The formulation of the mishna is also precise, in accordance with Rav Naĥman’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 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 Hiya bar Ashi was teaching the mishna to Hiya 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 Hisda 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 Naĥman 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 Gemara relates:
The Bartenura understands the mishna in a similar fashion. Since he set out on his way –

Rava said: Come and hear a resolution from the mishna: The Sages said that one establishes an eiruv with bread only to be lenient with the wealthy person, so that he need not exert himself and go out and establish an eiruv with his feet. And if you say that one who establishes an eiruv with bread does not have four cubits, is this really a leniency? It is a stringency. Based on the mishna, apparently, all leniencies that apply to one who establishes an eiruv by foot must also apply to one who establishes an eiruv with bread.

The Gemara rejects this argument: No proof can be cited from there, as even if he without the four cubits, this is preferable to him, so that he need not exert himself and go out and establish an eiruv by foot. Therefore, it can be said that establishing an eiruv with bread constitutes a leniency even if it entails the loss of four cubits.

MISHNA If a person set out to go on a Shabbat eve to a town for which an eiruv is established in order 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.

Rabbi Meir says: Anyone who can establish an eiruv, and negated his residence in his original place, and did not establish an eiruv, i.e., he did not at least state that he seeks to establish residence somewhere else, is likened to both a donkey driver, who walks behind the animal and prods it, and a camel driver, who walks before the animal and leads it, in the sense that he is pulled in two opposite directions. Due to the uncertainty with regard to the location of his Shabbat limit, his movement is restricted as though his residence was established in both his city and at a location along the way to the other city. He may not venture beyond two thousand cubits from either location.

GEMARA With regard to the mishna’s statement that according to Rabbi Yehuda, he himself is permitted to go to the other city, while for all the rest of the residents of his city it is prohibited to do so, the Gemara asks: What is different about him and what is different about them? Why is he permitted to proceed to the other city, while they are not? Rav Huna said: We are dealing here with a case where that person has two houses, one in each town, with 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, and he can therefore establish residence at the end of his Shabbat limit simply by declaring that he wishes to acquire residence in such-and-such place. 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.

That was also taught in a baraita: With regard to one who has two houses, with the distance of two Shabbat limits between them, once he set out on the way, clearly demonstrating his intention to leave, although he did not explicitly say: My residence is at the end of my Shabbat limit, he acquired an eiruv there. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda.

Furthermore, Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda said: Even if another found him before he left, and said to him: Spend the night here, it is a hot period, or it is a cold period and inadvisable to set out now, on the following day he may rise early and go to the other town, as his intention to walk is sufficient.
Rabbi Meir said: With regard to saying that he is establishing residence at the end of his Shabbat limit, everyone agrees that this is necessary, as otherwise it could be understood that he is returning to his house because he changed his mind about establishing residence elsewhere. When they disagree is with regard to whether or not it is necessary for him actually to set out on his way. Rabbi Yehuda maintains that he must have set out on his way, whereas Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, maintains that he need not even set out on his way, as his intention to leave is sufficient.

And Rav Yosef said: With regard to actually setting out on his way, everyone agrees that this is necessary. Where they disagree is with regard to whether or not it is necessary for him to say that he is establishing his residence at the end of his Shabbat limit.

The Gemara asks: In accordance with whose opinion is this halakha that Ulla stated? If a person set out on his way, and another persuaded him to return home, he is considered returned and as considered set out on his way.

The Gemara analyzes Ulla’s statement itself: If he is considered returned, with the same legal status as the rest of the residents of his city and has not established residence elsewhere, why is he described as set out on his way? And if he is considered set out on his way, indicating that he established residence at the end of his Shabbat limit, why is he described as returned?

The Gemara answers: Emend Ulla’s statement and explain that this is what he is saying: Although he was returned to his original place, he is nonetheless regarded as having set out on his way. In accordance with whose opinion did he state this ruling? According to the opinion of Rav Yosef, that everyone agrees he must set out on his way, and in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, that he need not declare it he is establishing his residence at the end of his Shabbat limit.

The Gemara relates that Rav Yehuda bar Ishtata once brought a basket of fruit to Rav Natan bar Oshaya in a nearby town, four thousand cubits away, on Shabbat eve. When he was going, Rav Natan left him until he descended one step, and then said to him: Lodge here tonight. He allowed him start his journey so that he would be considered as having set out on his way. On the following day Rav Yehuda bar Ishtata rose early and went home.

The Gemara comments: In accordance with whose opinion did Rav Natan bar Oshaya act? Apparently, it was in accordance with the opinion of Rav Yosef that everyone agrees that he must set out on his way, and in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei bar Yehuda that he need not declare that he is establishing his residence at the end of his Shabbat limit.

The Gemara rejects this suggestion: No, that is not necessarily so, as it is possible to say that he acted according to the opinion of Rabbi Sheshet, and in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, and Rav Yehuda bar Ishtata declared that he establishes his residence at the end of his Shabbat limit.

