

**רבי יהודה אומר כל שכנגד ארץ ישראל כולי –**

**א"י etc. is considered anyplace that is facing א"י says anyplace that is facing א"י**

## **OVERVIEW**

The גמרא concluded that the ברייתא of בא"י follows the opinion of ר' יהודה who maintains that כל שכנגד א"י הרי הוא כא"י. There are those<sup>1</sup> who are of the opinion that if a rectangle were drawn, in which the eastern border is the seashore of א"י, the western border is the אוקיינוס, and the north and south borders are the two lines drawn respectively from קפלוּרִיא and נחל מצרים to the אוקיינוס; anything within this rectangle whether lands or islands would be considered א"י. Our תוספות discusses the ramifications of this view, as well as alternate views.

-----  
תוספות poses a question:

**שאל רבינו פטר לרבינו תם דבזמן הזה היה להתחייב לרבי יהודה<sup>2</sup> במעשר -**

**asked the ר"ת, that nowadays there should be an obligation according to ר"י to tithe -**

**שאנו במערבה של ארץ ישראל -**

**For we (in France<sup>3</sup>) are west of א"י; therefore we who are living<sup>4</sup> א"י should be considered כא"י.** הרי הוא כא"י.

תוספות answers:

**והשיב דלא קיימא לן כרבי יהודה -**

**And the ר"ת responded to ר"פ that we do not endorse the opinion of ר"י.**

We maintain as the חכמים state that only those islands that are within the line drawn from נחל מצרים to טורי אמנון is considered א"י; anything west of this line is חו"ל.

תוספות asks an additional question: According to the conclusion of the גמרא, the ברייתא of ר' יהודה is following the opinion of ר"י, that the ים הגדול and the surrounding lands have the status of א"י. Therefore a גט brought in a ספינה from anywhere within the previously defined vicinity of the ים הגדול does not require בפ"נ.

**אבל קשה וכי רבי יהודה היה מכיר בכל ארץ ישראל עד אוקיינוס -**

---

<sup>1</sup> רבינו פטר (and by inference the ר"ת). He was a תלמיד of ר"ת and רשב"ם and lived in France. He was killed during the second crusade (1146-1147) עקה"ש.

<sup>2</sup> The רש"י amends this to read 'היה לנו להתחייב במעשר'. See נח"מ.

<sup>3</sup> It seems that the טורי אמנון were so far north, that (part of) France was included in the area of א"י. (?). See אמ"ה # 38-39.

<sup>4</sup> See 'Overview'.

**However there is another difficulty; was ר"י indeed familiar with all of א"י until the (Atlantic) ocean; that he knew for a fact -**

**שכולם היו בקיאים לשמה או שעדים מצויין לקיימם שאין צריך לומר בפני נכתב -**

**That there were all בקיאים לשמה or that there are sufficient witnesses to be מקיים the גיטין that arrive from these faraway places, that בפ"נ is not required to be said.** It does not seem likely that ר"י would know this. Therefore the question remains; how can he maintain that המביא גט בספינה כמביא בא"י; when we are not sure that they are בקיאים לשמה or that there are לקיימו מצויין?

replies: תוספות

**לכך יש לומר דלא כבשו הכל עולי בבל -**

**Therefore we should say that the עולי בבל did not conquer all** this territory (that surrounds the הגדול ים). Consequently, even though in the ראשון בית it was considered א"י<sup>5</sup>, nevertheless from the times of the שני בית onwards it did not have the status of א"י.

offers another explanation: תוספות

**אי נמי כדפירש בקונטרס דכל שכנגד ארץ ישראל היינו כל הים שכנגד ארץ ישראל -**

**Or we can say as רש"י explained<sup>6</sup> that the phrase 'anything that faces א"י' means the entire sea that faces א"י.** But -

**דלא איירי ביבשה שעד אוקיינוס אלא בנסין שבים הגדול דווקא -**

**We are not referring to the lands that extend till the ocean that are abutting the הגדול ים; they certainly do not have a דין of א"י, rather ר"י is referring specifically to the islands that are in the הגדול ים; it is to them that he attributes the status of א"י -**

**כדכתיב (יהושע ז') עד ים הגדול מבוא השמש יהיה גבולכם -**

**As it is written in the יהושע 'until the הגדול ים where the sun sets that will be your boundary' -**

**וכתיב (שמות כג') ושתי את גבולך מים סוף ועד ים פלשתים וממדבר עד הנהר -**

**And it is written; 'I will place your boundary from ים סוף till the sea of פלשתים and from the desert till the river'.**

<sup>5</sup> עולי בבל seems to be saying that since (all) the lands within the rectangle were not conquered by the עולי בבל, therefore these places do indeed have to say בפ"נ (and they are ממעשר since they are חו"ל). However ר"י is discussing המביא גט בספינה. A גט written in a ספינה within the הגדול ים itself (and perhaps also if it is written in the islands within the הגדול ים), is considered to be written in א"י, in regard to not saying בפ"נ. See 'Thinking it over' #1.

