



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

**Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h**  
**Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

Mav the studing of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and mav their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

[The Gemora cited a Mishna: If a small courtyard was breached into a large one, the (movement of objects on the Shabbos in the) large one is permitted but forbidden in the small one, because the gap is regarded as an entrance to the large one. The Gemora asked: Now, if this (a lechi which is seen only on the outside) is valid, then the movement of objects in the small courtyard should also be permitted, through the lechis (on both sides) that are seen on the outside though they are flush on the inside? The Gemora answered as follows: 1. **Rabbi Zeira** replied: This is a case where **the walls of the small one project into the large one** (so that the remaining sections of the common wall on either side of the breach cannot possibly be regarded as lechis of the entrance). 2. **Ravina** explained that the principle of lavud does not apply for this is a case where **the projections were removed by two tefachim from one wall and by four from the other**. 3. The Mishna is following the opinion of **Rebbe**, who holds that **two lechis (one on each side) are necessary**.]

The Gemora asks: But what kind of explanation is this? If you concede that a lechi that can be seen from outside but is flush from inside cannot be regarded as a valid lechi (and accordingly, the Mishna can be explained in its simple manner that the small courtyard is situated in the center of the larger one, and there are three tefachim of wall space on both sides of the breach), and that Rebbe holds the same view as Rabbi Yosi (that the minimum width of a lechi must be three tefachim, and how much more so, that of a sidepost of a courtyard wall) and that the replies of Rabbi Zeira and Ravina are not to be accepted, it will be quite understandable why the measurement of the small

courtyard was given as ten amos and that of the large one as eleven, the reason being that he (Rebbe) is of the same opinion as Rabbi Yosi (who maintains that a lechi must be at least three tefachim wide). [The one amah (six tefachim) by which the length of the wall of the larger courtyard exceeds that of the smaller one allows for two lechis, each of the width of three tefachim, one on either side of the breach, and thereby the permissibility of the use of the larger courtyard is effected. The object of the measurements given would thus be to indicate the grounds on which the permissibility of the use of the larger courtyard is based.] If, however, you contend that a lechi that can be seen from the outside, though it is flush from the inside may be regarded as a valid lechi, and that the replies of Rabbi Zeira and Ravina are to be accepted, and that Rebbe is not of the same opinion as Rabbi Yosi, what then was the purpose of giving the measurement of the large courtyard as eleven amos? For whatever the explanation advanced, it is unnecessary; for if it be suggested that the objective was to explain why the large courtyard was permitted, it could well be objected that a length of ten amos and two tefachim would have been enough (for a lechi of any width is valid), and if the objective was to provide a reason for the prohibition of the small courtyard, why did he not inform us of a case where the walls were much wider apart (and the principle of lavud would not apply)?

Therefore, it must be concluded that a lechi that can be seen from outside but is flush on the inside cannot be regarded as a valid lechi. This is indeed conclusive.

Rav Yosef remarked: I did not hear that reported ruling (from Rav Huna). Abaye said to him: You yourself told us that ruling, and it was in connection with the following that you told it to us, for Rami bar Abba said in the name of Rav Huna that a *lechi* which formed an extension of the wall of a *mavoi* (its edge touching the edge of the *mavoi* wall; from the inside the *lechi* was not visible; it was, however, visible from the outside, for it was thinner than the wall), provided it was less than four *amos* in length, may be regarded as a valid *lechi*, and one may carry in the *mavoi* until the *lechi*'s inner edge. If, however, it was four *amos* long, it must be regarded as a *mavoi*, and it is forbidden to carry in any part of the *mavoi*. And you (Rav Yosef) told us in connection with this that three rulings may be inferred from this statement: 1. It may be inferred that the space between the *lechis* is a forbidden domain; 2. it may be inferred that the minimum length of a *mavoi* is four *amos*; 3. it may also be inferred that a *lechi* that can be seen from the outside, though it is flush on the inside may be regarded as a valid *lechi*.

The *Gemora* concludes: And the law is that a post that a *lechi* that can be seen from the outside, though it is flush on the inside may be regarded as a valid *lechi*.

The *Gemora* asks: This opinion was refuted and nevertheless, it is the law!?

The *Gemora* answers: Yes, because Rabbi Chiya taught a *braisa* in agreement with him.

The *Mishna* had stated: And any entranceway (of a *mavoi*) that is wider than ten *amos* should be reduced.

Abaye said: A *braisa* taught: And any entranceway (of a *mavoi*) that is wider than ten *amos* should be reduced, but

Rabbi Yehudah ruled that it was not necessary to reduce it.

The *Gemora* asks: But up to what extent (according to R' Yehudah) is reduction unnecessary?

