other, one regards it as though the two sides were of equal length, adding to the narrow side to form a square.

Example: If there are three people, the more important person should be in the middle and not in the front. The more important person should be in the middle and not in the front.

Rabbi Eliezer said that we learn this same idea from here: “Say to wisdom, you are my sister, and call understanding, your kinswoman [moda’im]” (Proverbs 7:4), which means: Establish signs [moda’im] that convey knowledge of the Torah. Rava said with regard to this verse: Set appointed times [moda’im] for Torah study.
If one house in a row of dwellings was protruding like a turret, or if two houses were protruding like two turrets, one regards them as though a cord is stretched over their outer edge along the length of the city, and one measures two thousand cubits beginning from there. If the city was shaped like a bow or like the Greek letter gamma, one regards it as though the city is square but that square is not aligned with the four directions of the world, i.e., north, south, east, and west. Lest you say: Let us align the square with the four directions of the world, it teaches us that this is not done.

The Tosefta also stated: If one house in a row of dwellings was protruding like a turret, or if two houses were protruding like two turrets, one regards them as though a cord is stretched over their outer edge along the length of the city, and one measures two thousand cubits beginning from there. The Gemara asks: Now, if with regard to one house, you said to extend the city’s boundaries, with regard to two houses, is it necessary to say so?

The Gemara answers: It was necessary to teach this halakha only with regard to a case where the two houses were protruding on two different sides of the city. Lest you say: When a house protrudes from one side, we say that the city is extended even due to a single house, but if houses protrude from two sides we do not say so; therefore, it teaches us to regard the city as though it is extended on both sides.

The early commentaries disagree about how to establish the boundaries of a gamma-shaped city. Although most commentaries understand that it is made into an actual rectangle, some of them maintain that it is squared as illustrated (see Meir; Ritva).

The Toraḥ states that the principle with regard to turrets applies only where the distance between them is less than four thousand cubits. The Rashi and other commentaries explain that there is a difference between the city’s basic contours and a structure such as a turret or even the small watchtowers of a city. If the city is inhabited along an entire side and there are structures that protrude from that side, it is reasonable to assume that other structures will eventually be built there as well. However, if the entire city is shaped like a bow, it is clear that the space between the two ends of the bow is not meant to be inhabited, and if the residents add to the city, they will simply add to the ends of the bow.
A city that is shaped like a bow – עיר צזר עיר צזר בצד אחד

HALAKHA

A city that is shaped like a bow – עיר צזר עיר צזר בצד אחד

The Gemara asks: If so, what is Rav Huna teaching us in the case of the breached city wall, that one allocates a karpef, an area measuring slightly more than seventy cubits, to this section of the city and a karpef to that section of the city? Didn’t Rav Huna already say this on one occasion? As we learned in a mishna:

The Gemara stated: If the city was shaped like a bow or like the Greek letter gamma, one regards it as if the interior space were full of houses and courtyards, and one measures two thousand cubits beginning from there. Rav Huna said: With regard to a city that is shaped like a bow,10 the following distinction applies: If there are less than four thousand cubits between the two ends of the bow, so that the Shabbat limits measured from the two ends of the city overlap, the interior space of the bow is regarded as if it were filled with houses, and one measures the Shabbat limit of the city from the imaginary bowstring stretched between the two ends of the bow. But if that is not the case, and the distance between the two ends of the bow is four thousand cubits or more, one measures the Shabbat limit from the bow itself.

The Gemara asks: Did Rav Huna actually say that the distance between two sections of a single city that renders them separate entities is four thousand cubits? Didn’t Rav Huna say: With regard to the wall of a city that was breached,11 even if there is a gap between two sections of the city, the city is still considered a single entity if the breach is no more than 141 ⅔ cubits? However, if the breach is wider, the two sections are considered separate entities. Apparently, a distance of 141 ⅔ cubits suffices to separate between two sections of a city and to render them separate entities.

