Rava: This halakha applies only in a case where, were he to run to the trunk of the tree he could reach it before the onset of Shabbat. Abaye said to him: But doesn’t the mishna state: And it grew dark while he was traveling, indicating that he is farther away than that?

The Gemara answers: The mishna means that it grew dark while he was traveling so that he can no longer return to his house before nightfall; however, he is able to go to the trunk of the tree before Shabbat. Some state a different version of the previous statement. Rava said: The mishna means that it grew dark while he was traveling, so that were he to walk very slowly he could not reach his house; however, if he runs, he can still arrive before Shabbat.

Rabba and Rav Yosef were going together along the way. Rabba said to Rav Yosef: Our residence will be beneath the palm that carries its brother, the one with another palm tree leaning on it. And some say he said to him: Our residence will be beneath the palm that spared its owner from the land tax [karga], the palm which yielded enough dates for its owner to pay his entire land tax.

Rabba asked: Does the Master know of that tree? Rav Yosef said to him: No, I do not know of it. He said to him: Then rely on me, as it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yosei says: If two people were walking together, one of whom is familiar with a particular location in the distance, and one is not familiar with it, the one who is not familiar with it entrusts his right to designate his residence to the one who is familiar with it, and the one who is familiar with it says: My residence is in such-and-such place.

The Gemara comments: But it is not so; that is not the opinion of Rabbi Yosei. Rabbs only taught it as if it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei so that Rav Yosef would accept it from him, due to the fact that Rabbi Yosei’s reasoning accompanies his rulings. Since the halakha is usually in accordance with Rav Yosei’s opinion, Rav Yosef would be less likely to raise doubts with regard to the ruling.

We learned in the mishna: If one is not familiar with a tree or any other noticeable landmark, or if he is not an expert in the halakha, unaware that residence can be established from a distance, and he said: My residence is at my current location, his presence at his current location acquires for him the right to walk two thousand cubits in each direction.

The Gemara raises a fundamental question: These two thousand cubits, where are they written in the Torah? The Gemara answers that it is as it was taught in a baraita: “Remain every man in his place” (Exodus 16:29); these are the four cubits, which constitute the minimum Shabbat limit, e.g., for one who ventured beyond his prescribed limit. “Let no man go out of his place” (Exodus 16:29); these are the two thousand cubits of the Shabbat limit for one who remains in his place. Unless otherwise specified, the measure of one’s place is two thousand cubits.

**NOTES**

Where, were he to run to the trunk of the tree – בַּעֲרֵי לְעָרָה

One who establishes his enu with his feet only acquires his residence when he actually arrives in that place. Consequently, although the Sages were lenient with him and did not require his presence in the location when he establishes the enu, he must nevertheless arrive there by nightfall, or at least be in a position to do so.

Rabbi Yosei’s reasoning accompanies his rulings – לָא קָשָׁט לְנוּ עִמּוֹ. It is reasonable to rule in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei despite the fact that several Sages disagree with him, as several authorities accept Rabbi Yosei’s opinion as the halakha, even when he is opposed by more than one of his colleagues. Since Rabba knew that this was clearly the halakha, he cited it in the name of the well-known Sage, so that his statement would be accepted. In our versions of the Tosefta, however, the opinion is explicitly ascribed to Rabbi Yosei.

These two thousand cubits, where are they written – בַּעֲרֵי נֵא. Even according to the majority of commentators, who maintain that the two thousand cubit limit is rabbinic in origin, it still may be asked: On what did the Sages base their determination of this measurement? (Riva).

**HALAKHA**

However, if he runs, he can still arrive – בַּעֲרֵי נֵא. One can only establish residence in a distant location if he is capable of reaching it by nightfall, even if he can only do so by running. If he can reach the location by running, he need not actually run, but may proceed slowly. However, if one cannot reach it even by running, he does not establish it as his residence. This is in accordance with the second version of Rava’s statement (Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 491:11).