Rav Achai suggested before Rav Yosef: To the extent of thirteen and a third *amos*. This may be deduced through the following *kal vachomer*, from the law relating to enclosing boards around wells<sup>1</sup>: If in the case of enclosing boards around wells, where the use of the wells is permitted even though the gaps of the enclosure exceed the walled portions, no gap wider than thirteen *amos* and a third is permitted, then in the case of a *mavoi*, where it is not permitted for the gaps to exceed the walled portions, how much more reason is there that no opening wider than thirteen and a third *amos* should be permitted.

The *Gemora* asks: But in fact this very law provides ground for an argument to the contrary: in the case of enclosing boards around wells, where the use of the wells was permitted even if the gaps of the enclosure exceeded the walled portions, no gap wider than thirteen and a third *amos* could well be permitted, but in the case of a *mavoi*, the use of which is not permitted where the gaps exceeded their walled portions, an opening wider than thirteen and a third *amos* may well be permitted.

Alternatively, the argument might run in the opposite direction: Regarding enclosing boards around wells, since the law was relaxed in one respect, it could also be relaxed in another, but regarding a *mavoi*, no opening wider than ten *amos* should be allowed at all!

Levi taught a *braisa*: If an entranceway to a *mavoi* was twenty *amos* wide, a pole may be inserted (into the

<sup>1</sup> In order to allow one to draw water from a well on Shabbos that is situated in a public domain, one may erect four double-posts, one at each corner of the enclosure. These posts, which are two single posts at right angles, have the appearance of being eight posts. The area is

then regarded as a private domain, although the combined length of the boards makes up only a small portion of the entire perimeter of the area.



ground) in the center of it and this is sufficient (*for now, there is no gap more than ten amos wide*).

The *Gemora* notes: He himself has taught it and he himself said that the *halachah* is not in agreement with that teaching. [*This is because the empty space, being greater than the walled portion, i.e., the pole, on both sides of the pole annuls the existence of the pole.*]

There were those who said: Shmuel said in the name of Levi that the *halachah* was not in agreement with that teaching.

The *Gemora* asks: How, then, does one reduce it?

Shmuel said in the name of Levi: A strip of boarding of the height of ten *tefachim* by four *amos* may be constructed, and this is placed (*in the middle of the entranceway*) parallel to the length of the *mavoi*. [*Since a length of four amos constitutes a mavoi wall, the one wide entrance may now be regarded as consisting of two narrower mavois.*]

Alternatively, one may proceed in accordance with the advice of Rav Yehudah, who ruled that where an entranceway to a *mavoi* was fifteen *amos* wide, a strip of boarding of three *amos* (*in length*) may be constructed at a distance of two *amos* (*from one of the walls of the mavoi*). [*This would leave an entrance of ten amos in width between the boarding and the opposite wall of the mavoi. The space of two amos between the boarding and the wall close to it is deemed to be closed and forming together with the boarding a virtual wall five amos in length, the validity of such a wall being recognized on the ground that the walled portion of this wall (three amos) is larger than its gap (two amos). Likewise, where the entrance is twenty amos wide, a similar boarding is also set up near the other wall, or a board six amos in length is placed four amos away from one of the walls.*]

The *Gemora* asks: But why (*is this necessary*)? Couldn't one put up a board of the width of one *amah* and a half (*adjoining the wall*) and at a distance of two *amos* from it,

another board of the width of one *amah* and a half? May then one infer from this that walled portions on the two sides of a breach in it, though jointly exceeding the width of the breach, are not to be regarded as valid wall?

The *Gemora* disagrees: In fact it may be maintained that walled portions separated by a breach are elsewhere regarded as a valid wall, but here it is different, since the open space (*ten amos*) on the one side (*of the intermediate board*) and the open space (*two amos*) on its other side come to destroy its legal existence.

The *Gemora* asks: Then why shouldn't one put up adjoining one of the walls a board one *amah* wide, and at a distance of one *amah* from that board, place another board one *amah* wide, and at a distance of one *amah* from the second board, place a third board one *amah* wide? May then one infer from this that where the walled portions are equal in size to the gaps, the space it enclosed is forbidden?

The *Gemora* disagrees: In fact it may be maintained that elsewhere this is permitted, but here it is different, since the open space on the one side of the third board and the open space on its other side come to destroy its legal existence.

The *Gemora* asks: Then why shouldn't one put up a board of one *amah* and a half in width at a distance of one *amah* from one of the walls and another board of the width of one *amah* and a half at a distance of one *amah* from the first board?

The *Gemora* answers: This could indeed be done, but the Rabbis did not wish to put a man through so much trouble.