Rabba bar Ulla said: That is not difficult. Here, where Rav Huna speaks of four thousand cubits, he is referring to a case where the gap is on only one side, as the other side, the bow, is inhabited; but there, where he speaks of 141 ⅔ cubits, he is referring to a case where the breach is from two sides, which truly renders the city two separate entities.12

The Gemara asks: Isn’t it difficult, if there is a breach in the city wall, that one allocates to this section of the city an area of 141 ⅔ cubits, and a karpef of the entire city? Isn’t an area of 141 ⅔ cubits already considered a karpef? Why does Rav Huna allocate a karpef to this section of the city and another karpef to the remainder of the city? Did Rav Huna already say this on one occasion? As we learned in a mishna:

A city that is breached – עיר ששו עיר ששו בין ארבעת אלפים

BACKGROUND

A city that is shaped like a bow – עיר צזר עיר צזר בצד אחד

The wall of a city that was breached – עיר צזר עיר צזר בצד אחד

The Gemara asks: If the city was breached, what is the measurement taken from that breach? Is it that the breach is considered as the interior of the city, and the breach is considered as the boundary? Or is the breach actually the interior of the city, and the breach is considered as the boundary? Or is there an area measured from the breach, which is considered as the interior, and the breach is considered as the boundary? Rav Huna said: It is the breach.

The Gemara asks: If it is the breach, what is the interior? Doesn’t the breach mean that the breach is considered as the interior of the city and the breach is the boundary? Or does it mean that the breach is already the interior, and the breach is the boundary? Or is there an area measured from the breach, which is considered as the interior, and the breach is the boundary? Rav Huna said: It is the breach.

The Gemara asks: If it is the breach, what is the interior? Doesn’t the breach mean that the breach is considered as the interior of the city and the breach is the boundary? Or does it mean that the breach is already the interior, and the breach is the boundary? Or is there an area measured from the breach, which is considered as the interior, and the breach is the boundary? Rav Huna said: It is the breach.

The Gemara asks: If the breach is the boundary, what is the interior? Doesn’t the breach mean that the breach is already the interior and the breach is the boundary? Or is the breach measured from the city, which is considered the interior, and the breach is the boundary? Rav Huna said: The breach.

The Gemara asks: If the breach is the boundary, what is the interior? Doesn’t the breach mean that the breach is already the interior and the breach is the boundary? Or is the breach measured from the city, which is considered the interior, and the breach is the boundary? Rav Huna said: The breach.

The Gemara asks: If the breach is the boundary, what is the interior? Doesn’t the breach mean that the breach is already the interior and the breach is the boundary? Or is the breach measured from the city, which is considered the interior, and the breach is the boundary? Rav Huna said: The breach.

The Gemara asks: If the breach is the boundary, what is the interior? Doesn’t the breach mean that the breach is already the interior and the breach is the boundary? Or is the breach measured from the city, which is considered the interior, and the breach is the boundary? Rav Huna said: The breach.
One allocates a karpef to every city, i.e., an area of slightly more than seventy cubits is added to the boundary of a city and the Shabbat limit is measured from there; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir. And the Sages say: They spoke of the measure of a karpef only with regard to the space between two adjacent cities, i.e., if adjacent cities are separated by a shorter distance than that, they are considered one city.

And it was stated that the amora’im disputed this issue. Rav Huna said: A karpef is added to this city and another karpef is added to that city, so that as long as the cities are not separated by a distance of slightly more than 141 cubits, they are considered one entity. And Hyya bar Rav said: One allocates only one karpef to the two of them. Accordingly, Rav Huna has already stated that the measure of a karpef is added to both cities in determining whether they are close enough to be considered a single entity.

The Gemara answers: It is necessary for Rav Huna to state this halakha in both instances, as, had he taught it to us only here, in the case of the breached wall, one might have said that a karpef is allocated to each city only in that case because it had an aspect of permissibility from the outset, namely, the two sections originally formed one city. But there, with regard to the two cities, say that this is not the case and the two cities are only considered as one if they are separated by less than the measure of a single karpef.

And he had taught it to us only there, with regard to the two cities, one might have said that only in that case is a karpef allocated to each city because one karpef would be too cramped for the use of both cities. But here, in the case of the breached wall, where one karpef would not be too cramped for the use of both sections, as the vacant space is inside the city, in an area that had not been used in this fashion before the wall was breached, say that this is not the case and a single karpef is sufficient. Therefore, it was necessary to state this halakha in both cases.

