



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Eiruv Daf Mem Aleph

- **Q: Rabbah** said, we asked **R' Huna** whether one who fasts on a Friday should complete the fast (it is not proper to go into Shabbos while suffering from hunger). **R' Huna** did not know the answer. They then asked **R' Yehuda** and he did not know the answer. **A: Rava** quoted a Braisa which says that when Tisha B'Av falls on a Friday, one should eat something before Shabbos.
 - Another Braisa says this is a machlokes Tanna'im. The Braisa quotes **R' Yehuda** who said that he was once with **R' Akiva** on Tisha B'Av that was on a Friday and **R' Akiva** ate something before Shabbos began. **R' Yose** argues and says that one may complete a fast on Friday. **R' Yose** said, you surely agree that when Tisha B'Av is on a Sunday, one stops eating while it is still Shabbos. If he can fast at the end of Shabbos he can complete a fast on Friday into the beginning of Shabbos as well. They responded, it is very different when one ate all day and stops for the last hour of Shabbos, and when one hasn't eaten all day and continues to fast for the first hour of Shabbos.
 - **Ulla** paskens like **R' Yose** (that one may complete his fast on a Friday).
 - **Q:** How can he say that we pasken like **R' Yose**? A Mishna says, **R' Gamliel** says we do not begin to decree a series of fasts on Rosh Chodesh, Chanukah or Purim, but if the series had begun and one of these days fell out on a fast day of the series, one should fast. **R' Meir** says, **R' Gamliel** would agree that one would not complete the fast on those days. Similarly, one may not complete the fast of Tisha B'Av on a Friday! A Braisa goes further and says that during the lifetime of **R' Gamliel**, the halacha was accepted as following him. After his passing, **R' Yehoshua** tried to change the halacha. **R' Yochanan ben Nuri** said, while he was alive we followed him, we will not change the halacha now. We see that we pasken that a fast on Friday may NOT be completed!? **A:** During **R' Gamliel's** lifetime they paskened like him, but during **R' Yose's** lifetime, they paskened like **R' Yose**.
 - **Q:** Did they pasken like **R' Gamliel** during his lifetime? A Braisa says that **R' Elazar the son of R' Tzadok** (who was a descendant of Sanav from sheivet Binyamin) said, when Tisha B'Av fell on a Shabbos and the fast was therefore pushed off to the next day, Sunday, our family fasted but did not complete the fast because the 10th of Av is a Yom Tov for us. It seems that only a Yom Tov itself is enough of a reason not to complete a fast. However, on Erev Yom Tov or Erev Shabbos the fast would have to be completed!? **A: Ravina** said, that Yom Tov was only D'Rabanan, and therefore one may even fast part of the Yom Tov itself, so surely one may complete the fast on that Yom Tov's eve. However, on Erev Shabbos one may not complete a fast, because on Shabbos itself one may not even fast part of the day.
 - **R' Yosef** said, "I never heard that the halacha follows **R' Yose**". **Abaye** told him, you taught us this halacha on the Mishna that we quoted before with **R' Gamliel** and **R' Meir**. You said that **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** says that **R' Meir** says the fast may not be completed, but the **Chachomim** say it may be completed. Presumably the **Chachomim** are arguing about completing the fast on Rosh Chodesh, Chanukah, Purim and Friday!
 - The Gemara says, it could be that the **Chachomim** were only arguing about Rosh Chodesh, Chanukah and Purim, but would agree that one may not complete a fast on Friday.

- This would make sense that **R' Yehuda** was not referring to a Friday, because **R' Yehuda** was asked regarding the halacha of fasting on a Friday and he did not know the answer!
 - This is not a proof, because we find that **R' Huna** also didn't know the halacha when asked and yet we find that he paskens that a fast may be completed on Friday. We must say that they did not know the halacha when asked originally but then later learned the halacha.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK BAKOL M'ARVIN!!!