**LANGUAGE**

The Gemara asks: From where do we derive that this is the measure of one's place? Rav Hisda said: We derive this by means of a verbal analogy between the term place written here: “Let no man go out of his place,” and from the term place written with regard to an unwitting murderer: “Then I will appoint you a place to where he shall flee” (Exodus 21:13). This last verse mentions both place and fleeing, and the term place is derived from the term fleeing. And the term fleeing is derived from the term fleeing, written in a different verse with regard to the Shabbat limit of cities, which also served as cities of refuge: “And you shall measure from outside [mihutz] the city on the east side two thousand cubits, and on the south side two thousand cubits, and on the west side two thousand cubits, and on the north side two thousand cubits” (Numbers 35:3). From this chain of identical terms, the meaning of the term place stated in connection with Shabbat is derived from the two thousand cubits mentioned with regard to the Levite cities.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: What is significant about the difference between the two terms? Didn’t the school of Rabbi Yishmael teach a verbal analogy with regard to leprosy of houses between the verse: And the priest shall return [uva haĥutza] the priest shall come [vaĥutza]” (Leviticus 14:39) and the verse: “And the priest shall return [uva haĥutza]” (Leviticus 14:44), from which it is derived that this is the halakha with regard to returning, i.e., it is after seven days; this is the same halakha with regard to coming; it is after seven days. Obviously, the less pronounced difference of one letter between the two terms? Doesn’t the tanna’im of the mishna disagree whether the two-thousand-cubit limit granted to a person in every direction is measured as a circle or as a square tablet. The Gemara poses a question: With regard to the opinion of Rabbi Hanina ben Antigenos that the limit is measured as a circle, no matter what you say, it is difficult. If he is of the opinion that there is a verbal analogy from the verse written with regard to the Levite cities it is difficult, because sides are the term written, indicating squared boundaries. And if he is not of the opinion that there is a verbal analogy, from where does he derive that the Shabbat limit is two thousand cubits?

The Gemara rejects this argument: This applies only when there are no terms that are identical to it however, where there are terms that are identical to it, we derive the verbal analogy from terms identical to it, rather than from the terms that are not precisely identical.

The tanna’im of the mishna disagree whether the two-thousand-cubit limit granted to a person in every direction is measured as a circle or as a square tablet. The Gemara poses a question: With regard to the opinion of Rabbi Hanina ben Antigenos that the limit is measured as a circle, no matter what you say, it is difficult. If he is of the opinion that there is a verbal analogy from the verse written with regard to the Levite cities it is difficult, because sides are the term written, indicating squared boundaries. And if he is not of the opinion that there is a verbal analogy, from where does he derive that the Shabbat limit is two thousand cubits?
The Gemara asks: And how do the Rabbis understand the emphasis placed on the word this in the verse? The Gemara answers: As it was taught in a baraita that Rav Hananya says: Like this measure shall be the calculations of measures for all those who rest on Shabbat, i.e., square.

Rav Aha bar Ya’akov said: One who carries an object four cubits in the public domain is only liable if he carries it four cubits with their diagonal. The four cubits mentioned in many places is only the basic measure by which the distance beyond which it is prohibited to carry is calculated. However, in practice, a person is liable only if he carries the object the length of the diagonal of a square with four-cubit sides.

Rav Pappa said that Rava once tested us by asking: With regard to a pillar in the public domain, ten handbreadths high and four handbreadths wide, the width be four handbreadths with their diagonal in order to be regarded a private domain, or not? And we said to him: Is this not that which was taught by Rav Hananya? As it was taught in a baraita: Rav Hananya says: Like this measure shall be that of all those who rest on Shabbat, indicating that the diagonal is the determining measure for the halakhot of rest on Shabbat.

We learned in the mishna: And this is the meaning of that which the Sages said: A pauper can establish an eiruv with his feet, i.e., one who does not have the bread required to establish an eiruv may walk anywhere within his Shabbat limit and acquire residence. We have this leniency in effect only for a pauper, who does not have food for two meals. However, one who has bread may only establish residence with bread. Rabbi Yehuda says: This leniency is in effect for both a pauper and a wealthy person.

Rav Nahman said: This dispute between Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda is with regard to a case where the person said: My residence is in my current location. As Rabbi Meir maintains: The primary ordinance and establishment of eiruv is with bread.

Therefore, it is only with regard to a pauper, who does not have food for two meals, that the Sages were lenient and permitted him to establish residence merely by saying: My residence is in my current location. However, with regard to a wealthy person in his own house who has bread, no, they did not permit him to do so.