The Gemara asks: And how much distance may there be between the imaginary bowstring and the center of the bow in a city that is shaped like a bow?11 Rabbà bar Rav Huna said: Two thousand cubits. Rava, son of Rabba bar Rav Huna, said: Even more than two thousand cubits.

Abaye said: It stands to reason in accordance with the opinion of Rava, son of Rabba bar Rav Huna, as if one wants, he can return and go anywhere within the bow by way of the houses. Since one can always walk to the end of the city, and from there he is permitted to walk down the line of the imaginary bowstring, he should also be permitted to walk from the middle of the bow to the bowstring, even if the distance is more than two thousand cubits.

We learned in the mishna: If there were remnants of walls ten handbreadths high on the outskirts of a city, they are considered part of the city, and the Shabbat limit is measured from them. The Gemara asks: What are these remnants? Rav Yehuda said: Three partitions that do not have a roof over them,12 which are considered part of the city despite the fact that they do not comprise a proper house.

---

11. See Ritva.
12. See Kesef Mishne, Shulchan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 398:6.)
A tomb is a structure built over a grave. In this context, the word "tomb" is referring to a covered cistern that serves as a crypt, similar to a house. Occasionally, it would also contain a grave, or more typically alongside it, to serve as a recognizable marking of the grave. Additionally, it could be a grave that do not have a residence; and an idolatrous temple in which there is a residence for the priests; and similarly, horse stables and storehouses in fields in which there is a residence; and small watchtowers in the fields; and similarly, a house on an island in the sea, which is located within seventy cubits of the city; all of these structures are included in the city's boundaries.

In any case, it was taught that a tomb that was breached on both sides, from here to there, i.e., from one side all the way to the other; and similarly, a bridge and a grave that do not have a residence; and a synagogue that does not have a residence for the sexton; and an idolatrous temple in which there is a residence for the priests; and similarly, stables and storehouses in fields that do not have a residence, and therefore are not used for human habitation; and a cistern, and an elongated water ditch, and a cave, i.e., a covered cistern, and a wall, and a dovecote in the field; and similarly, a house on a boat that is not permanently located within seventy cubits of the city; all of these structures are not included in the city's boundaries.

The dilemma was raised before the Sages: In the case of two partitions that have a roof over them, what is the halakha? Is this structure also treated like a house? Come and hear a proof from the Tosefta: 'These are the structures that are included in the city's extension: A monument [nefesh] over a grave that is four cubits by four cubits; and a bridge or a grave in which there is a residence; and a synagogue in which there is a residence for the sexton or synagogue attendant, and which is used not only for prayer services at specific times; and an idolatrous temple in which there is a residence for the priests; and similarly, horse stables and storehouses in the fields in which there is a residence; and small watchtowers in the fields; and similarly, a house on an island in the sea or lake, which is located within seventy cubits of the city; all of these structures are included in the city's boundaries.

And these structures are not included in the boundaries of a city: A tomb that was breached on both sides, from here to there, i.e., from one side all the way to the other; and similarly, a bridge and a grave that do not have a residence; and a synagogue that does not have a residence for the sexton; and an idolatrous temple in which there is a residence for the priests; and similarly, stables and storehouses in fields that do not have a residence, and therefore are not used for human habitation; and a cistern, and an elongated water ditch, and a cave, i.e., a covered cistern, and a wall, and a dovecote in the field; and similarly, a house on a boat that is not permanently located within seventy cubits of the city; all of these structures are not included in the city's boundaries.

In any case, it was taught that a tomb that was breached on both sides, from here to there, is not included in the city's boundaries. What, is this not referring to a case where there is a roof on the tomb, and the two remaining walls are not included in the city's boundaries even though they have a roof? The Gemara answers: No, the Tosefta is referring to a case where there is no roof on the tomb.

The Gemara asks: A house on an island in the sea, what is it suitable for if it is not actually part of the inhabited area? Rav Pappa said: It is referring to a house used to move a ship's utensils into it for storage.