We learned in the mishna that Rabbi Meir says: Anyone who can establish an eiruv, and negated his residence in his original place, and did not establish an eiruv, is likened to both a donkey driver and a camel driver. The Gemara asks: Didn’t we have already learned it once before in another mishna: In a case of uncertainty, Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda say: This person is likened to both a donkey driver and a camel driver. Here too, it is obvious that the same applies, as that is Rabbi Meir’s opinion with regard to all uncertain cases.
HALAKHA

One who went out beyond his limit — מִשַּׁבָּת רַגְלֶךָ לֹא יִכָּנֵס — If a person intentionally went even one cubit beyond his Shabbat limit, he may not reenter, in accordance with the unattributed opinion of the first tanna in the mishna. According to the Magen Avraham, if the person did so to perform a mitzva, the ruling is lenient and his limit is incorporated within that of the town. This is in accordance with the explanation of Rashi and other commentaries (Shulḥan Arukh, Oḥiṭ Ḥayyim 405:1).

One foot beyond the Shabbat limit — מִשַּׁבָּת רַגְלֶךָ לֹא יִכָּנֵס — If a person had one foot beyond his Shabbat limit, he may reenter, in accordance with the second version of Rabbi Hanina’s statement, because the halakha is in accordance with the second version, as it is supported by other sources. In addition, the halakha is in accordance with the lenient opinion in the halakhot of eiruv (Shulḥan Arukh, Oḥiṭ Ḥayyim 405:2).

NOTES

If you turn away your feet due to Shabbat — אַחַת בְּתוֹךְ הַתְּחוּם וְרַגְלוֹ אַחַת חוּץ — Rabbi Hanina interprets the verse as though it should be read literally, i.e., sometimes Shabbat is obviated when a person intentionally went even one cubit beyond the Shabbat boundary, and it is as though he never left. If, however, he has ventured slightly further, his limit is merely contiguous with the town limit but not incorporated within it. As a result, he is not permitted to reenter (Ritva).

Two and three — Two and three: The Gemara concludes that Rabbi Eliezer’s ruling is based on the incorporation of Shabbat boundaries, i.e., each person has a limit of four cubits, two on each side. Consequently, if he is within two cubits, his own narrow limit is incorporated within the town limit, and it is as though he never left. If, however, he has ventured slightly further, his limit is merely contiguous with the town limit but not incorporated within it. As a result, he is not permitted to reenter (Ritva).

One who intentionally went even one cubit beyond his Shabbat limit, he may not reenter, in accordance with the explanation of Rashi and other commentaries (Shulḥan Arukh, Oḥiṭ Ḥayyim 405:1).

MISHNA

One who intentionally, not for the purpose of performing a mitzva, went out beyond his Shabbat limit, even if only one cubit, may not reenter. Rabbi Eliezer says: If he went out two cubits he may reenter; however, if he went out three cubits he may not reenter.

GEMARA

Rabbi Hanina said: If one of his feet was within the Shabbat limit, and his other foot was beyond the Shabbat limit, he may not reenter, as it is written: “If you turn away your feet [raglekha] due to Shabbat” (Isaiah 58:13). The word raglekha is written in defective form without the letter yod, and can therefore be read as your foot in the singular, indicating that Shabbat can be desecrated by the reentry of even a single foot.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: But wasn’t the opposite taught in a baraita? If one of his feet was within the Shabbat limit, and his other foot was beyond the Shabbat limit, he may reenter. The Gemara answers: In accordance with whose opinion is this taught? It is in accordance with the opinion of Aĥerim, as it was taught in a baraita: Aĥerim say: He is attributed to the place where the majority of his body lies, and therefore, it is permitted for him to enter, as he stepped out with only one foot.

The Gemara cites a different version of the previous discussion. Some say that Rabbi Hanina said: If one of his feet was within the Shabbat limit, and his other foot was beyond the Shabbat limit, he may reenter. The Gemara answers: In accordance with whose opinion is this taught? It is in accordance with the opinion of Aĥerim, as it was taught in a baraita: Aĥerim say: He is attributed to the place where the majority of his body lies, and therefore, it is permitted for him to enter, as most of his body remains within the Shabbat limit.

We learned in the mishna that Rabbi Eliezer says: If he went out two cubits he may reenter; however, if he went out three cubits he may not reenter.” The Gemara asks: But wasn’t it taught otherwise in a baraita? Rabbi Eliezer says: If he went out one cubits he may reenter; however, if he went out two cubits he may not reenter. The Gemara answers: That is not a difficulty. This, the mishna, is referring to a case where he moved from the first cubit and is now standing two cubits out, and therefore it is permitted for him to reenter; however that, the baraita, is referring to a case where he moved from the second cubit and is now standing three cubits out. Consequently, it is prohibited for him to reenter.
The Gemara raises another difficulty. But wasn’t it taught in a different baraita that Rabbi Eliezer says: Even if he went one cubit out, he may not enter. The Gemara answers: When that baraita was taught it was with regard to one measuring his limit by counting two thousand steps. As we learned in a mishna: And for one established residence in a particular place, and is now measuring his limit by counting out steps, with regard to whom the Sages said one provides him with two thousand cubits, even if his measurement ended in a cave he may not walk even one cubit beyond his measurement.