And Rabbi Yehuda maintains: The primary ordinance of eiruv is by foot, i.e., by going and stating that he is establishing his residence in that location, and therefore it applies to both a pauper and a wealthy person. However, with regard a case when the person said: My residence is in such-and-such place, and he is not there, everyone, both Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda, agrees that for a pauper on the road on a Shabbat eve, yes, an eiruv may be established in that manner; however, for a wealthy person, no, an eiruv may not be established in that manner.

They with their diagonal – שולחן ערוך: There are three opinions among the commentaries with regard to this basic issue. Rashi, Tosafot, and the Rashba explain that this additional diagonal depends on the direction in which one wishes to proceed. In other words, one may only walk two thousand cubits to the east or west, but to the northeast he may advance up to a little over two thousand eight hundred cubits. He adds that the same principle applies to all measures. Rabbi Yitzchak Tam and other commentators contend that the calculation is based on the measurement with its diagonal in every direction, and that all the established measurements refer to the basic length, without the diagonal. Yet other commentaries maintain that one is only liable by Torah law for the measurement with its diagonal, but proceeding beyond the basic measure is prohibited by rabbinic law. Alternatively, they distinguished between the cases mentioned in this context, e.g., four cubits, and the other halakhot of Shabbat.

They with their diagonal – Perek Hananya: One who carries an object four cubits in the public domain is only liable if he transfers it the length of the diagonal of a four cubit square, which is 5.6 cubits. It is permitted to carry it less than that distance (Rav Shimon of Saens, Tosafot, Rash; Rashi; Rashad). Some authorities state that it is only permitted to carry within a circle of a four-cubit radius. If one walked any further, he is exempt from punishment or from bringing a sin-offering, but it is prohibited to do so (Rambam, according to the Maggid Mishne; Shulhan Arukh, Oraĥ Ḥayyim 349:2).

HALAKHA

A pauper and a wealthy person – Perek Hananya: The pauper mentioned in this context is not necessarily a person in dire financial straits. Rather, anyone traveling who intends to establish his residence in a location he has determined for himself is considered a pauper in terms of this halakha, as it can be assumed that he does not have with him all that he requires for a meal. The reverse is also true. One who is at home on Shabbat evening but establishes an eiruv in order to go the next day is considered a wealthy person. The proof is from the inhabitants of Shitini mentioned in the baraita. Although they were going to receive charity, they were still considered wealthy with regard to the eiruv (Rashbi).

HALAKHA

My residence in such-and-such place – תărッション בקומה: If one says, my residence is in such-and-such place, without going there or placing an eiruv there, it is only valid if he was on the road on Shabbat eve. It is not effective for one who remains at home, as per the opinion of Rabbi Nahman, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, and the explanation of the Rashba (Vilna Gaon; Shulhan Arukh, Oraĥ Ḥayyim 349:3).
And as for the mishna's statement: And this is what the Sages meant when they said that a pauper can establish an eiruv by his feet, who, which Sage, is teaching it? It is Rabbi Meir. And to which clause of the mishna is it referring? It refers to the previous statement: If he is not familiar with a tree or any other noticeable landmark, or if he is not an expert in the halakha, and therefore is unaware that a residence can be established from a distance, and said: My residence is in my current location, he acquires two thousand cubits in each direction. And as for the statement in the continuation of the mishna: The Sages said that one establishes an eiruv with bread only to be lenient with the wealthy person, who, which Sage, is teaching it? It is Rabbi Yehuda, who maintains that the option of establishing an eiruv by foot is available to the wealthy as well.

Rav Hisdai, however, disagreed with Rav Nahman and said: The dispute between Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda in the mishna is with regard to a person who said: My residence is in such-and-such place, in which case the his residence is neither acquired by foot nor with bread. As Rabbi Meir maintains: A pauper, yes, he establishes residence with an eiruv in that manner; however, a wealthy person, no, he does not. And Rabbi Yehuda maintains: Both a pauper and a wealthy person may establish an eiruv in that manner. However, in a case where one said: My residence is in my present location, everyone, both Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda, agrees that an eiruv of this kind is effective both for a pauper and for a wealthy person, as everyone agrees that the primary ordinance of eiruv is by foot.

