



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

Eirubin Daf Mem Daled

- **R' Nachman** had said that **R' Chisda** should create a human wall from where **Nechemia** stood until his original techum.
 - **Q: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** asked **Rava**, a Braisa says that if a succah wall fell down on Yom Tov, one may not put a person, an animal, or keilim there to act as a wall, because one may not make even a temporary structure on Yom Tov or Shabbos!? **A: Rava** answered, another Braisa allows it. The Braisa says a person may have his friend act as a wall for a succah to allow him to eat and sleep there, and he may stand up a bed and put a sheet over it to shade a meis or food from the sun.
 - **Q:** The Braisos contradict each other!? **A:** The first Braisa follows **R' Eliezer** and the second Braisa follows the **Rabanan**. A Mishna says: **R' Eliezer** says a window shutter may be placed to close the window on Shabbos if the shutter is attached to the building and does not drag on the floor when it hangs. The **Chachomim** say the shutter may be placed to close the window even if it is not attached at all. We see that **R' Eliezer** prohibits making a temporary structure and the **Rabanan** allow it.
 - **Q:** The Gemara on that Mishna says, **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** says that all agree that one may not create a new temporary structure, and they only argue regarding making a temporary addition to an existing structure. If so, the second Braisa, which allows making the entire wall, can't follow the **Rabanan** either!? **A:** The first Braisa (which says the animal cannot be placed as a wall) follows **R' Yehuda**, and the second Braisa follows **R' Meir**. A Braisa says, if one uses an animal for a wall of a succah, **R' Meir** says it is passul (we see he says it does not have the din of a wall, so constructing such a wall on Shabbos would be allowed) and **R' Yehuda** says it is kosher (it is a good wall and would therefore not be allowed to be made on Shabbos).
 - **Q: R' Meir** only disallows placing an animal there because it may run away. However, he would seemingly allow using people and keilim as the succah wall, and therefore he would not allow a wall of people or keilim to be made on Shabbos. The Braisa which we have tried to attribute to **R' Meir** *does* allow the making of a wall of people and keilim!? Also, **R' Meir** according to **R' Eliezer** would not even allow adding to a wall, and **R' Meir** according to the **Rabanan** only allow adding, not creating a new wall!? **A:** Both Braisos follow the **Rabanan** and they are not contradictory with regard to using keilim as the wall for the following reason. The Braisa that allows using keilim for the wall is discussing using it for the 4th wall (a succah with 3 walls is kosher, so the 4th wall is considered to only be "adding" to an existing wall). The Braisa that doesn't allow keilim is referring to placing the keilim as a 3rd wall. That is truly making a wall, which is assur to do on Yom Tov.
 - **Q:** Both Braisos said that placing the person there makes the succah kosher, which would mean that with regard to a person, they are referring to the 3rd wall. If so, the Braisos are contradictory regarding using a person for a wall!? **A:** The Braisa that allows it discusses where the person is not aware that he is being used as a wall. The Braisa that prohibits it discusses

where the person stands there intending to be a wall. That is more akin to “building” and is therefore prohibited.

- **Q:** The case with **Nechemia** presumably was where the people intended to act as a wall and yet it was permitted!? **A:** They were not aware that they were being used to make a wall.
- **Q:** **R’ Chisda** was clearly aware!? **A:** **R’ Chisda** was not one of the people used to make the wall.
- There were people of a wedding party who knowingly acted as a human wall to allow the carrying of water from a reshus harabim into a reshus hayachid. **Shmuel** gave them malkus and said, the **Rabanan** only allowed this when the people were not aware that they were acting as a wall, not when they knowingly did so!
- **Rava** left bottles in the town square of Mechuza. On Shabbos, after giving his shiur and while surrounded by his talmidim, his attendant picked up the bottles and brought them to the reshus hayachid (while surrounded by the human wall). On another Shabbos the attendant wanted to again use this method, but **Rava** did not allow him to do so, because doing it again would be considered as “knowingly” having done so.
- **Levi** brought straw into the reshus hayachid using a human wall. **Ze’iri** brought in “aspasta”. **R’ Simi bar Chiya** brought in water.

MISHNA

- One who left his techum for a permitted reason (e.g. to say witness about the new moon, to fight an invading army, to save people from a flood, or to be a midwife at a birth) and is told (before the destination is reached) that the need is no longer there, this person gets a full 2,000 amah techum. If he is still within his original techum, he retains his original techum.
- All who leave to rescue people may return to their places.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What does the Mishna mean, “If he is still within his original techum, he retains his original techum”? **A:** **Rabbah** says it means that if he is within his original techum it is as if he never left his house (i.e. he retains the original techum with his house as the epicenter of the techum).
 - **Q:** That is obvious!? **A:** We would think that once he sets out to leave the techum permissibly, his techum begins to center around him instead of his house. The Mishna teaches us that his house continues to be the center of his techum.
 - **A:** **R’ Simi bar Chiya** says this part of the Mishna is a continuation of the previous statement. It means to say, that if the new techum awarded this person overlaps his original techum, he may return to his original techum and retain the original techum as if he never left.
 - **Rabbah and R’ Simi bar Chiya** argue whether the fact that the techumin overlap allows him to return to his original techum. **R’ Simi bar Chiya** says that it does allow him to do so, and **Rabbah** says that it does not allow him to do so.
 - **Q:** **Abaye** asked **Rabbah**, how could you say that overlapping techumin is not something of halachic significance? If one makes his dwelling in a cave that is 4,000 amos long, with an entrance at each end, but the distance between the entrances above ground is less than 4,000 amos apart, the halacha is that he would be allowed to walk above ground for the full length between entrances and an additional 2,000 amos in each direction. This is because the techum of one entrance overlaps the techum of the other. This overlap allows them to be considered one large techum. We see that overlapping techumin have halachic significance!? **A:** **Rabbah** says this case is very different. In this case, both techumin were established at the onset of Shabbos (through his dwelling in the

cave). In the case of the Mishna, one techum was created at the onset of Shabbos and one was created when he legally left his techum on Shabbos itself (which act caused him to get a new “dwelling”).

- **Abaye** asked, a Mishna says that if someone improperly leaves his techum, but remains within 2 amos of the techum, **R' Eliezer** says that he may reenter his original techum. This is because **R' Eliezer** holds that the 4 amos a person gets when he leaves his techum are measured as a circle with a 4 amah diameter of which he is in the middle (that gives him 2 amos in each direction). In any case, we see that if his new “techum” (i.e. the 4 amah area) overlaps with his original techum, he may reenter the techum! This is a case of a new techum created on Shabbos and still we see that overlapping has legal significance!? **Rabbah** himself said that the **Rabanan** agree that if one left the techum permissibly for a mitzvah (like in our Mishna), the overlapping of the techumin allow him to return to the original techum! Based on this, the Mishna is a valid proof!