And we learned in the next clause of the mishna concerning one who places his eiruv even one cubit beyond the city’s boundary: That which he gains on one side of the city he loses on the other. The Gemara expresses surprise: Does that mean that only that which he gains on one side he loses on the other, and no more? Wasn’t it taught in a baraita: With regard to one who places his eiruv within the outskirts of the city, he has not done anything; if, however, he placed it outside the outskirts of the city, even one cubit outside, he gains that cubit and loses the entire city because the measure of the city is included in the measure of his Shabbat limit? If one’s Shabbat residence had been in the city, the two thousand cubits of his Shabbat limit would have been measured from the edge of the city’s outskirts; now that he has established his Shabbat residence outside the city, the city itself is included in the two thousand cubits, and he may lose far more on that side than he will gain on the other side.

And this is in accordance with the opinion stated by Rabbi Idi, as Rabbi Idi said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: If one was measuring the two thousand cubits of his Shabbat limit from the location of his Shabbat residence outside the city, and his measure terminated in the middle of the city, he has only half the city, i.e., he may walk only to the end of his two thousand cubits. If, however, his measure terminated at the far end of the city, the entire city is regarded as four cubits, and he completes the rest of the Shabbat limit on the other side of the city.

The Gemara answers: This is not difficult. Here the baraita is referring to a case where his measure of two thousand cubits terminated in the middle of the city, whereas there the mishna is referring to a case where his measure terminated at the far end of the city.

Rabbi Idi said: These are nothing more than words of prophecy; i.e., I do not see the logic behind this statement. What difference is it to me if the measure terminated in the middle of the city, or if it terminated at the far end of the city?

Rava said: They are not words of prophecy, as both cases were taught in the following mishna: ‘The residents of a large city may walk through an entire small city that is fully included within its Shabbat limit; the small city is considered as though it were four cubits, and the rest of the Shabbat limit is measured from the other side of the city.’

And the residents of a small city may not walk through an entire large city.

Halahka

An eiruv outside the Shabbat limit – מְרֵי לַעֲבֹר בַּחוֹזָא: A city incorporated within his measure – מִדְּבֵר בַּחוֹזָא: If one places his eiruv outside his Shabbat limit, it is invalid; his limit is measured either from his home or from his physical location (Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 408:4).

His measure terminated in the middle of the city – כְּלָתָר בְּמוֹדֵד וּבָא: His measure terminated in the middle of the city; the following distinction applies: If the entire city is within his limit, it is treated as four cubits. Consequently, he may walk anywhere in the city and still complete the rest of his two thousand cubits beyond the city. However, if his limit does not include the entire city, it is measured like regular terrain. Some say that if the entire city is not within his limit, as measured from his Shabbat residence, he is still permitted to walk throughout the city itself, as long as he does not exit it on the other side (Rema, based upon Rashi; Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 408:1).

Notes

A city incorporated within his measure – מִדְּבֵר בַּחוֹזָא: In this case, the length of the city does not count toward a person’s two thousand cubits. One may add the length of the city to the end of the two thousand cubits measured from his place of residence, as indicated by the black line in the illustration below.
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A city located on the edge of a ravine – יד שנעשת על ערש חל
The ge’onim and the rambam explained this case as referring to a city located on a riverbank that built a pier along the river’s edge. If, however, no pier was built along the river’s edge, the river and the area that is between it and the bank of the river is considered part of the city. Moreover, if they did not build a pier, the Shabbat limit is measured from its houses. The Rif explains the case in a similar manner.

The Gemara answers: Although there is a source for the case of a city located on a riverbank that built a pier along the river’s edge, the river and the area that is between it and the bank of the river, the Gemara distinguishes between a river that fills with water during the rainy season but is dry during the rest of the year, in which case the city’s area, and the city’s Shabbat limit is measured from its houses, and a river that flows during the rainy season, in which case the city’s boundary is measured from the far bank of the river. In the case of a city located on a riverbank that fills with water during the rainy season but is dry during the rest of the year, the city’s Shabbat limit is measured from its houses. The Rif explains the case in a similar manner.

And Rabbi Idi, who said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi’s statement has no source, may hold that the mishna teaches the two cases with the same formulation. Just as it states: The residents of a large city may walk through an entire small city, it similarly states: The residents of a small city may walk through an entire large city. His version of the mishna did not state that the residents of a small city may not walk through an entire large city.