And as for the mishna's statement: And this is what the Sages meant when they said that a pauper can establish an eiruv by foot, who is teaching it? It is Rabbi Meir. And to which clause of the mishna is it referring? It is referring to this clause: One who was coming along the way on Shabbat eve, and it grew dark while he was traveling. According to Rabbi Yehuda, he could have established an eiruv even if he was in his house. And as for the statement in the continuation of the mishna: The Sages said that one establishes an eiruv with bread only in order to be lenient with the wealthy person, who is teaching it? Everyone agrees with this halakha, and it is taught according to both opinions.

The Gemara comments: A baraita was taught in accordance with the opinion of Rav Nahman, who said that the dispute between Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda is with regard to one who said: My residence is in my present location. It was stated in the baraita: Both a pauper and a wealthy person establish an eiruv with bread; however a wealthy person may not go out beyond the Shabbat limit and say: My residence is in my present location, because the Sages said that one can establish an eiruv by foot only in the case of a person who was coming along the way and it grew dark while he was traveling. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir.

Rabbi Yehuda says: Both a pauper and a wealthy person establish an eiruv by foot. And a wealthy person will go out beyond the Shabbat limit and say: My residence is in my present location. And this is the primary ordinance of eiruv. However, the Sages permitted a homeowner to send his eiruv in the hand of his servant, or in the hand of his son, or in the hand of his agent, in order to be lenient with him, so that he need not exert himself and go out and establish an eiruv by foot. This baraita presents the debate between Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda as it was delineated by Rav Nahman.

The baraita continues. Rabbi Yehuda said: There was an incident involving the members of the household of the Memel family and members of the household of Guryon family in the village of Aroma, who were distributing dried figs and raisins to the paupers in years of famine, and the paupers of the village of Sîchin and the paupers of the village of Hananya would come to the edge of the Shabbat limit at nightfall, which was also within the Shabbat limit of Aroma, and then go home. The following day they would rise early and go to receive their figs and raisins. Apparently, one can establish an eiruv by foot, if he says: My residence is in my present location.

And as for the mishna's statement: And this is what the Sages meant when they said that a pauper can establish an eiruv by his feet, who, which Sage, is teaching it? It is Rabbi Meir. And to which clause of the mishna is it referring? It refers to the previous statement: If he is not familiar with a tree or any other noticeable landmark, or if he is not an expert in the halakha, and therefore is unaware that a residence can be established from a distance, and said: My residence is in my current location, he acquires two thousand cubits in each direction. And as for the statement in the continuation of the mishna: The Sages said that one establishes an eiruv with bread only to be lenient with the wealthy person, who, which Sage, is teaching it? It is Rabbi Yehuda, who maintains that the option of establishing an eiruv by foot is available to the wealthy as well.

Rav Hisdai, however, disagreed with Rav Nahman and said: The dispute between Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda in the mishna is with regard to a person who said: My residence is in such-and-such place, in which case the his residence is neither acquired by foot nor with bread. As Rabbi Meir maintains: A pauper, yes, he establishes residence with an eiruv in that manner; however, a wealthy person, no, he does not. And Rabbi Yehuda maintains: Both a pauper and a wealthy person may establish an eiruv in that manner. However, in a case where one said: My residence is in my present location, everyone, both Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda, agrees that an eiruv of this kind is effective both for a pauper and for a wealthy person, as everyone agrees that the primary ordinance of eiruv is by foot.

And as for the mishna's statement: And this is what the Sages meant when they said that a pauper can establish an eiruv by foot, who is teaching it? It is Rabbi Meir. And to which clause of the mishna is it referring? It is referring to this clause: One who was coming along the way on Shabbat eve, and it grew dark while he was traveling. According to Rabbi Yehuda, he could have established an eiruv even if he was in his house. And as for the statement in the continuation of the mishna: The Sages said that one establishes an eiruv with bread only in order to be lenient with the wealthy person, who is teaching it? Everyone agrees with this halakha, and it is taught according to both opinions.

The Gemara comments: A baraita was taught in accordance with the opinion of Rav Nahman, who said that the dispute between Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda is with regard to one who said: My residence is in my present location. It was stated in the baraita: Both a pauper and a wealthy person establish an eiruv with bread; however a wealthy person may not go out beyond the Shabbat limit and say: My residence is in my present location, because the Sages said that one can establish an eiruv by foot only in the case of a person who was coming along the way and it grew dark while he was traveling. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir.

