Rav Ami bar Adda from Harpanya raised a dilemma before Rabba: If a public domain has a ladder on one side, to allow people to scale the wall that blocks it, and an entrance on the other side, what is the halakhah? Is it considered a public domain that is open on both sides? Rabba said to him that Rav said as follows: A ladder has the status of an entrance, and therefore the public domain is considered open on both sides.

Rav Nahman said to them: Do not listen to him. Rav Adda said that Rav said as follows: A ladder has the status of an entrance in certain cases, and it has the status of a partition in other cases. It has the status of a partition in the case that we mentioned, where there is a ladder at the end of a public domain. In this case, the ladder is not considered an entrance and therefore the public domain is considered closed at that end. It has the status of an entrance in the case of a ladder between two courtyards. If the residents of the courtyards wish, they may join the two courtyards by means of the ladder and establish one eiruv; if they wish, the two courtyards may each establish a separate eiruv.

The Gemara asks: Did Rav Nahman actually say this? Didn’t Rav Nahman say that Shmuel said: With regard to residents of the ground floor of a courtyard and residents of a balcony, i.e., the floor above the ground floor, who forgot...
The Gemara relates that certain residents of the city of Kakunya came before Rav Yosef and said to him: Provide us with someone who will establish an eiruv for our city. The city had originally been a public city and had turned into a private one, requiring that part of the city be excluded from the eiruv. Rav Yosef said to Abaye: Go, establish an eiruv for them, and see to it that there is no outcry against it in the study hall, i.e., make sure the eiruv is valid beyond any doubt. He went and saw that certain houses opened to the river and not to the city. He said: Let these houses serve as the section excluded from the eiruv for the city.

Abaye subsequently retracted and said: This cannot be done, as we learned in the mishna: One may not establish an eiruv for all of it; by inference, if they wanted to establish an eiruv for the entire city, they would have been able to establish such an eiruv, if not for the requirement to exclude a section of the city from the eiruv. However, these houses, which do not open to the city, could not have joined in an eiruv with the rest of the city in any case, and therefore they cannot serve as the excluded section. Rather, I will create windows for them between the courtyards of their houses and the rest of the city, so that if they want to establish an eiruv with the rest of the city by way of the windows, they can establish such an eiruv, and then these houses will be fit to serve as the excluded section.

He subsequently retracted again and said: This is not necessary, as Rabba bar Avuh established an eiruv for the entire city of Mehoza, which was a public city that had become a private one, neighborhood by neighborhood, due to the fact that the neighborhoods were separated by ditches from which the cattle would feed. In other words, Rabba bar Avuh established a separate eiruv for each neighborhood without excluding any of them, as he maintained that each one was an excluded section for the other. And although the neighborhoods would not have been able to establish an eiruv together even if they wanted to, due to the ditches separating them, the neighborhoods were still able to serve as excluded areas for each other.

He subsequently retracted once again and said: The two cases are not really comparable. There, in Mehoza, if they wanted, they could have established a single eiruv by way of the roofs; but these houses cannot establish an eiruv with the other houses of the city, and therefore we must create windows for them.

He subsequently retracted yet again and said: Windows are also not necessary. As, that storehouse of straw which belonged to Mar bar Pofidata from Pumbedita was designated as the section excluded from the eiruv arranged for the city of Pumbedita, which proves that it is not necessary for the excluded section to be one that could have been included in an eiruv with the rest of the city.

Abaye said to himself: This is what the Master meant when he said to me: See to it that there is no outcry against it in the study hall. Abaye now understood the many factors that had to be considered and how wary one must be of reaching a hasty conclusion.
The mishna stated that if a public city becomes a private city, one may not establish an *eiruv* for all of it unless he maintains an area outside the *eiruv* which is like the size of the city of Hadasha in Judea. It was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda said: There was a certain city in Judea and its name was Hadasha, and it had fifty residents including men, women, and children. And the Sages would use it to measure the size of the section that must be excluded from an *eiruv*, and it itself was the excluded section of the *eiruv* of a larger city that was adjacent to it.

A dilemma was raised before the Sages: As for Hadasha, what is the halakha? Is it permissible to establish an *eiruv* for Hadasha itself without excluding a section of the city from the *eiruv*? The Gemara answers: With regard to Hadasha, just as it was the excluded section of the larger city, the larger city was also the excluded section of the smaller city.92

Rather, the question pertains to a small city like Hadasha that stands by itself, not in proximity to a larger city: What is the halakha?93 Does a small city require an excluded section or not? Rav Huna and Rav Yehuda disagreed about this issue. One said: It requires an excluded section; and one said: It does not require an excluded section.94

It is stated in the mishna that Rabbi Shimon says: The excluded area must be large enough to include at least three courtyards with two houses each. Rav Hama bar Gurya said that Rav said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon. However, Rabbi Yitzḥak said: Even one house and one courtyard suffice.95 The Gemara expresses surprise at the wording of this statement: Can it enter your mind that one courtyard even without a house is sufficient? Rather, correct it and say as follows: One house in one courtyard.