And he establishes the mishna as referring to one who was measuring his ciruva inside the other city. Consequently, that city becomes his Shabbat residence, and he may walk anywhere in that city and an additional two thousand cubits beyond it. But we did not learn anything about one who was measuring two thousand cubits from his residence inside a city, and in which case it makes a difference whether the entire city is within his two thousand cubits or whether only part of it is within this limit.

The Gemara asks: And did we not learn in the mishna about one who was measuring? Didn’t we learn in the mishna: And as for one who is measuring his Shabbat limit, with regard to whom the Sages said that one gives him two thousand cubits, that applies even if the end of his measurement terminates in the middle of a cave? Although a cave has the status of a private domain, he may enter only the part of the cave that is within his two thousand cubits. This case is directly parallel to the case of one whose limit ends at the middle of a city.

With regard to the mishna cited above, Rav Nahman: One who teaches the following in the second clause: The residents of a small city may walk through an entire large city, does not err in his rendering of the mishna. And one who teaches: The residents of a small city may not walk through an entire large city, also does not err. Both renderings are plausible.

Rav Nahman explains: One who teaches: The residents of a small city may walk through an entire large city, does not err, as he establishes the mishna as referring to one who placed his ciruva inside the other city. And one who teaches: The residents of a small city may not walk through an entire large city also does not err, as he establishes the mishna as referring to one who measures his Shabbat limit and arrives at the city from the outside.

And the mishna is incomplete and it teaches the following: The residents of a large city may walk through an entire small city, but the residents of a small city may not walk through an entire large city. In what case is this statement said? It was said with regard to one who was measuring his two thousand cubits from his Shabbat residence. But one who was in the large city and placed his ciruva in the small city, and similarly one who was in the small city and placed his ciruva in the large city, he may walk through the entire city in which he placed his ciruva and beyond it two thousand cubits.

Rav Yosef said that Rami bar Abba said that Rav Huna said: With regard to a city located on the edge of a ravine, if there is a barrier four cubits high in front of it, one measures its Shabbat limit from the edge of the ravine, as it is considered the border of the city. And if there is not a barrier four cubits high in front of it, the Shabbat limit is measured from the entrance of each person’s house, as the city is not considered a permanent settlement.
Abaye said to him: You told us with regard to this case that a barrier four cubits high is required. What is different about this case that it requires a barrier that is higher than all other barriers, which must reach a height of only four handbreadths?

He said to him: There, use of the place is not frightening; here, use of the place is frightening. Generally, partitions serve a symbolic function, and therefore it is sufficient for the partition to be four handbreadths high. In this case, however, it is frightening to stand along the edge of the ravine without a protective barrier, and therefore a barrier four cubits high must be constructed for the safety of the residents.

Rav Yosef said: From where do I derive to say this halakha? As it was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi permitted the residents of Geder, situated at the top of a slope, to descend on Shabbat to Hamtan, situated at the bottom of the slope, but the residents of Hamtan may not ascend to Geder. What is the reason? Is it not because these, the inhabitants of Geder, constructed a barrier at the lower edge of their city, and these, the members of Hamtan, did not construct a barrier at the upper edge of their city? Consequently, the residents of Geder measured their Shabbat limit from their barrier, and Hamtan was included in their two thousand cubits. The residents of Hamtan had to measure their Shabbat limits from their homes, and therefore Geder was not within their two thousand cubit limit.

The Gemara relates that when Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said: This ruling was issued not due to their respective Shabbat limits, but rather because the residents of Geder would assault [metatreg] the residents of Hamtan. And what does it mean that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi permitted the residents of Geder to descend to Hamtan, but not vice versa? He instituted this. In other words, this was not a halakhic ruling, but rather an ordinance instituted to protect the public welfare and prevent fighting.

The Gemara asks: What is different about Shabbat that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi instituted this ordinance only for Shabbat and not for the rest of the week? The Gemara answers: Drunkenness is common on Shabbat, when people eat to their heart’s content. Therefore, there is a greater chance of violent behavior.

---

**BACKGROUND**

Geder and Hamtan – גדר והחמ الثاني: Geder was an important city in the talmudic period. It was inhabited mostly by gentiles and was one of the ten cities of the Decapolis. The town of Hamat Gader, or Hamtan, situated on the hillside below it, was named after its hot springs [חמיים].

Constructed a barrier – עבד דאר: This drawing illustrates the opinion that the residents of Geder established a barrier on the hillside, whereas their counterparts from Hamtan did not do so. Consequently, the residents of Geder could walk further on Shabbat than the residents of Hamtan.

