



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

Mav the studing of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and mav their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

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 from our Mishnah: The Rabbis’ enactment that an eiruv is to be prepared with bread having the only purpose of making it easier for the rich man so that he shall not be compelled to go out himself and make the eiruv with his feet. Now if you were to contend that he is not entitled to the four cubits, [how can it state its purpose to be] ‘of making it easier’? Surely [it results in the imposition] of a restriction! — One is nevertheless pleased with the enactment since thereby one avoids the trouble of going out. (52a)

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 *eruv* 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.*] (52a)

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: If a man had two houses, and two *Shabbos* limits intervened between them, he acquires his eiruv as soon as he had set out on his journey; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. Relaxing the law still more, Rabbi Yosi son of Rabbi Yehudah ruled: Even if a friend of his met him and said: ‘Spend the night here, as the weather is rather hot’ or ‘rather cold’, he may set out on his



journey on the following day as early as he likes. Rabbah submitted: All agree that it is necessary to make [the prescribed declaration], the only point at issue between them [being whether it is essential for the man] to have actually set out on his journey. Rav Yosef, however, submitted: That it is essential for the man to have set out on his journey is disputed by none, the only point at issue between them being whether it is necessary for him to make [the prescribed declaration].

Whose view is followed in the ruling of Ulla that if a man set out on a journey and a friend of his induced him to return, behold he is regarded as having returned and as having set out? But if he is regarded as 'having returned' why is he described as 'having set out'? And if he is regarded as 'having set out' why is he described as 'having returned'? — It is this that was meant: Although he has actually returned he is regarded as one who had set out. Now in agreement with whose view has this statement been made? — In agreement with that of Rav Yosef according to Rabbi Yosi son of Rabbi Yehudah.

Rav Yehudah bar Ishtasa once brought a basket of fruit to Rav Nassan bar Oshaya. When the former was departing the latter allowed him to descend the stairs and then called after him, 'Spend the night here'. On the following day he got up early and departed. In agreement with whose view did he act? Was it in agreement with that of Rav Yosef according to Rabbi Yosi son of Rabbi Yehudah? No; in agreement with Rabbah according to Rabbi Yehudah. (52a – 52b)

Rabbi Meir ruled: whoever is able to prepare an eiruv etc. Have we not already learnt this once: If this is doubtful, the man, said Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehudah, [is in the position of both] a donkey-driver and a camel-driver? — Rav Sheishes replied: Do not say that Rabbi Meir's view is that only where it is doubtful whether a man had a valid eiruv or not is he in the position of a

donkey-driver and a camel-driver and that where it is certain that he prepared no eiruv he is not in such a position; but rather even where it is certain that he prepared no eiruv he is in the position of a donkey-driver and camel-driver; for here, surely, it is a case where It is certain that the man had prepared no eiruv and yet he is put in the position of a donkey-driver and a camel-driver. (52b)

MISHNAH: He who went out beyond his Shabbos limit even only a distance of one cubit must not re-enter. Rabbi Eliezer ruled: [if a man walked] two cubits beyond his Shabbos limit he may re-enter, [and if he walked] three cubits he may not re-enter. (52b)

GEMARA: Rabbi Chanina ruled: If a man had one foot within his Shabbos limit and his other foot without that Shabbos limit, he may not re-enter, for it is written in Scripture: If you turn away your foot from the Shabbos, the written form being 'your foot'. But was It not taught: If a man had one foot within his Shabbos limit and his other foot without, he may re-enter? — This represents the view of 'Others'. For it was taught: Others maintain that a man is deemed to be where the greater part of his body is.

Some there are who read: Rabbi Chanina ruled: If a man had one foot within his Shabbos limit and his other foot without, he may re-enter, for it is written in Scripture: If you turn away your foot from Shabbos which is read as 'your feet'. But was it not taught: He may not re-enter? — He maintains the same view as 'Others', it having been taught: A man is deemed to be where the greater part of his body is. (52b)

RABBI ELIEZER RULED: [IF A MAN WALKED]] TWO CUBITS BEYOND HIS SHABBOS LIMIT HE MAY RE-ENTER [AND IF HE WALKED] THREE CUBITS HE MAY NOT RE-ENTER. But was it not taught: Rabbi Eliezer ruled: If he



walked one cubit beyond his Shabbos limit he may re-enter and if two cubits he may not re-enter? — This is no difficulty, since the former refers to a person who left the first cubit but was still within the second, while the latter refers to one who left the second and was within the third. But was it not taught: Rabbi Eliezer ruled: Even if he was one cubit beyond his Shabbos limit he may not re-enter? — This was taught concerning a measurer, for we have in fact learnt: And to the measurer of whom the Rabbis have spoken a distance of two thousand cubits only is allowed even if the end of his permitted measure terminated within a cave. (52b)

MISHNAH: IF a man was overtaken by dusk when only one cubit outside the Shabbos limit, he may not enter it. Rabbi Shimon ruled: even if he was fifteen cubits away he may enter since the surveyors do not measure exactly on account of those who err.

GEMARA: It was taught: On account of those who err in their measures. (52b)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, ME SHEHOTZIUHU

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

As explained at length earlier, 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.