18.01.05; 7b (ר' יהודה אומר) → 9a (ערער דבעל)

- ז. וַיֹּאמְרוּ הַגַּה חַג ה' בְּשָׁלוֹ מִיְמִים יָמִימָה אֲשֶׁר **מִצְפוֹנֶה לְבֵית אֵל מִזְרְחָה הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ לְמְסְלֶּה הָעֹלֶה מִבֵּית אֵל שְׁכֶמֶה וּמְנֶּגֶב לְלְבוֹנָה:שוּפטים כא, יט 2. וּגְבוּל יָם וְהָיָה לְכֶם הַנָּדוֹל וּגְבוּל זֵה יָהְיָה לְכֶם גָּבוּל יָם:ב***מדבו לד, ו*
 - 3. שפתים ישק משיב דברים נכחים: משלי כד, כו
- I משנה ב"נ boundary cities of the Land for purposes of בפ"נ ובפ"נ
 - a אשקלון (קדש נפתלי) and east; עכו and north, אשקלון and south (and Mediterranean to the west)
 - i dissent: עכו ר"מ is considered part of א"י
 - ii *Challenge*: (to implication that עכו is the northern border) ruling that if one was walking north from ינוע towards (a city on the Lebanese coast), to the east is דו"ל and to the west is כזיב
 - iii *Answer*: there is a strip of א"י that continues north from עכו
 - 1 Challenge: why would the תנא mention such a narrow strip of א"י
 - 2 Response: we find the same in תנ"ך v. 1
- II Bringing a א"י to א"י in a boat (if it was written on the boat)
 - a בפ"נ ובפ"נ considered as א"י no need for ברייתאו
 - b בפ"ג ובפ"ג considered as חו"ל must declare בפ"ג ובפ"ג
 - c resolution: ר' יהודה/רבנו:
 - i *if*: a boat is entering א"י, anything growing on it is חייב במעשר etc.
 - ii *qualifier*: ר' יהודה only if the boat is scraping the seabed
 - d alternately: both are ר' יהודה it is considered א"י if the boat is scraping the seabed
 - e *tangential suggestion*: food growing in a pot with holes in the bottom, resting on pegs its status vis-à-vis תרו"מ depends on the dispute between ר'י יהודה/רבנן
 - i *rejection*: perhaps ר' only requires איי with a boat, which travels; or רבנן consider the boat א"י because there is no airspace between the material growing on the boat, the boat and sea; but here, there is airspace
 - f alternate take on the ברייתות. not referring to a boat in the rivers of א"י. all agree that that is א"י.
 - i rather: dispute is about a boat in the Mediterranean regarding range of territorial waters of א"י
 - 1 (נחל מצרים); line stretched from NW border (נחל מצרים) to SW border (נחל מצרים); anything within that line is
 - 2 '77: line stretched from NW border out to Gibraltar, and line stretched from SW border to Gibraltar (v. 2)
 - (a) רבנן use v. 2 to include islands (ר' יהודה islands need no special verse)
- III status of Syria (first conquered by דוד)
 - a question asked: if someone sells a slave to Syria, is that considered selling to חו"ל (automatically goes free)?
 - i Answer: from our משנה even ר"מ only extended א"י to include גיטין, only for גיטין
 - \rightarrow חו"ל is חו"ל for slaves; certainly north of חו"ל וועכו
 - ii Associated ברייתא there are 3 ways in which Syria is like מר"ל and 3 in which it is דר"ל.
 - 1 שמא (as per טמא (as per גורת טומאת ארץ העמים); selling a slave there goes free; bringing a אם must say בפ"נ
 - 2 *י"*א
 - (a) 1: obligated in מעשר ושביעית since this תנא holds that כיבוש is a full כיבוש
 - (b) 2: may enter בטהרה even בי, who disallows entering חו"ל in a box/sedan, would allow it here
 - (c) 3: buying a house here is like buying in יישוב איי; meaning, he may instruct a non-Jew to sign the deed on יישוב א"י due to the importance of יישוב א"י
- IV Tangent: If a slave appears with a writ from his master stating: "You and my possessions are given to you" he only acquires his own freedom; not the possessions
 - a Question: what if the document stated "and all my possessions"
 - b אביי: since he acquires himself, he acquires the possessions as well
 - i אביי (later): since he can't acquire the possessions, he can't acquire himself
 - ורבא: in either case, he acquires himself (parallel to גט his "hand" comes with the writ) but not possessions
 - i note: this seems to follow מ'ר"ש 's opinion (פאה ג:ח), in spite of יוסי's praise for "ר"ע (v. 3), והלכה כר"מ
 - challenge: מתנת שכיב מרע ruled that a מתנת שכיב מרע can be reverted for possession, but not for freeing his slave
 - (a) explanation: we see that מכפלגינן דיבורא) accepts the principle of "splitting the words" (פלגינן דיבורא)
 - (b) and: he rules against מיש since the גיט isn't a complete excision, since the master held some possessions
- $V \quad \mbox{\em '}$: situations where we rely on validation of signatures if there is a challenge
 - a *note*: challenge must be made by the husband; else a challenge of 1 isn't heard, if 2 then its 2 vs. 2 and why would we believe the witnesses (אם יש עליו עדים יתקיים בחותמיו)
 - b if it is brought within א"י or if brought from חו"ל and he can't declare בפ"ג בפ"ג