The Sages of Neharde’a said: If this person is clever, he will enter into his original Shabbat limit, and since he was permitted to enter it, he entered, and may remain there.

Rav Pappa said: With regard to produce that was taken out beyond the Shabbat limit and was later returned, even if this was done intentionally, the produce has not lost its place; rather, it may still be carried within the entire limit. What is the reason for this halakha? It is that the produce did not go out willingly, but was taken due to circumstances beyond its control.

Rav Yoσef bar Shemaya raised an objection to the opinion of Rav Pappa from a baraita: Rabbi Nehemya and Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov say: It is actually prohibited to carry the produce beyond four cubits, unless it was returned to its place unwittingly. By inference, if it was returned unwittingly, yes, it is permitted, but if it was returned intentionally, it is not.

The Gemara answers: This is subject to a dispute between the tanna’im, as it was taught in a baraita: With regard to produce that was taken out beyond the Shabbat limit, if it was taken out unwittingly, it may be eaten; but if it was taken out intentionally, it may not be eaten.

Rabbi Nehemya says: If the produce was returned and is now in its original place, it may be eaten; but if it is not in its original place, i.e., if it is still beyond the Shabbat limit, it may not be eaten.

The Gemara clarifies: What is meant by: In its place? If you say that the produce was returned to its place intentionally, there is a difficulty, as it was explicitly taught in a baraita: Rabbi Nehemya and Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov say: It is actually prohibited to carry the produce beyond four cubits, unless it was returned to its place unwittingly. By inference, only if it was returned unwittingly is it indeed permitted, but if it was returned intentionally, it is not permitted.

Rather, does it not mean that the produce was returned to its place unwittingly, and the baraita is incomplete and it teaches the following: With regard to produce that was taken out beyond the Shabbat limit, if it was taken out unwittingly, it may be eaten; but if it was taken out intentionally, it may not be eaten.

In what case is this statement said? In a case where the produce is not in its original place, i.e., it is still beyond the Shabbat limit. But if it was returned and is now in its original place, even if it was returned intentionally, it may be eaten. And Rabbi Nehemya came to say: Even if the produce was returned and is now in its original place, a distinction applies. If it was returned unwittingly, yes, it is permitted; but if it was returned intentionally, it is not.
The Gemara objects to this reading: However, since the latter clause of this baraita teaches that Rabbi Nehemya and Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov say: Actually, carrying the produce beyond four cubits is prohibited, unless it was returned to its place unwittingly, and by inference, only if it was unwittingly returned is it indeed permitted; however, if it was returned intentionally, it is not permitted. And since Rabbi Nehemya maintains that produce that was intentionally returned to its place is forbidden, by inference, the first tanna holds that even if it was returned intentionally, it is also permitted. If so, the preceding explanation cannot be accepted, and the Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from here that Rav Pappas opinion is supported by the opinion of the first tanna.20

Rav Naĥman said that Shmuel said: If one was walking in a certain place and does not know where the Shabbat limit lies, he may take two thousand medium strides6 in each direction from the spot he acquired as his place of residence, and this is the Shabbat limit, for a medium stride is approximately a cubit.6

And Rav Naĥman also said that Shmuel said: If one established residence in a valley,6 and gentiles surrounded the entire area with a partition6 for the purpose of residence on Shabbat, he may walk only two thousand cubits6 in each direction, as he cannot rely on partitions that were not present when he acquired his place of residence. However, he may carry in the entire partitioned area,6 as in any other private domain, even in the part that is beyond his two thousand cubits, but only by means of throwing, as he himself cannot accompany the object past two thousand cubits.

Rav Huna said: He may walk two thousand cubits; however, even within this area he may carry objects only a distance of four cubits, as in a karmelit. The Gemara asks: And let him be permitted to carry in the entire partitioned area by means of throwing. Although he himself is limited in where he may walk, the partitions render it a private domain, and he should be permitted to carry in the entire area.