Abaye said to Rav Yosef: Is that ruling of Rabbi Yitzḥak based on oral tradition or his own logic? Rav Yosef said to him: What practical difference does Rabbi Yitzḥak’s source make to us?96 Abaye said to him, quoting a well-known adage: When you study Talmud is it merely a song? Is the material you study like the lyrics of a song that you do not understand? It is proper to investigate all aspects of the statements of the Sages, regardless of the practical ramifications.

**MISHNA**

One who was to the east of his home when Shabbat began, and he had said to his son before Shabbat: Establish an *eiruv* for me to the west; or, if he was to the west of his home and he had said to his son: Establish an *eiruv* for me to the east, the *halakha* is as follows: If there is a distance of two thousand cubits from his current location to his house, and the distance to his *eiruv* is greater than this, he is permitted to walk to his house, and from there he may walk two thousand cubits in every direction, but it is prohibited for him to walk to the spot where his son had deposited his *eiruv*.

If the distance from one’s current location to his *eiruv* is two thousand cubits, and the distance to his house is greater than this, he is prohibited from walking to his house, and he is permitted to walk to the spot of his *eiruv*, and from there he may walk two thousand cubits in every direction. In other words, with regard to the Shabbat limit, one’s place of residence for Shabbat cannot be more than two thousand cubits from his physical location when Shabbat begins.97

Like Hadasha, what is the *halakha* – is it permitted or prohibited? In other words, is the city of Hadasha mentioned only due to the number of its residents? Or were its location and proximity to other cities also of significance (Ritva)?

What difference does Rabbi Yitzḥak’s source make to us? Tosafot explain that Rav Yosef said this because it was clear to him that the *halakha* is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yitzḥak. Consequently, there is no reason to analyze his statement. The authorities who rule in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yitzḥak explain the statement in the opposite manner: Since it is clear that the *halakha* is in accordance with the view of Rabbi Yitzḥak, it is not necessary to understand his reasoning (Rosh).

**NOTES**

92. It is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yitzĥak explain the statement in the opposite manner: Since it is clear that the *halakha* is in accordance with the view of Rabbi Yitzĥak, it is not necessary to understand his reasoning (Rosh).

93. For Ĥadasha itself and his Shabbat residence is at the location of his *eiruv* (Shulĥan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 392:1).

94. The residents of the section of the city excluded from the *eiruv* may establish their own *eiruv*, and the rest of the city serves as the area excluded from their *eiruv* (Shulĥan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 392:1).

95. Even if the city had less than two thousand cubits, it would be permitted for him to walk to the spot where his son had deposited his *eiruv*.

96. For Ĥadasha itself the *eiruv* may be established for the entire city, in accordance with the following explanation of the phrase: Like Hadasha (Shulĥan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 392:2).

97. It was taught in a baraita: The small city of Ĥadasha, near Jerusalem, is mentioned in the Bible as one of the cities of the tribe of Judah. It existed during the Second Temple period as well. Judah the Maccabee’s crushing defeat of Nikanor’s army took place nearby.
The outskirts of the city – Ḥadasha: Some explain that one placed the eiruv in a different city that is within two thousand cubits of his own city. According to this explanation, the mishna’s point is that one gains nothing from the fact that he placed it in a city as opposed to placing it in a field (Rav Hai Gaon, cited by the Me’am Loei).

**HALAKHA**

Eiruv in the outskirts of the city – Ḥadasha: If one placed his eiruv inside the city where he is spending Shabbat, or even if he placed it in the outskirts of the city that are annexed to it when measuring the Shabbat limit, his eiruv has not accomplished anything, as stated in the mishna (Shulḥan Arukh, Orach Ḥayyim 408:3).

**NOTES**

To the west of his son – Ḥadasha: The Jerusalem Talmud’s presentation of this discussion arrives at a similar conclusion, without detailing the difficulties that led to this explanation.

Within the outskirts – Ḥadasha: This phrase emphasizes that if one placed his eiruv within the outskirts of the city that are annexed to it for the purpose of measuring the Shabbat limit, it is as though his Shabbat residence were within the city itself. However, some commentaries distinguish between the city and its outskirts when such distinctions lead to lenient conclusions (Ravai).

**BACKGROUND**

To the east of his house – Ḥadasha: The image below demonstrates that if one is located to the east of his house and the eiruv is to the west of his house, he must be closer to his house than to his eiruv.