Rabbi Yehuda says: Both a pauper and a wealthy person establish an eiruv by foot. And a wealthy person will go out beyond the Shabbat limit and say: My residence is in my present location. And this is the primary ordinance of eiruv. However, the Sages permitted a homeowner to send his eiruv in the hand of his servant, or in the hand of his son, or in the hand of his agent, in order to be lenient with him, so that he need not exert himself and go out and establish an eiruv by foot. This baraita presents the debate between Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda as it was delineated by Rav Nahman.

The baraita continues. Rabbi Yehuda said: There was an incident involving the members of the household of the Memel family and members of the household of Guryon family in the village of Aroma, who were distributing dried figs and raisins to the paupers in years of famine, and the paupers of the village of Sîchin and the paupers of the village of Hananya would come to the edge of the Shabbat limit at nightfall, which was also within the Shabbat limit of Aroma, and then go home. The following day they would rise early and go to receive their figs and raisins. Apparently, one can establish an eiruv by foot, if he says: My residence is in my present location.
Rav Ashi said: The formulation of the mishna is also precise, in accordance with Rav Nahman’s explanation, as it teaches: If on a Shabbat eve one set out to go to a city for which an eiruv is established enabling him to go there on Shabbat, and another person caused him to return home, he himself is permitted to go to that city on Shabbat, and for all the other residents of the town it is prohibited to go there. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda.

And we discussed this mishna and raised a difficulty: What is different about him and what is different about them? Why is he permitted to proceed to the other town while it is prohibited for the other residents to do so? And Rav Huna said: We are dealing here with a case where he has two houses, one in each city, and there is the distance of two Shabbat limits, four thousand cubits, between them.

With regard to him, since he set out on his way, his legal status is that of a pauper, as he did not intended to return to his first house, but to continue to his other house. Therefore, he can establish residence at the end of his Shabbat limit by verbal means alone.

And the legal status of these other inhabitants of his city, is that of wealthy people, as they are in their houses and have food. Consequently they can only establish residence at the end of their Shabbat limit by depositing food there prior the onset of Shabbat. Apparently, everything stated with regard to one who says: My residence is in such-and-such place; to a pauper, yes, it applies to a wealthy person, no, it does not apply. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from this that this is the case.

Rav Huna bar Ashi was teaching the mishna to Hiyya bar Rav before Rav. He stated that this leniency applies both to a pauper and to a wealthy person. Rav said to him: Conclude your statement also: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda.

The Gemara relates: Rabba bar Rav Hanan was in the habit of coming from his home in Artibbena to Pumbedita on Shabbat.

He would declare on Shabbat eve: My residence is in Tzinta, a settlement located between the Shabbat limits of the two places. Abaye said to him: What is your opinion that led you to act in that manner? Is it because in a dispute between Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda, the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, and Rav Huna said: The dispute between these two Sages is in a case where the person said: My residence is in such-and-such place, and you rely on Rabbi Yehuda and establish residence at a place between the two cities even though you are still at home?

But didn’t Rav Nahman explain the dispute between Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda differently, and furthermore, a baraita was taught in accordance with his opinion. Rabba bar Rav Hanan said to him: I retract my opinion and will no longer do so.

Rami bar Hama said: The Sages have said that one who establishes residence by foot has four cubits at that location, and another two thousand cubits beyond. However, with regard to one who deposits his eiruv in a certain place, there is a dilemma whether he has four cubits from the site of his eiruv, or not.

The early commentaries: The formulation of the mishna is also precise – if the mishna can be explained only according to Rabbi Nahman’s opinion, how can Rabbi Hisdas rule against an explicit mishna? The answer is that Rabbi Hisdas maintains that the other inhabitants of the town cannot be included in an eiruv unless they declare their intentions. Consequently, for one who declares that he is establishing a residence for himself it is a valid eiruv, but not for the others (Ritva).

Was in the habit of coming from his home in Artibbena – Rabbeinu Hananel explains that he would go to Pumbedita to hear Rabbi Yosef’s torah every Shabbat. Therefore, it is clear that he did not walk the day before. Rather, he spent Friday night in his own home, and walked to Pumbedita the following day.