The Gemara answers: The Sages prohibited this as a preventive measure, lest he be drawn after his object. It is prohibited for him to leave the two thousand cubit limit, but were he permitted to carry by means of throwing, he might follow his object and go out beyond his permitted limit.

The Gemara asks: Within two thousand cubits, at any rate, let him carry the object in his usual manner. Since he may traverse this area, there should be no concern that he might come to be drawn after the object. 

The Gemara rejects this explanation: No, this is not necessarily the case, as the baraita can also be explained as follows: If the produce was returned intentionally to its place, everyone agrees, i.e., both the first tanna and Rabbi Nehemya, that it is forbidden. However, here they disagree with regard to produce that was unwittingly taken out beyond the Shabbat limit and was not returned, so that it is not in its original place. The first tanna holds that if the produce was taken out unwittingly, it is permitted to be eaten, even if it is not in its original place. However, Rabbi Nehemya holds that even if the produce was taken out unwittingly, if it was returned to its original place, it is permitted; but if it was not returned to its original place, it is not permitted. 

The Gemara establishes that there is a tannaitic precedent for Rav Pappas opinion based on an unstated opinion of the first tanna, inferred from the statement cited from Rabbi Nehemya and Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov. The latter tannaim stipulate that only produce returned to its place unwittingly is permitted, while the first tanna does not address this case explicitly. However, once the latter tannain address this issue, the Gemara understands that they must be responding to the opinion of the first tanna. It then analyzes his opinion and infers that he disputes the claim cited from Rabbi Nehemya and Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov, and rules that even if the produce was returned intentionally, it is permitted. This inferred opinion of the first tanna of the baraitas corresponds with Rav Pappas statement, validating his opinion (see Rashba).

He may walk two thousand cubits systematically. By Torah law, the entire area is regarded as a private domain and it is legally considered like four cubits, just like any other courtyard. Nevertheless, the Sages decreed that this is prohibited as a preventive measure (see Tosafot). He may carry in the entire partitioned area systematically. This ruling refers to ownerless objects that are not limited by the place of residence of their owner. This is because an owners Shabbat limit applies to his possessions as well.

Background

If one established residence in a valley systematically. The image depicts a valley surrounded by a partition, including the area within which the person is permitted to walk, as he established his place of residence there.

Measuring the Shabbat limit systematically. If one is walking and does not know where the Shabbat limit is, he may walk two thousand medium strides, each of which is approximately two shoe lengths (Magen Avraham), as stated by Shmuel (Shulhan Arukh, Oraĥ Ĥayyim 403:1).

If one established residence in a valley and gentiles surrounded it with a partition systematically. The Gemara explains: If one established his Shabbat residence in a field and then gentiles surrounded it with a partition on Shabbat for the purpose of residence (Rashi), he may only walk two thousand cubits from his place of residence within the enclosure. However, he may carry in the entire area by means of throwing.

Some authorities rule stringently with regard to carrying within a Shabbat limit established in the valley. They hold that even in that area, he may throw but not carry (Rema, based on Tosafot; and others), since the concern of a partition that was breached in its entirety applies to Shmuel’s opinion as well (Vilna Gaon). However, other authorities permit him to carry within this limit in the usual manner (Rash). Rabbeinu Yehonatan; Rash; Tur). Most later commentators were lenient in this regard; based on the principle that the Kaddish follows the lenient opinion with regard to eruvin (Shulhan Arukh Halḥak; Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 403:1).
The Gemara answers that this is prohibited due to another aspect of the laws of *eiruv*, namely because this is similar to the case of a partition that is breached in its entirety, leaving the space open to a place in which it is prohibited to carry. Since he may not carry more than two thousand cubits, and the enclosed area is larger than two thousand cubits, the area that is permitted to him is breached in its entirety, left open to an area that is prohibited to him. Consequently, carrying is prohibited in the entire area, even by means of throwing.

However, ០vrCollapse bar Rav said: In that case, he may walk two thousand cubits, and he may also carry objects within these two thousand cubits. The Gemara poses a question: In accordance with whose opinion did ០vrCollapse bar Rav issue his ruling? It is neither in accordance with the opinion of Rav Nehamai, nor in accordance with the opinion of Rav Huna, while this dispute would appear to leave no place for a third opinion.