<sup>6</sup> בד"ה מן החוט

<sup>7</sup> פסוק ד'

<sup>8</sup> פסוק לא

**פירוש ים סוף לצד דרום ים פלשתים לצד מערב מדבר למזרח נהר פרת לצד צפון -**  
The explanation of these boundaries is<sup>9</sup>: **ים סוף is the southern boundary, the sea of פלשתים<sup>10</sup> is the western border, the desert to the east and the river פרת is the northern border.** These two פסוקים indicate that the western boundary of א"י includes the sea and by inference the islands of the sea; but not the lands that surround the sea<sup>11</sup>.

ועוד יש לומר שהיה יודע שהיו כולם בקיאים לשמה

**And in addition one may say that all the lands within this imaginary rectangle are indeed א"י; for indeed ר"י did know that all these Jews living west of א"י, they were all לשמה<sup>12</sup> -**

תוספות offers a final explanation reverting to the original hypothesis:

**לפי שהיה ידוע להם עד היכן ישראל עומדין -**

**Because it was known to the חכמים of that era, until where the Jews lived west of א"י.** They did not live in the entire area of the ים הגדול till אוקיינוס. Rather they lived in a limited area of the ים הגדול, closer to א"י, and ר"י knew that those Jews were בקיאים לשמה -

**ומשם ואילך לא היו ישראל עד סוף העולם כדאמרין בסוף מנחות (דף קי, א) -**

**And from there westward there were no Jews till the end of the world, as the גמרא says in the end of מנחות** -

**מצור כלפי מערב ומקרטיגיני כלפי מזרח אין מכירין לא ישראל ולא אביהם שבשמים:**  
**From the city of צור heading westward and from the city of קרטיגיני heading eastward;** the peoples in those lands west of צור and east of קרטיגיני **are aware neither of the Jews nor of their Father in heaven.** We see from the גמרא that the חכמים had a precise knowledge as to where בני"י lived. Therefore we may say that they knew that the Jews who lived west of א"י were בקיאים לשמה.

## **SUMMARY**

There are two interpretations of שיטת ר"י concerning the western border of א"י. According to תוספות, all the land encompassed by the borders delineated by ר"י, are א"י. We however do not follow the ruling of ר"י, therefore even

<sup>9</sup> See 'Thinking it over' #4.

<sup>10</sup> The ים פלשתים is synonymous with the ים הגדול.

<sup>11</sup> See 'Thinking it over' #3.

<sup>12</sup> תוספות does not mention anything concerning עדים מצויין לקיימו. Perhaps since they were close to א"י and בל"י אות קסב. See עדים מצויין לקיימו. It is assumable that there were בקיאים לשמה.

those who live within these borders are not required to be מפריש מעשר.

Concerning the question how can one assume that the people in those countries are בקיאים לשמה and/or מצויין לקיימו to exempt them from saying בפ"נ תוספות offers various solutions.

א"י maintains that the whole aforementioned area is considered א"י in the times of ראשון only, however since לא כבשוהו עולי בבל therefore בפ"נ is required if a גט was brought from one of these countries. However, if המביא is from the הגדול (or from the נסין שבים), then בפ"נ is not required. The requirement of עולי בבל does not apply to the proper (or to its islands).

An alternate explanation is that the חכמים actually knew precisely where the גט was brought from those countries bordering the הגדול. A גט that was brought from those countries bordering the הגדול are not required to say בפ"נ.

The other option is to accept the opinion of רש"י, who states that א"י maintains that only the הגדול and the נסין שבים are א"י; the lands bordering the הגדול are not part of א"י.

### **THINKING IT OVER**

1. Why are the lands bordering א"י required to say בפ"נ since לא כבשוהו עולי א"י? <sup>14</sup> however the הגדול is considered א"י; <sup>13</sup> בבבלי
2. Is there a practical difference between שיטת תוספות that לא כבשוהו עולי בבל and שיטת רש"י who maintains that כל שכנגד א"י וכו' refers only to the נסין שבים?
3. תוספות supports שיטת רש"י from two פסוקים; <sup>15</sup> however רש"י supports his view based on a different פסוק. <sup>16</sup> Why do they differ?
4. Why is it necessary for תוספות to explain in detail the פסוק of 'ושתי וגו' <sup>17</sup> It seems he may be negating a simpler interpretation.

---

<sup>13</sup> See footnote # 5.

<sup>14</sup> See נח"מ and בל"י אות ו'.

<sup>15</sup> See footnote # 11.

<sup>16</sup> See מהר"ם שי"ף. רש"י סד"ה ר' יהודה.

<sup>17</sup> See footnote # 9.

5. According to רש"י if one brings a גט מנסין שבים according to ר"י there is no requirement to say בפ"נ. Why not?!

6. תוספות offers three answers to his question 'how did ר"י know they were רבינו' of שיטה. The first and third answers seemingly follow the שיטה of רבינו לשמה בקיין לשמה. The first and third answers seemingly follow the שיטה of רבינו לשמה בקיין לשמה; while the second answer follows שיטת רש"י. Why did not תוספות group the answers according to the שיטות?