Roman bath ruins at Hamat Gader, and map of area surrounding Geder and Hamtan

---

**LANGUAGE**

Assault [metatreg] – טראג: Possibly from the Greek word δέδαρχα, dedarkha, a popular term meaning hit or struck. Other commentaries claim it comes from the Semitic-Arabic root, طرق, also meaning hit.
**BACKGROUND**

Geder, a city shaped like a bow –�ֶׁשֶׁטָּר וְעִיר

The Talmud states that they may walk through the entire large city.

A city located on the edge of a ravine –עִיר שֶׁיּוֹשֶׁבֶת עַל שְׂ׳ַת רַחַל

One who teaches this, and one who teaches that –וְלַמּוֹדֵד שֶׁאָמְרוּ וֹתְיִין אַלְ׳ַּיִם אַמָּר – מְצָא ַל תּוֹכָרּ

The Sages disagreed about the matter.

The inhabitants of Geder and Hamtan –בְּ ֵי חַמְּתָן גְּדוֹלָר

The Sages of the Jerusalem Talmud also disagreed about the reason for the policy permitting the residents of Geder to go to Hamtan but prohibiting the residents of Hamtan to travel to Geder. One opinion is that the policy is based on the laws of a large city near a small one. Other Sages state that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi acted because the authorities in Geder, a city with a large gentle population, did not welcome the Jewish inhabitants of Hamtan. The Ra’avia explains that there was a village between the two cities, which was located closer to Geder than to Hamtan. The Shabbat limit of Geder included the entire village, and therefore the village was considered as though it were four cubits, and the rest of the Shabbat limit of Geder was measured from the other side of the village. Consequently, the Shabbat limit of Geder included Hamtan as well. However, the Shabbat limit of Hamtan ended in the middle of the village, and therefore the residents of Hamtan could travel no farther than the village.

**NOTES**

The residents of a large city, whose Shabbat limit includes an entire small city, may walk throughout the small city. The area of that city is considered as though it were only four cubits, and the rest of the Shabbat limit is then measured from the other side of the city. The residents of the small city, however, whose Shabbat limit does not incorporate the entire large city, are permitted to walk through it only until the end of their two thousand cubit limit. If they placed their eiruv in the large city, the large city is considered their Shabbat residence, and they may walk anywhere within the large city, and an additional two thousand cubits beyond.

**Halakha**

A small city and a large city –עִיר רָעֲשׂוּיָר כְֶּשֶׁת רֲוַאי, וְחַד אָמַרד

The Gemara asks: When the residents of Geder go to Hamtan, will they assault the residents there; of what use, then, is this ordinance? The Gemara answers, citing a popular saying: A dog that is not in its place will not bark for seven years. On its own turf, a dog barks readily, but it becomes scared in unfamiliar surroundings and remains silent. Similarly, the people of Geder are not nearly as bold when they visit Hamtan as they are in their own town.

The Gemara asks: If so, we should be concerned about the reverse scenario, that now too, the residents of Hamtan, in their home territory, will take revenge and assault the residents of Geder. The Gemara answers: The people of Geder would not be submissive to such an extent. While visiting Hamtan, they would not initiate fights, but they would certainly fight back if they were attacked. Consequently, the people of Hamtan would not dare initiate hostilities with them. Therefore, there is no concern about the safety of either group.

Rav Safra said: Geder was a city shaped like a bow,4 whose two ends were separated by less than four thousand cubits. The empty space of the bow was viewed as though it were filled with houses, and its Shabbat limit was measured from the imaginary bowstring stretched between the two ends of the bow. Consequently, Hamtan was included in its Shabbat limit, and the residents of Geder were permitted to go there on Shabbat. With regard to the inhabitants of Hamtan, however, that same area between the ends of Geder was viewed as empty space, and therefore the houses of Geder along the arc of the bow were beyond their Shabbat limit.

Rav Dimi bar Hinana said: The people of Geder were residents of a large city, and the people of Hamtan were residents of a small city. Consequently, the residents of the large city, Geder, could walk through all of Hamtan, the small city; but the residents of Hamtan could walk only through part of Geder, as explained previously.