The Gemara answers: Read ០vrCollapse bar Rav’s ruling as follows: He may carry objects only a distance of four cubits. The Gemara asks: If so, this is the same as the opinion of Rav Huna. The Gemara answers: Read it then as follows: And similarly, Rabbi ០vrCollapse bar Rav said.

Rav Nehamai said to Rav Huna: Do not argue with the opinion of Shmuel as cited by Rav Nehamai with regard to a field surrounded by a partition on Shabbat, as it was taught in a *baraita* in accordance with his opinion. As it was taught in a *baraita*:

If a person was measuring the two thousand cubits of his Shabbat limit from the spot where he deposited his *eiruv*, and he measuring ended in the middle of the city, he is permitted to carry throughout the city, provided that he does not overstep the limit by foot, i.e., that he does not walk beyond his permitted limit in the middle of the city. If he cannot walk about on foot, how can he carry throughout the city? Is it not by means of throwing? This presents a difficulty for Rav Huna, who prohibits carrying by means of throwing in a place where it is prohibited to walk.

Rav Huna said: No, it means that he may carry in the city by means of pulling, i.e., he is permitted to pull objects from the other side of the city to the side where he is permitted to walk, for in this manner there is no concern that he might be drawn after the object, since he is bringing the object to him.

Similarly, Rav Huna said: If a person was measuring the two thousand cubits of his Shabbat limit from the spot where he deposited his *eiruv*, and he measuring ended in the middle of a courtyard, he has only half the courtyard in which to walk.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: It is obvious that he is not permitted to walk beyond his Shabbat limit. The Gemara answers: Read Rav Huna’s statement as follows: He has half a courtyard, i.e., if it is a large city, he may still walk another two thousand cubits. The second possibility is that the area enclosed by partitions is fully within a person’s Shabbat limit. The third option is a situation where the enclosure lay partially beyond his Shabbat limit. In that circumstance, he may not venture beyond his limit, even if it is located in the middle of a city or courtyard.

Neither in accordance with Rav Nehamai nor in accordance with Rav Huna. If there is no decree against throwing due to a concern that one might carry, then throwing should be permitted in the entire field, in accordance with the opinion of Shmuel. On the other hand, if there is a decree against throwing, then it should apply even within the area of two thousand cubits, in accordance with the opinion of Rav Huna (R. N.). In the Jerusalem Talmud, the opinion of Rabbi ០vrCollapse bar Rav remains an independent view, and is not aligned with the opinion of Rav Huna.
Since the house is closed off on all sides by partitions, His measuring ended at the edge of the roof – (Hananel).
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it is considered halakhically like four cubits (Rabbeinu). In that case, one may carry throughout the entire house by means of throwing. differently, namely, that it refers to a situation where his measuring ended inside the house. In that case, one may carry throughout the entire house by means of throwing.

NOTES:

The Gemara rejects this comparison: From what do you infer that this is the case? Perhaps Rabban Gamliel and Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya did not prohibit walking in a pen or a stable due to the limits imposed on walking in a field, but this applies only there, because they are two distinct places. In other words, the pen and stable are enclosed by partitions, while the field is not, and there is no reason to prohibit walking in one place out of concern that one might come to walk in a place prohibited to him.

However, as for the prohibition of carrying due to the limits imposed on walking, where it is all one place, might we also say that even Rabban Gamliel and Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya would decree against carrying as a preventive measure, lest the person be drawn after the object he is carrying: If a person was measuring the two thousand cubits of his Shabbat limit from the spot where he deposited his eiruv, and his measuring ended at the edge of the roof of a house, most of which stood outside his Shabbat limit, he is permitted to carry throughout the house by means of throwing.

What is the reason that Rav Huna agrees in this case? Because the edge of the roof of the house is regarded as if it presses down vertically at the end of his Shabbat limit, thus creating a partition, and so there is no concern that he might pass beyond this partition and be drawn after his object.

