



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o"n

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

1. According to the opinion that the main form of eiruv techumin is with one's feet, it is unclear whether a separate four cubits is given to one who does an eiruv with bread.

The Gemora quotes Rami bar Chama as asking that while we know that one receives an additional four cubits (besides the two thousand cubits) if he makes an eiruv techumin in his place, does he receive these four cubits if he makes an eiruv with bread? Rava tries to answer this question, but his answer is pushed aside by the Gemora. The Gemora therefore remains inconclusive.

2. There is an argument in the Mishna regarding the law of someone who wanted to go make an eiruv techumin and did not (see INSIGHT).

The Mishna states that if a man left his home (*on Friday*) to proceed to a town with which they may make an eiruv with (*for the two towns were within four thousand amos of each other*), but a friend of his convinced him to return home, he himself is allowed to proceed to the other town, but all the other townspeople (*who did not begin to travel*) are forbidden; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. Rabbi Meir says: Whoever is able to place an eiruv and did not (*but rather, he declared that some place other than his house should be his Shabbos residence*), Behold this man represents a combination

of a donkey driver and a camel driver. [*Such a driver is unable to make any progress. A camel can be led only by pulling its rein and a donkey can be driven only from behind. A man who is in charge of both animals can neither lead the two on account of the donkey, nor can he drive the two on account of the camel. In this case, he must remain between the areas permitted to his current place and the place he wanted to make his eiruv.*]

The Gemora asks: In what respect does he differ from them? Rav Huna replied: We are here dealing with the case of a man who had, for instance, two houses between which two Shabbos limits intervened. As far as he is concerned, since he had set out on his journey, he has the status of a poor man. They, however, have the status of rich men. The Gemora cites a braisa in support of this.

3. There is an argument regarding how to understand the opinion of Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah.

The braisa quotes Rabbi Yehudah as saying that once he started on the road, his eiruv is valid. Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah is quoted as saying that even if his friend stopped him by saying it is too cold or too hot, his eiruv is valid. Rabbah understands that Rabbi Yehudah only says the eiruv is valid if he both started traveling and his friend



convinced him not to. Rabbi Yosi holds that even if his friend convinced him before he started traveling, the eiruv is valid. Rav Yosef understands that Rabbi Yosi is being more stringent than Rabbi Yehudah. While Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah requires both, Rabbi Yehudah only requires that he start traveling. Even if his friend does not say anything to him and he turns back, it is valid.

4. If someone purposely goes out of the techum for no valid reason, there is an argument whether or not he can come back if he is less than two cubits out.

The Tanna Kamma says he may not, while Rabbi Eliezer says he can. The Gemora earlier (45a) explained his position by saying that Rabbi Eliezer holds the four cubits of a person are always viewed as two on each side. Therefore, he is technically still within the techum if he is two cubits out, as even if he only has four cubits he is within the techum.

5. There is an argument whether according to the Tanna Kamma the same law would apply if only one of his feet was outside the techum.

The Gemora quotes two versions of Rabbi Chanina that argue with each other. Both hinge on how to interpret the verse, "If you will return from Shabbos "raglecha." The version that says this is forbidden points out that the way the verse is written, the implication is that even one foot cannot be returned. The other version states that the word is understood as "feet" plural, implying that one could return only one foot. (52a – 52b)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, ME SHEHOTZIUHU

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

As explained at length earlier (see above #2-3), there is an argument in the Mishna regarding the law of someone who wanted to go make an eiruv techumin and did not. Rabbi Yehudah is of the opinion that if he merely starts traveling in that direction and is turned back by his friend who tells him it is too hot (according to Rav Yosef even if he is not told this by his friend), he still acquires the techum in the place where he wanted to go.

The first opinion in Rashi is that this is even if he did not explicitly say, "My resting place should be in this area (the place he wanted to go)."

However, the Ritva and others say this opinion is just too difficult to understand. It is a big enough novelty that we permit a traveler to "name his techum." To say that we do this even when he turns back and does not explicitly say, "My resting place should be in this area (the place he wanted to go)," is such a novel law that it should have to be said explicitly by the Gemora.

The Ritva and other Rishonim therefore say that the correct explanation is that this is even when he does say, "My resting place should be in this area (the place he wanted to go)." Even so there is an argument whether or not his techum is valid, as he turned back.