



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

Eirubin Daf Mem Hey

V'CHOL HAYOTZIN L'HATZIL CHOZRIN LIMKOMAN

- **Q:** The Mishna seems to say that all rescuers may always return to their original techum, no matter how far away they are. This contradicts the earlier part of the Mishna which said that he gets a new 2,000 amos, but not more than that!? **A: R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** says, the Mishna means to say that they may carry their weapons back for a distance of 2,000 amos even though there is no apparent danger anymore and therefore no reason to allow carrying outside a reshus hayachid.
 - **Q:** Maybe the Mishna does mean that a rescuer is different than the people mentioned previously in the Mishna and a rescuer may actually go back from more than 2,000 amos away!? **A: R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** did not want to answer like that because a Mishna in Meseches Rosh Hashana groups rescuers with all others who have left their techum permissibly and gives them 2,000 amos. Therefore he said the Mishna refers to allowing them to carry their weapons with them when returning from the fighting. A Braisa explains, originally they would leave their weapons at the nearest house after the fighting. However, it once happened that the enemy realized this and chased the returning fighters, who all ran back to this house to get their weapons. The enemy followed them inside. Amid the chaos, more Yidden were killed by fellow Yidden than were killed by the enemy. At that time it was instituted that they carry their weapons back with them.
 - **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** says, the Mishna in Rosh Hashana is discussing where the Yidden were victorious. In that case they are limited to an area of 2,000 amos since the danger is gone. Our Mishna is talking about a case where they were not victorious. In that case the danger still exists and they are therefore allowed to return all the way to their original techum.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, if goyim besiege a Jewish city on Shabbos, we may not go out to fight them with weapons on Shabbos, or in any way violate Shabbos.
 - A Braisa says the same thing and adds, that is only if they are besieging the city for monetary purposes. If they have come to kill people, of course we may go fight them with weapons on Shabbos and violate Shabbos in any way. Also, if the city under siege is a border city, then we may go fight them with weapons and violate Shabbos in any way even if the siege is for monetary purposes (because if a border city were to fall, it would be easier for the goyim to conquer the other cities).
 - **R' Yosef bar Menyumi in the name of R' Nachman** said, Neharda'ah has the status of a border city.

MISHNA

- If one is travelling and after Shabbos begins realizes that he is within 2,000 amos to a city (had he realized this before Shabbos he would have designated the city to be his place of dwelling, something which he may do based on a Mishna later on), **R' Meir** says, since he did not have in mind to make the city his place of dwelling, his place of dwelling remains the place he was when Shabbos began. **R' Yehuda** says, the city is considered to be his place of dwelling (since we assume that he would have intended that had he known its location).
 - **R' Yehuda** said, **R' Tarfon** was once in this situation and he considered the city to be his place of dwelling.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** said, **R' Tarfon** was travelling and Shabbos began while he was still on the road. He went to sleep, not realizing that he was in close proximity to a city. In the morning

he found shepherds who told him that the city was nearby. He entered and went to the Beis Medrash. We see that even without intention he went into the city and took on its techum! They said to **R' Yehuda**, there is no proof from there. It could be that **R' Tarfon** realized where the city was and intended to treat it as his dwelling place. Also, maybe he didn't take on the city's techum. Maybe he went to the Beis Medrash because it was within the techum of where he was when Shabbos began!

MISHNA

- If one is on the road and is sleeping at the onset of Shabbos, **R' Yochanan ben Nuri** says he gets a techum of 2,000 amos. The **Chachomim** say he must remain within his 4 amos.
 - **R' Eliezer** said, the 4 amos are measured with him being in the center (i.e. he gets 2 amos in each direction). **R' Yehuda** says he can choose 4 amos in any direction he wants, but once the choice is made he cannot retract and choose a different direction.
- If there are 2 people limited to 4 amah areas, and their areas overlap, they may bring their food to the overlapping area and eat together, as long as each doesn't carry items belonging to the other back into his own exclusive area.
- If there are 3 people limited to 4 amah areas, and the middle person overlaps with each outer person, but the 2 outer people do not overlap with each other, the middle person may eat in the overlapping area of each side with the one who overlaps that area, but the two outer people may not eat together.
 - **R' Shimon** said, this case is similar to a case where there are 3 chatzeiros which each open to the reshus harabim, and in which the 2 outer ones open to the middle one as well. If the 2 outer chatzeiros each made an eiruv with the middle chatzer, the middle chatzer is permitted to transfer to each of them, and each of them to it, but the 2 outer ones remain assur to each other.

GEMARA

- **Q: Rava** asked, does **R' Yochanan ben Nuri** hold that keilim of hefker also get a 2,000 amah techum, and the reason the machlokes is regarding a sleeping person is to show the extent of the **Rabanan**, that although a person gets a techum when he is awake, he does not get more than 4 amos when he is sleeping at the onset of Shabbos, or does **R' Yochanan ben Nuri** hold that keilim of hefker do not get a techum, and a sleeping person is different than hefker keilim because an awake person gets a 2,000 amah techum, so a sleeping person is no different? **A: R' Yosef** brings a proof from a Braisa which says, rain that falls on Erev Yom Tov gets a techum of 2,000 amos. If **R' Yochanan ben Nuri** holds that hefker items get their own techum, this Braisa is following his view. If we say that he says hefker items do not get a techum, who is the Tanna of this Braisa!? It must be that he holds that hefker items get their own techum.
 - **Q: R' Safra** asked **Abaye**, maybe the Braisa is dealing with rain that fell near a city and it gets a techum because the people of the city have in mind to use that water on Yom Tov!? **A: Abaye** said, it must be that **R' Yochanan ben Nuri** holds this way for another reason. A Mishna says that a well used by those being oleh regel takes on the techum of those who draw the water. A Braisa says that the water of such a well has its own techum of 2,000 amos. These contradictory statements must be answered by saying that the Mishna follows the **Chachomim** that hefker items do not have their own techum, and the Braisa follows **R' Yochanan ben Nuri** who says that they do!
 - **R' Yosef** told **Abaye**, you could have just answered **R' Safra** from the original Braisa. If it is true that the rainwater gets the techum of the people in the nearby city, the Braisa should say so, and not say that it gets a "techum of 2,000 amos"!
 - The Braisa quoted by **R' Yosef** said that rain that falls on Yom Tov gets the techum of whoever takes the water (since it had no techum when Yom Tov began).
 - **Q: Why don't we say that its "dwelling place" is in the ocean (which is where it must have been before it came down as rain)?** **A: R' Yitzchak** says the Braisa is discussing rainclouds that formed from before Yom Tov, so the rain was not in the ocean at the start of Yom Tov.
 - **Q: Maybe the clouds that produced the rain are different than the clouds that were there on Erev Yom Tov?** **A: He has a way of recognizing**

that they are the same clouds. **A2:** Or we can say that it is at most a safek with regard to a halacha D'Rabanan, and therefore we can be meikel.

- **Q:** Why don't we say the rain's dwelling place is in the clouds? From the fact that we don't say that, it is a proof that the halachos of techum do not apply above 10 tefachim!? **A:** It could be that techum does apply, but the rain at the start of Yom Tov is absorbed in the clouds and therefore cannot be said to have a dwelling place.
 - **Q:** If so, the rain should be muktzeh as "nolad"?! **A:** The rain does exist in a liquid state in the clouds, but the water is in constant motion in the clouds, thus making that it can't be said to have a dwelling place at the onset of Yom Tov.
 - Now that we have said this, the same thing can be said for water in the ocean. Since it is in constant motion, it cannot be said to have a dwelling place.