Rav Kahana taught it that way, as stated previously; whereas Rav Tavyomi taught it more concisely, in this way: Rav Safra and Rav Dimi bar Hinana disagreed about the matter. One of them said: Geder was a city shaped like a bow; and one of them said: The people of Hamtan were residents of a small city and the people of Geder were residents of a large city.5

**MISHNA**

The residents of a large city may walk through an entire small city, and the residents of a small city may walk through an entire large city, even if part of it is located more than two thousand cubits from their city. How so? One who was in a large city and placed his eiruv in a small city, or one who was in a small city and placed his eiruv in a large city, may walk through the entire city in which he placed his eiruv and another two thousand cubits beyond it, as the entire city is considered as though it were only four cubits.5

Rabbi Akiva says: He has only two thousand cubits from the place of his eiruv, as the actual area of the city is included in the calculation. Rabbi Akiva said to the Rabbis: Do you not concede to me that one who places his eiruv in a cave has only two thousand cubits from the place of his eiruv, and that consequently the entire cave is not considered as merely four cubits?

The Rabbis said to him: When does this apply? When the cave has no residents. But if it has residents, it is considered as though it were only four cubits, and one may walk through all of it and another two thousand cubits beyond it. Consequently, the halakha with regard to an eiruv placed inside a cave is sometimes more lenient than the halakha governing an eiruv placed in the area above the cave. If one places his eiruv inside a cave that has residents, he has two thousand cubits beyond the cave; if he places it above the cave, where there are no residents, he has only two thousand cubits from the place of his eiruv.

And as for one who is measuring his Shabbat limit, with regard to whom the Sages said that one gives him two thousand cubits, that measurement applies even if the end of his measurement terminates in the middle of a cave. He may not walk further into the cave, even if the cave is inhabited.
GEMARA Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: If one established his Shabbat residence in a desolate city whose walls are still standing, according to the Rabbis he may walk through all of it as though it were four cubits, and he may walk an additional two thousand cubits beyond it. If, however, he merely placed his eiruv in a desolate city, he has only two thousand cubits from the place of his eiruv. The Rabbis distinguish between one who establishes his Shabbat residence by actually being present in that location at the onset of Shabbat and one who does so by placing his eiruv there before Shabbat. Rabbi Elazar says: Whether he established his Shabbat residence through his physical presence or he merely placed his eiruv there, he may walk through all of it and another two thousand cubits beyond it.

The Gemara raises an objection based upon the mishna. Rabbi Akiva said to the Rabbis: Do you not concede to me that one who places his eiruv in a cave has only two thousand cubits from the place of his eiruv? They said to him: When does this apply? When the cave has no residents. Consequently, when it has no residents the Rabbis concede to Rabbi Akiva that one who has only two thousand cubits from the place of his eiruv. This contradicts Rabbi Elazar’s assertion that, according to the Rabbis, even if one places his eiruv in the abandoned city, he may walk through all of it and another two thousand cubits beyond it.

The Gemara responds: What is the meaning of the qualification that it has no residents? It means that the place is not fit for residence. If, however, the city is suitable for habitation, it is considered like four cubits even if it is currently uninhabited.

Come and hear another difficulty from the following baraita: If one established his Shabbat residence through his physical presence in a city, even if it is as large as Antioch, or in a cave, even if it is particularly large, like the Cave of Zedekiah, king of Judah, he may walk through all of it and another two thousand cubits beyond it. The baraita teaches the case of a city that is similar to that of a cave: Just as a cave is presumably desolate, i.e., uninhabited, so too the city must be one that is desolate. And only in the case where he established his Shabbat residence through his physical presence would yes, this halakha apply, but if he merely placed his eiruv there, no, he may not measure his two thousand cubits from the edge of the city.

HALAKHA One who establishes his Shabbat residence and one who places his eiruv – mesmo. One who establishes his Shabbat residence in a desolate but inhabitable city or cave, either through his physical presence at the beginning of Shabbat or by placing an eiruv there before Shabbat, may walk through the entire area and two thousand cubits beyond it. If one establishes his Shabbat residence in an uninhabitable place, he may travel only two thousand cubits in all directions from that location. The halakha is in accordance with the Rabbis, as explained by Rava and in accordance with Rabbi Elazar, as the difficulties that were raised against him were answered. This follows the general principle that the halakha is in accordance with the lenient opinion with respect to the halakhot of eiruv (Shu"han Arukh, Orach Hayyim 488:2).
Therefore, there are locations for which the following ruling applies:

Arukh: The Arukh explains that Mar Yehuda was argumentative in that he favored opinions that were not accepted as normative halakhu. Rashi explains that his argumentative nature was demonstrated in his habitual quarrels with his colleagues.