Rav Huna, son of Rav Natan, said: The dispute between Shmuuel and Rav Huna is parallel to a dispute between tanna'im recorded in the mishna: If the gentiles brought him to a different city beyond his Shabbat limit, or if they put him in a pen or a stable, the Sages disagree. Rabban Gamliel and Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya say: He may walk about the entire stable or pen. Since they are enclosed by a partition, their entire area is considered like only four cubits. Rabbi Yehoshua and Rabbi Akiva say: He has only four cubits from where he was deposited.

Is it not the case that Rabban Gamliel and Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya, who said: He may walk about the entire area, do not prohibit walking in a pen or a stable due to walking in a field where one is limited to four cubits? Rather, they say that since the stable is surrounded by partitions, it is not similar to a field, in which a person may not leave his four cubits.

And since they did not prohibit walking in a pen or a stable due to the limits imposed on walking in a field, they would certainly not prohibit carrying in a pen due to the limits imposed on walking in a field. Rather, they would permit a person to carry in a field that had been enclosed on Shabbat by gentiles, and even to throw into the part lying beyond his two thousand cubits, parallel to the opinion of Shmuuel who did not decree against this.

And is it not the case that Rabbi Yehoshua and Rabbi Akiva, who say that he has only four cubits, prohibit walking in a pen or a stable due to the limits imposed on walking in a field, and since they prohibit walking in a pen or a stable due to the limits imposed on walking in a field, they would also prohibit carrying past the two thousand cubit limit by means of throwing due to the limits imposed on walking past there, in accordance with Rav Huna’s opinion.

The Gemara rejects this comparison: From what do you infer that this is the case? Perhaps Rabban Gamliel and Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya did not prohibit walking in a pen or a stable due to the limits imposed on walking in a field, but this applies only there, because they are two distinct places. In other words, the pen and stable are enclosed by partitions, while the field is not, and there is no reason to prohibit walking in one place outside of concern that one might come to act improperly in a different place.

The comparison can also be rejected from another angle: And with regard to Rabbi Yehoshua and Rabbi Akiva too, from what can it be inferred that they prohibit walking beyond four cubits due to a decree? Perhaps it is because they hold that when we say that the entire house is considered like four cubits, this applies only where one acquired his place of residence within the airspace of the partitions of the house while it was still day, i.e., prior to the onset of Shabbat.
He established residence on a boat – חסכט הפק: One who establishes residence on a boat may walk throughout the entire boat. If the walls of the boat are breached while it is at sea, he may still walk throughout the entire boat. However, if it has come to a stop, he may only walk four cubits (Hisagot Halot), in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Zeira, since the halakha accords with his opinion in disputes with Rabbi Zeira (Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 405:3).

The halakha is in accordance with Rabban Gamliel with regard to a boat – חסכט הפק: Proof for this opinion is offered in the Jerusalem Talmud from the statement with regard to Rabbi Yehoshua and Rabbi Akiva that they wished to be stringent upon themselves. This indicates that even they agree that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Gamliel, but they maintain that it is best to be stringent.

Since the boat lifts him – חסכט הפק: Rabbi Yehoshua and Rabbi Akiva do not accept Rabban Gamliel’s reasoning in this context because, although the boat moves from one set of four cubits to another, the passengers themselves do not move on the boat. Therefore, the passengers do not have a fixed, particular location that can be considered their four cubits (Ritva).

The Gemara asks: What is the practical difference between these two explanations? The Gemara answers: There is a practical difference between them with regard to a case where the walls of the boat were breached, so that the person is no longer located between its partitions. Alternatively, there is a difference with regard to a case where the person jumped from one boat to another, so that he is no longer on the boat where he had acquired his place of residence. In both of these cases, Rabba’s reason no longer applies, but Rabbi Zeira’s reason does.

The Gemara asks: As for Rabbi Zeira, what is the reason that he did not state his opinion in accordance with the opinion of Rabba, whose explanation is more straightforward? The Gemara answers: He could have said to you: The sides of a boat are not regarded as proper partitions,