



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

Eiruv Daf Samach Aleph

- The Gemara said that there are 2 versions of the next Mishna. One version says that people of a large town may walk through the entire neighboring small town, but those of the small town may not walk through the entire large town. The other version says that both are permitted.
 - **R' Nachman** said, both versions are correct. The second version is discussing a case where the small town placed an eiruv in the large town. Therefore the people are considered to be living there and may walk through the entire town. The first version is discussing where no eiruv was made and the 2,000 amah techum measurement of the small town ends in middle of the large town. Therefore, they may not go beyond their techum.
- **R' Yosef in the name of Rami bar Abba in the name of R' Huna** said, with regard to a city that is situated on a deep river bank, if a 4 amah tall fence is erected to protect from falling into the river, the techum of the city will begin at the fence. If there is no fence, the techum for each person begins at the entrance to his house.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, all over we only require a fence of 4 tefachim to establish a separation. Why do we require 4 amos in this case? **A: R' Yosef** said, this fence is not just a legal separation, it is to alleviate the danger of falling into the river. If they can't alleviate the fear, they will not use the area and the gathering of homes will therefore not be given the status of a city.
 - **R' Yosef** brings a proof from a Braisa. The Braisa says that **Rebbi** allowed the people of Geder to walk down the mountain and through the town of Chamsan, but not visa-versa. Presumably this was because the people of Geder had a protective fence around the town, thus giving it a status of a city, meaning the techum began at the fence, thereby allowing it a farther reaching techum, and allowing it to get through Chamsan. The town of Chamsan did not have a protective fence and therefore had a techum that began at the entrance of their houses, thus not providing them enough distance to make it through Geder. We see this concept of **R' Yosef**.
 - **R' Dimi** said, the reason for **Rebbi's** psak had nothing to do with a protective fence. It was because the people of Geder would physically attack the people of Chamsan. To prevent that from happening he said that the people of Chamsan should not even go to Geder at all. The reason why this was instituted specifically on Shabbos was because intoxication was more prevalent on Shabbos.
 - **Q:** Why did he allow the people of Geder to go to Chamsan? Wouldn't they attack the people of Chamsan there? **A:** People are not as tough when they are off their home turf.
 - **Q:** Why not be concerned that the people of Chamsan would attack the visiting people of Geder? **A:** Even when off their home turf, the people of Geder would instill enough fear to prevent being attacked.
 - **R' Safra** says, Chamsan was a city shaped like a bow, whose ends were more than 4,000 amos apart, which means that their techum began at every point along the bow, and not at an imaginary bow string. Geder was nearby. The entire Chamsan was within the techum of the edge of Geder. Therefore, **Rebbi** allowed the people of Geder to travel there. However, parts of Geder were not within the techum of Chamsan, and therefore **Rebbi** prohibited their travelling to points beyond their techum.

- **R' Dimi bar Chininah** says, these two towns were a situation of a small city (Chamsan) and a large city (Geder), as described previously, and in the next Mishna.

MISHNA

- The people of a large city may walk through the entire neighboring small city, and the people of the small city may walk through the entire neighboring large city. This is so when the residents of one town place an eiruv in the other town. In that case, it is as if they live in that town, to the point that the entire town (where the eiruv was placed) is considered to be only 4 amos, and they may travel 2,000 amos in every direction beyond the town. **R' Akiva** says that they only get 2,000 amos from the place of the eiruv (the entire town is not considered only 4 amos).
 - **R' Akiva** said to the **Rabanan**, you surely agree that when one's eiruv is placed in a cave, the cave is not considered to be only 4 amos. The **Rabanan** responded, the halacha that it is only considered to be 4 amos only applies for an inhabited area (not an uninhabited cave). If the cave was inhabited he would count the entire interior of the cave as 4 amos and would get 2,000 amos beyond the cave as his techum. This would be a case where placing the eiruv inside the cave would lead to a greater leniency than placing it outside, on top of the cave.
 - If one placed an eiruv outside of the inhabited area, and his 2,000 amos end in middle of an inhabited area, in that case the area would not be considered only 4 amos, and he would have to stop walking at his 2,000 amah limit.

GEMARA

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, if one began Shabbos in an uninhabited town, the entire town is treated as 4 amos, and the person's 2,000 amos begin outside the town's boundaries. However, if he began Shabbos elsewhere and had placed an eiruv in the uninhabited town, the town is not treated as only 4 amos. **R' Elazar** says, in both cases the town is treated as 4 amos.
 - **Q:** We see from the Mishna that even the **Rabanan** say that an eiruv placed in an uninhabited area does not make the area to be considered as only 4 amos!? **A:** The **Rabanan** in the Mishna are referring to a place that is not fit to be lived in (it is not fully enclosed). However, if it is fit, even if it is uninhabited, the **Rabanan** would treat the entire area as 4 amos when an eiruv is placed in it.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if one began Shabbos in a large city or large cave (like the cave of Tzidkiyahu Hamelech), the entire area is treated as being only 4 amos, and he gets 2,000 beyond the area. Presumably the mention of a city and a cave is made to compare the city to the cave. Just like a cave in uninhabited, we are referring to a city that is uninhabited. The Braisa say its din only when he began Shabbos there. It would therefore follow that merely placing an eiruv in an uninhabited area would not produce that same result. This must be following the view of the **Rabanan**, because according to **R' Akiva**, there is no difference between an inhabited and an uninhabited town. This is a proof to **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel!**? **A:** The Braisa means to compare a cave to a city, to teach that this is only the din for an inhabited city and an inhabited cave, and even then only when he begins Shabbos there. However, placing of an eiruv will not result in this din. Based on that, this Braisa only follows the view of **R' Akiva**. The **Rabanan**, however, can possibly agree with **R' Elazar's** view.
 - **Q:** How can we say the Braisa is discussing an inhabited cave? The Braisa says "a cave like the cave of Tzidkiyahu", which was an uninhabited cave!? **A:** The Braisa means that the cave is like Tzidkiyahu's cave in that it is large. However it is unlike his cave because his cave was uninhabited, and the cave under discussion was inhabited.
- **Mar Yehuda** seemed to hold like **R' Akiva** (because he suggested that an eiruv placed in a building would not mean that the building is treated as only 4 amos. **Rava** told him he is wrong, because no one follows this view of **R' Akiva**).