The Gemara continues clarifying the baraita: In accordance with whose opinion is this baraita? If you say it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, why did the baraita specifically teach the case of a desolate city? Even if it was inhabited, the same halakha should also apply, as Rabbi Akiva holds that even if one placed his eiruv in an inhabited city, he has only two thousand cubits from the place of his eiruv. Rather, is it not in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis? And nonetheless, the reason is that one established his Shabbat residence through his physical presence. In such a case, yes, one may walk through the entire city and another two thousand cubits beyond it. But if one merely placed his eiruv there, he would not be permitted to walk more than two thousand cubits from his eiruv, which would contradict the opinion of Rabbi Elazar.

The Gemara asks: Doesn’t the baraita teach that this halakha applies even to a cave like the Cave of Zedekiah, which was uninhabited? The Gemara answers: The baraita is referring to a cave that is like the Cave of Zedekiah in one respect and not like the Cave of Zedekiah in other respects. It is like the Cave of Zedekiah in that the cave is as large as that one. And it is not exactly like the Cave of Zedekiah, as there, with regard to Zedekiah’s cave, it was desolate, and here the baraita is referring to a cave that is inhabited.

The Gemara relates that Mar Yehuda once found the residents of Mavrikhta placing their eiruvin in the synagogue of Beit Agor. He said to them: Place your eiruv farther into the synagogue, so that more will be permitted to you, as the Shabbat limit is measured from the spot where the eiruv is deposited. Mar Yehuda holds that even when an eiruv is placed in an inhabited city, the two thousand cubits are measured from the location of the eiruv rather than from the edge of the city.

The Gemara relates to the halakhot of eiruv, nobody is concerned about this opinion of Rabbi Akiva, as the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis. Consequently, no matter where one places his eiruv in a city, the entire city is considered as though it were four cubits, and he is permitted to walk two thousand cubits beyond the edge of the city.
MISHNA One who resides with a gentile in the same courtyard, or one who lives in the same courtyard with one who does not accept the principle of eiruv, even though he is not a gentile, such as a Samaritan [Kuti], this person renders it prohibited for him to carry from his own house into the courtyard or from the courtyard into his house, unless he rents this person’s rights in the courtyard, as will be explained below.

Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov says: Actually, the gentile does not render it prohibited for one to carry, unless there are two Jews living in the same courtyard who themselves would prohibit one another from carrying if there were no eiruv. In such a case, the presence of the gentile renders the eiruv ineffective. However, if only one Jew lives there, the gentile does not render it prohibited for him to carry in the courtyard."

Rabban Gamliel said: “There was an incident involving a certain Sadducee who lived with us in the same alleyway in Jerusalem, who renounced his rights to the alleyway before Shabbat. And Father said to us: Hurry and take out your utensils to the alleyway to establish possession of it, before he changes his mind and takes out his own utensils so as to reclaim his rights, in which case he would render it prohibited for you to use the entire alleyway.

Rabbi Yehuda says: Rabban Gamliel’s father spoke to them with a different formulation, saying: Hurry and do whatever you must do in the alleyway prior to Shabbat, before he takes out his utensils and renders it prohibited for you to use the entire alleyway. In other words, you may not bring out utensils to the alleyway at all on Shabbat, as the institution of an eiruv cannot be used in the neighborhood of a Sadducee. This is because, even if he renounced his rights to the alleyway, he can always retract and reclaim them.

GEMARA Abaye bar Avin and Rav Hinana bar Avin were sitting, and Abaye was sitting beside them, and they sat and said: Granted, the opinion of Rabbi Meir, the author of the unattributed mishna, is clear, as he holds that the residence of a gentile is considered a significant residence. In other words, the gentile living in the courtyard is considered a resident who has a share in the courtyard. Since he cannot join in an eiruv with the Jew, he renders it prohibited for the Jew to carry from his house to the courtyard or from the courtyard to his house. Consequently, the case of one Jew living in the courtyard is no different from the case of two Jews living there. In both cases, the gentile renders it prohibited for carrying.

But Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov, what does he hold? If you say he holds that the residence of a gentile is considered a significant residence, he should prohibit carrying even when there is only one Jew living in the courtyard. And if it is not considered a significant residence, he should not prohibit carrying even when there are two Jews living there.

Abaye said to them: Your basic premise is based on a faulty assumption. Does Rabbi Meir actually hold that the residence of a gentile is considered a significant residence? Wasn’t it taught in the Tosefta: The courtyard of a gentile is like the pen of an animal, i.e., just as an animal pen does not render it prohibited to carry in a courtyard, so too, the gentile’s residence in itself does not impose restrictions on a Jew.