The Gemara raises another question with regard to the Tosefta: And is a cave on the outskirts of a city really not included in its extension? Didn't Rabbi Hyya teach in a baraita: A cave is included in its extension? Abaye said: That statement applies when there is a structure built at its entrance, which is treated like a house on the outskirts of the city.

The Gemara asks: If there is a structure at the entrance to the cave, why is the cave mentioned? Let him derive the halakha that it is treated like a house because of the structure itself. The Gemara answers: No, it is necessary only in a case where the cave serves to complete the structure, i.e., where the area of the structure and cave combined are only four by four cubits, which is the minimum size of a house.

The discussion with regard to measuring Shabbat limits has been referred to a properly built city. Rav Huna said: Those who dwell in huts, i.e., in thatched hovels of straw and willow branches, are not considered inhabitants of a city. Therefore, one measures the Shabbat limit for them only from the entrance to their homes; the huts are not combined together and considered a city.

Rav Hisda raised an objection: The Torah states with regard to the Jewish people in the desert: "And they pitched by the Jordan, from Beir-HaYeshimot to Avel-Shittim in the plains of Moab" (Numbers 33:49), and Rabba bar bar Ḥana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: I myself saw that place, and it is three parasaṃgs [parsa], the equivalent of twelve mil, by three parasaṃgs.
And it was taught in a *baraita*: When they would defecate in the wilderness, they would not defecate in front of themselves, i.e., in front of the camp, and not to their sides, due to respect for the Divine Presence; rather, they would do so behind the camp. This indicates that even on Shabbat, when people needed to defecate, they would walk the entire length of the camp, which was considerably longer than two thousand cubits, which equals one mil. It is apparent that the encampment of the Jewish people was considered to be a city despite the fact that it was composed of tents alone. How, then, did Rav Huna say that those who live in huts are not considered city dwellers? 41

**HALAKHA**

A settlement composed of huts – *yishuv kohelet*. A settlement composed of huts and tents does not have the status of a permanent city. Therefore, the Shabbat limit of each resident is measured from the entrance to the hut. However, if the residents are permanently settled in a location, it is considered a city (*magen Avraham*).

**NOTES**

The Jewish people in the wilderness – *neshamah b’makom*. This difficulty is raised in the *Jerusalem Talmud* and several solutions are suggested, including the possibility that Moses built several permanent houses for the encampment so that the entire camp would be considered a single city.

And with regard to one who marries their daughters – *ein ba’mivtah*. In other words, the lives of traveling people are so difficult that they are unable to maintain appropriate standards of modesty and instead live like animals, leading to the fact that their daughters will be prohibited. For this reason, Eliezer of Biriyya cited this particular verse rather than a verse dealing with children born from illegitimate relationships (*Ritva; Rashba*).

The Gemara asks: **What is the reason** for this harsh statement with regard to the daughters of those who dwell in huts or travel in deserts? *Ulla* said: They do not have bathhouses, and therefore the men have to walk a significant distance in order to bathe. There is concern that while they are away their wives commit adultery, and consequently their children are not really their own. And Rabbi Yohanan said: Because they sense when one another immerses. Similarly to the men, the women must walk a significant distance in order to immerse in a ritual bath. Since the settlement is very small and everyone knows when the women go to immerse, it is possible for an unscrupulous man to use this information to engage in adulterous relations with them by following them and taking advantage of the fact that they are alone.

The Gemara asks: **What is the practical difference between** the explanations of *Ulla* and Rabbi Yohanan? The Gemara explains: There is a practical difference between them in a case where there is a river that is adjacent to the house, and it is suitable for immersion but not for bathing. Consequently, the women would not have to go far to immerse themselves, but the men would still have to walk a significant distance in order to bathe.

Having mentioned various places of residence, the Gemara cites what Rav Huna said: Any city that does not have vegetables, a *Tarah scholar* is not permitted to dwell there for health reasons. The Gemara asks: Is that to say that vegetables are beneficial to a person’s health? Wasn’t it taught in a *baraita*: Three things increase one’s waste, bend his stature, and remove one five-hundredth of the light of a person’s eyes; and they are...