Diagram of one standing to the east as initially understood by the Gemara

In the arrangement below, it is possible for one to be positioned to the east of his house and still be closer to his eiruv.

Diagram of one standing to the east according to Rava bar Rav Sheila’s answer

We learned in the mishna: One who places his eiruv within the outskirts of the city has not accomplished anything. However, if he places it outside the city limits, it is effective. The Gemara expresses surprise: Can it enter your mind that the mishna is dealing with a case where one placed his eiruv outside the Shabbat limit? If the eiruv is outside the Shabbat limit as measured from his physical location at the onset of Shabbat, he cannot access it on Shabbat; it is therefore ineffective in establishing his Shabbat residence. Rather, correct it and say as follows: If one placed his eiruv outside the city’s outskirts, i.e., beyond the area of slightly more than seventy cubits surrounding the city, the eiruv is effective in establishing his Shabbat residence at that location.

![Diagram of one standing to the east as initially understood by the Gemara](image)

![Diagram of one standing to the east according to Rava bar Rav Sheila’s answer](image)

One who places his eiruv in the outskirts of the city, i.e., within an area of slightly more than seventy cubits surrounding the city, it is as though he has not done anything. The two thousand cubits of one’s Shabbat limit are measured from the edge of the outskirts of the city even if there is no eiruv, and one therefore gains nothing from placing an eiruv within this area.

If, however, he placed his eiruv outside the city’s boundary, even if he placed it only one cubit beyond the city,
An eiruv outside the Shabbat limit – Ḥullin 40a:4

His measure terminated in the middle of the city – Ḥullin 40a:4

NOTES

His measure terminated at the end of the city – Ḥullin 40a:4

This phrase emphasizes that if one is located to the east of his house and the city’s area is included according to its actual measurement (see Me’iri). The Ra’avad explains that allowing half of a city to be included in such a manner would lead to confusion and result in mistaken halakah conclusions.

Words of prophecy – Berachot 42a:10

See Tosafot, who discuss the meaning of this expression. Most commentaries, including the Rif and the Shulĥan Arukh, interpret this phrase as referring to a case where, for example, the eastern side of one’s Shabbat limit includes an entire city. One is permitted to continue measuring the northern or southern sides of his Shabbat limit from the edge of the city. The city is treated like a four cubit strip in a single direction (Rabbeinu Yehonatan).

Terminated in the middle of the city – Ḥullin 40a:4

A city incorporated within his measure – Ḥullin 40a:4

In this case, the length of the city does not count toward a person’s two thousand cubits. One may add the length of the city to the end of the two thousand cubits measured from his place of residence, as indicated by the black line in the illustration below.

BACKGROUND

A person’s Shabbat limit includes the entire city if his measure terminated at the end of the city. However, if his measure terminated in the middle of the city, his measure is reduced to the two thousand cubits of his Shabbat residence and the entirety of the city is considered as a four-cubit strip. Consequently, the person may walk through the entire city as though it were four cubits. The city is treated like a four-cubit strip in a single direction (Rabbeinu Yehonatan).

HALAKHA

The Gemara answers: This is not difficult. Here the baraita is referring to a case where his measure of two thousand cubits terminated in the middle of the city; whereas there the mishna is referring to a case where his measure terminated at the far end of the city.

And this is in accordance with the opinion stated by Rabbi Idi, as Rabbi Idi said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: If one was measuring the two thousand cubits of his Shabbat limit from the location of his Shabbat residence outside the city, and his measure terminated in the middle of the city, he has only half the city, i.e., he may walk only to the end of his two thousand cubits. Now, if the measure that is measured at the far end of the city is regarded as four cubits, and he completes the rest of the Shabbat limit on the other side of the city.

Rabbi Idi said: These are nothing more than words of prophecy, i.e., I do not see the logic behind this statement. What difference is it to me if the measure terminated in the middle of the city, or if it terminated at the far end of the city?

Rava said: They are not words of prophecy, as both cases were taught in the following mishna: ‘The residents of a large city may walk through an entire small city that is fully included within its Shabbat limit; the small city is considered as though it were four cubits, and the rest of the Shabbat limit is measured from the other side of the city.

And the residents of a small city may not walk through an entire large city.

What is the reason for this difference? Is it not because these, the residents of the small city, their measure of two thousand cubits terminated in the middle of the large city, and therefore they may walk only to the end of their two thousand cubits, and these, the residents of the large city, their measure of two thousand cubits terminated at the far end of the small city, allowing them to walk through the entire city as though it were four cubits and complete the two thousand cubit measure of their Shabbat limit on the other side of the city?