The *Gemora* asks on Rav Yehudah: But shouldn't the possibility be taken into consideration that one might abandon the bigger opening and enter by the smaller one? [*The smaller opening is not provided with a lechi, and the lechi which is fixed at the larger opening, which is now no*



longer used as an entrance, loses its status as a valid lechi; it emerges that the mavoi would remain unprovided for by any valid lechi, and movement of objects in it on the Shabbos would be forbidden.]

Rav Adda bar Masnah replied: There is a legal presumption that no man would forsake a big opening and enter by a small one.

The Gemora asks: But why does this case differ from that of Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Assi (on Daf 5a, where provision was made against the possibility of one using the smaller opening in preference to the bigger one)?

The Gemora answers: There, one might use the smaller opening as a short cut (for the gap is in the side wall of the mavoi), but here, it cannot be used as a short cut (for both entrances are in the same side of the mavoi).

It was taught in a Mishna (braisa) elsewhere: The leather straps of a stool and its hole combine to (constitute the minimum of) a tefach (and is regarded as a "roof," which can bring corpse tumah to a susceptible item found under the same roof as certain parts of a corpse).

The Gemora asks: What is meant by 'the leather straps of a stool'?

Rabbah bar bar Chanah said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: The leather covering a latrine seat.

The Gemora asks: And how large can the hole be (that the seat can still be regarded as "closed")?

When Rav Dimi came (to Bavel), he stated: An area of two fingers of leather on the one side (of the hole) and an area of two fingers on the other side, and a hole of the size of two fingers in the center (for a total of six tefachim).

When Ravin came (to Bavel), he stated: An area of a finger and a half of leather on the one side (of the hole) and an

area of a finger and a half on the other side, and a hole of the size of one finger in the center (for a total of four tefachim).

Abaye said to Rav Dimi: Are you in dispute (with Ravin)?

He replied: No, one of us (Ravin) referred to a large finger (the thumb) and the other to the small finger, and there is no real difference of opinion between us.

Abaye retorted: Indeed, you do differ, and your difference emerges in a case where the walled portions exceed its breach (only when combining the width) on both sides. According to your view, the walled portions situated on the two sides (of the breach) do combine (and that is why it is regarded as closed when the straps on each side are two fingers wide and the hole is two fingers wide, for although each side does not exceed the hole, both sides combine to exceed the size of the hole); but according to Ravin's view, when it exceeds on one side (as in his case, where the straps are each one and a half fingers' wide, and the hole is only one finger wide), it is regarded as "walled," but if they exceed only due to the combination of both sides, they cannot combine.

Abaye proves his point: For, if you would imagine that you have no difference of opinion on this point, Ravin should have stated as follows: An area of a finger and a half of leather on the one side (of the hole) and an area of a finger and a half on the other side, and a hole of the size of one finger in the center (for a total of four tefachim).

Rav Dimi asked Abaye: What then do you suggest - that we do indeed differ? Shouldn't my statement then have been as follows: An area of a finger and two thirds of leather on the one side (of the hole) and an area of a finger and two thirds on the other side, and a hole of the size of two and two-thirds fingers in the center (for a total of six tefachim). Rather, if it must be said that we differ, our difference would be regarding the case where the gap is equal to the walled portions. (9b – 10b)



## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Levi and Shmuel say that in order to permit an entranceway twenty *amos* wide, one must put a ten *tefachim* high wall that is four *amos* long between the two entranceways.

What exactly does this accomplish?

The Ritva quotes Rashi as explaining that this essentially creates two separate entranceways of less than ten *amos* each. This seems consistent with the opinion that the minimum length of an entranceway is four *amos*, which is why a four *amos* divider is needed.

Alternatively, the Ritva explains that it really is still considered one entranceway. The four *amah* divider is merely a “sign.”

The Ritva continues that Tosfos holds that this essentially makes the entranceway have the shape of a letter “ches” (with the entrance of the entranceway being the bottom of the ches).

Tosfos therefore says that there cannot be from the inner back wall of the entranceway to the start of the divider more than ten *amos*, as then this become a “*pirtzah*” -- “gap” that requires a “*tzuras ha’pesach*.”

However, the Ritva disagrees with Tosfos. Firstly, he states, the *Gemora* should have mentioned this. Additionally, the *Gemora* presumably is trying to tell us the easiest way to fix this situation. If a *tzuras ha’pesach* is going to be required in the back, why didn’t the *Gemora* merely say to make a *tzuras ha’pesach* in front of the entranceway and omit having to put a divider at the entrance as well? If there is a *tzuras ha’pesach* at the front, there is no need for a divider at the back, as the entranceway will not be shaped like a *ches*!

The Ritva therefore holds that there is no need for a *tzuras ha’pesach* in the back of the entranceway.