**MISHNA**

With regard to one for whom it grew dark,* while he was traveling outside the Shabbat limit* of the town where he was heading, even if he was only one cubit outside the limit he may not enter the town.* Rabbi Shimon says: Even if he was fifteen cubits beyond the limit he may enter the town, because the surveyors do not precisely demarcate the measures; rather, they mark the Shabbat limit within the two thousand cubits, due to those who err.*

**GEMARA**

With regard to the mishna’s statement: Due to those who err, it is taught in a baraita: Due to those who err in their measurement. In other words, because the surveyors are concerned that they might have erred in their measurements, they are stringent and do not position the mark at the edge of the limit, but move it several cubits within the limit.

---

**NOTES**

One who went out and one for whom it grew dark — Also, in the Jerusalem Talmud it is explicitly stated that there is no difference between someone who went out and one for whom it grew dark; the tannaim disagree in both cases. Consequently, there are three opinions regarding this issue: The opinion of the first tanna, that of Rabbi Eliezer, and that of Rabbi Shimon. Some early commentators explain differently (Rabbeinu Yehonatan and others).

If it grew dark for a person while beyond the limit — Apparently, he is permitted to walk another two thousand cubits from his location at nightfall. However, he may not enter the town itself, because he was not located within its limit when nighttime arrived. See the Meiri and the opinions he cites.

Due to those who err — The Rambam, in his Commentary on the Mishna, indicates that this refers to the errors of the surveyors in their measurement, and that the fifteen cubits is not a fixed distance. Rather, if the topography is flat, the assumption is that they erred by less; if the terrain is shaped by hills and ravines, their error will be greater (Bartenura).

**HALAKHA**

One for whom it grew dark while outside the Shabbat limit — Apparently, he is permitted to walk another two thousand cubits from his location at nightfall. However, he may not enter the town itself, because he was not located within its limit when nighttime arrived. See the Meiri and the opinions he cites.

One who went beyond his limit — The Rambam, in his Commentary on the Mishna, indicates that this refers to the errors of the surveyors in their measurement, and that the fifteen cubits is not a fixed distance. Rather, if the topography is flat, the assumption is that they erred by less; if the terrain is shaped by hills and ravines, their error will be greater (Bartenura).
MISHNA How does one extend the boundaries of cities in order to ensure that all its protrusions are included within the borders of the city? He extends a straight line across the edge of the city, and if a house is recessed and another house protrudes, or a turret [pagum] is recessed and another turret protrudes from that line, and similarly, if there were remnants of walls ten handbreadths high, and bridges and monuments over graves in which there is a residence, one extends the measure of that side of the city as though there were other structures opposite them in the adjacent corner of the city. And prior to measuring the Shabbat limit, one renders the city like a square tablet so that it gains the corners, although there are actually no houses in those corners.

GEMARA The Gemara cites a dispute with regard to the mishna’s terminology. Rav and Shmuel disagreed: One taught that the term in the mishna is me’abberin, with the letter ayin, and one taught that the term in the mishna is me’abberin, with the letter alef.

The Gemara: The one who taught me’abberin with an alef explained the term in the sense of limb [ever] by limb. Determination of the city’s borders involves the addition of limbs to the core section of the city. And the one who taught me’abberin with an ayin explained the term in the sense of a pregnant woman [ubbera] whose belly protrudes. In similar fashion, all the city’s protrusions are incorporated in its Shabbat limit.

Apropos this dispute, the Gemara cites similar disputes between Rav and Shmuel. With regard to the Machpelah Cave, in which the Patriarchs and Matriarchs are buried, Rav and Shmuel disagreed. One said: The cave consists of two rooms, one farther in than the other. And one said: It consists of a room and a second story above it.

The Gemara asks: Granted, this is understandable according to the one who said the cave consists of one room above the other, as that is the meaning of Machpelah, double. However, according to the one who said it consists of two rooms, one farther in than the other, in what sense is it Machpelah? Even ordinary houses contain two rooms.

Rather, it is called Machpelah in the sense that it is doubled with the Patriarchs and Matriarchs, who are buried there in pairs. This is similar to the homiletic interpretation of the alternative name for Hebron mentioned in the Torah: “Manre of Kiryat Ha’Arba, which is Hebron” (Genesis 35:27). Rabbi Yitzḥak said: The city is called Kiryat Ha’Arba, the city of four, because it is the city of the four couples buried there: Adam and Eve, Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rebecca, and Jacob and Leah.

MALACHA Extending cities – A city’s Shabbat limits are not measured from each house separately. Rather, they are measured from the city’s borders, which are established as a straight line that incorporates all structures that are part of the city (Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayim 398:6).

LANGUAGE Turret [pagum] – From the Greek πεγμα, meaning an addition to a construction, a stage, or a wooden structure meant to hold something.

NOTES Me’abberin with an ayin and me’abberin with an alef – The Arukh explains the word me’abberin with the letter alef as follows. Just as a person’s limits [everim] protrude from his body, so too, extra, protruding sections are added to a city. The Melili explains the word me’abberin with the letter ayin to mean that just as a pregnant woman [me’ubberet] contains an addition to her body in the form of a child, so too, the additions to a city’s structures are added to the city’s borders.