PEREK MI SHEHOTZIUHU -- PEREK REVI'I

MISHNA

- A person who was forcibly removed from his techum by goyim or due to temporary insanity, may only walk in the 4 amos that he is now in. If they forcibly took him back to within his original techum, he may walk around his entire original techum.
 - If they took him to another city or a building outside of his techum, **R' Gamliel** and **R' Elazar ben Azarya** say he may walk the entire city or building. **R' Yehoshua** and **R' Akiva** say that he only gets 4 amos.
 - It once happened that they were on a ship that moved beyond 2,000 amos from where it was bein hashmashos. **R' Gamliel** and **R' Elazar ben Azarya** walked around the entire ship. **R' Yehoshua** and **R' Akiva** stayed within their 4 amos because they wanted to be machmir on themselves.
 - Another time they did not reach the port until it was already Shabbos. They asked **R' Gamliel** if they were allowed to disembark. **R' Gamliel** said they may, because he saw that they were within 2,000 amos to the port as Shabbos began.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, there are 3 things that cause a person to go against his own will and Hashem's will: avodah zarah, evil spirits, and the suffering of poverty. The reason to give this list is so that people should daven not to fall to one of these.
 - Three things save a person from having to enter Gehenom: suffering with poverty, having stomach sickness, and one who is indebted to creditors (who come after him). Others say, also one who has a bad wife. The first view doesn't include this because the person can just divorce her and not suffer. The second view says there are times when he can't divorce her (she has a large kesubah or they have children). The reason to give this list is that one should accept these sufferings with love.
 - Three people die suddenly: one suffering from stomach sickness, one who has given birth, and one with the "hadrokan" illness. The reason to give this list is so that one should prepare "tachrichin".
- **R' Nachman in the name of Shmuel** says, if one leaves his techum willingly, he may only walk within his 4 amos.
 - **Q:** The Mishna says even if he is forcibly removed he only gets his 4 amos, so surely when he leaves willingly he only gets 4 amos!? **A: R' Nachman** meant that if one returns to his techum willingly he only gets his 4 amos.
 - **Q:** That is also obvious! The Mishna says if the goyim return him he gets his original techum back. It is mashma that if he returns on his own he does not!? **A: R' Nachman** meant, if he left willingly and was returned forcibly he only gets his 4 amos.
 - **Q:** That is also obvious! The Mishna says, if he is forcibly removed and forcibly returned he gets his original techum. It is mashma that if one way was willingly he does not get his techum!? **A:** We would have thought that the Mishna should not be read as one case, but means that even if he left willingly but was returned forcibly he gets his techum back. **R' Nachman** tells us that this is not the case.

- **Q:** They asked **Rabbah**, if one left his techum and is therefore stuck in his 4 amos, but needs a bathroom, may he leave the 4 amos? **A: Rabbah** said, this is a human dignity issue, which surely trumps this halacha D'Rabanan.
 - **Nehardai** says, if he is clever, he should look for the closest bathroom towards his original techum, and if that results in him reentering his techum, he would get his original techum back.
- **R' Pappa** says, if fruits were taken out of their techum (objects take on the techum of their owners), and are then returned to the techum, even b'meizid, they regain their original techum, because they are considered to have been forcibly removed and returned (since they don't move on their own).
 - **Q: R' Yosef bar Shmaya** asked, a Braisa says that **R' Nechemia and R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** say the fruit is assur unless it is returned to its techum b'shogeg!? **A:** It is actually a machlokes Tanna'im. The **T"K** of a Braisa says, fruits removed from their techum may only be eaten if removed b'shogeg, not b'meizid. **R' Nechemia** says the fruits may only be eaten if returned to their techum. **R' Nechemia** must be referring to where it was returned b'shogeg (based on the earlier Braisa quoted in the question). If so, he is not discussing the same case as the **T"K**! The Braisa must be missing words. The **T"K** must be saying that if returned to the techum, even b'meizid, the fruits may be eaten, and **R' Nechemia** is saying that is true only if returned b'shogeg. We see this is a machlokes among Tanna'im.
 - **Q:** Maybe all agree that when returned to the techum it may only be eaten if returned b'shogeg. Maybe they only argue regarding eating them outside the techum, in which case the **T"K** says it may be eaten only if brought out b'shogeg and **R' Nechemia** says even then it may not be eaten outside the techum!? **A:** When **R' Nechemia and R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** say it may not be eaten when returned to the techum b'meizid, that must mean that the **T"K** argues and says that even if returned b'meizid it may be eaten.