



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o'h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Rabbi Zakkai taught the following *braisa* in the presence of Rabbi Yochanan: The space between the *lechis* (*between a lechi and the opposite wall*) and beneath the *korah* is subject to the laws of a *karmelis*¹. Rabbi Yochanan told him: Go out and recite this outside (*an expression of disapproval; this version of the braisa has been corrupted*). [R' Yochanan holds that the space mentioned is regarded as a part of the *mavoi* in which the free movement of objects is permitted.]

Abaye said: It stands to reason that the view of Rabbi Yochanan applies to the space under the *korah*, but that between the *lechis* is forbidden.

Rava, however, said: The space between the *lechis* is also permitted.

Rava said: From where do I know to say this? It is because when Rav Dimi came (to Bavel) he reported in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: A place which is less than four *tefachim* by four *tefachim*, the residents both of (*the adjoining*) public and private domain may rearrange their burdens upon it, provided that they do not exchange (*from private to public or vice versa*). [*This would lead people erroneously to assume that it is permitted to carry from a public domain into a private domain or vice versa. For a similar reason, the space between the lechis, not being of sufficient size to constitute a domain of its own,*

assumes the same status as the spot spoken of by R' Yochanan.]

The Gemora notes that Abaye would explain it as follows: There (*Rav Dimi is referring to a case where*), the place was three *tefachim* in height. [*Since it is a clearly defined spot, it may be regarded as an 'exempt area.'* The space between the *lechis*, however, being comparatively small and level with the ground, is not in any way distinguishable from the domains adjoining it; and, if its use were permitted, people would erroneously assume that it is permitted to carry objects from a public domain into a private domain or vice versa.]

Abaye said: From where do I know to say this? It is because Rav Chama bar Gurya said in the name of Rav: That which lies within the entranceway (*where the posts of the entranceway can be regarded as lechis*) requires another *lechi* to permit it (*to carry in the entranceway itself*). [*Evidently, Rav maintains that one cannot carry between the lechis.*] And should you suggest that this is one where the area is four *tefachim* by four (and due to its size, it is regarded as a *karmelis*, and therefore Rabbinically forbidden to carry in it); surely, Rav Chanin bar Rava said in the name of Rav: That which lies within the entranceway – even if it is not four *tefachim* by four *tefachim* – requires another *lechi* to permit it! [*Evidently, Rav maintains that one cannot carry between the lechis, even if the area is less than four tefachim deep.*]

¹ It is an area which is neither a public nor private domain – it is neutral, known as an exempt area. By Biblical law, one may carry from a *karmelis* to a public or a private domain, or vice versa. However, regarding certain exempt areas, the Rabbis decreed that one may not carry from a *karmelis* to a public or a private domain, or vice versa.

The *Gemora* notes that Rava would explain it as follows: There (*Rav* is referring to a case where), the *mavoi* opens out into a *karmelis* (and not a public domain).

The *Gemora* asks: Is this, however, permitted where the *mavoi* opens out into a public domain? The citizen then would be on the ground and the stranger is on the highest heavens (an expression noting the absurdity of the logic)!? [The reverse surely should be expected. If an opening to a *karmelis*, which is only a Rabbinically forbidden domain, requires a *lechi*; how much more so one that opens into a public domain, which is Biblically forbidden!]

The *Gemora* answers: Yes, the one kind has found its own kind and is awakened. [The space within the entrance is a place of exemption, so if it is situated between a private and a public domain, it retains its auxiliary relationship to the private domain, and one may carry into it from the *mavoi*. If, however, it adjoins a *karmelis* on one side, it is regarded as being a *karmelis* itself, and therefore, it is forbidden to carry there.]

Rav Huna the son of Rabbi Yehoshua said to Rava: Do you not uphold the view that (according to R' Yochanan, the space) between the *lechis* is forbidden? Surely, Rabbah bar bar Chanah stated in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: If (a section of one side of) a *mavoi* was lined with *lechis* (fixed within distances of) less than four *tefachim* between each other, we come to the dispute between Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel and the Rabbis (regarding the concept of *lavud* – the virtual closing of a gap less than three *tefachim*, or even less than four *tefachim*).

Rav Huna explains: Now this obviously means, does it not, that according to Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, who ruled that (in respect of gaps less than four *tefachim*, the law of) *lavud* is applied, one is allowed to carry (in the *mavoi* only) up to the inner edge of the innermost *lechi* (since all the *lechis* are deemed to be united into one single unit, the space between this edge and the entrance of the

mavoi is subject to the law of the 'space between the *lechis*', and therefore, from that point and on, it is forbidden to carry), and that according to the Rabbis, who ruled (in respect of gaps more than three *tefachim*, the law of) *lavud* is not applied, one is allowed to carry (in the *mavoi* only) up to the inner edge of the outermost *lechi*, but (the carrying in the space) between the *lechis* is unanimously forbidden?

The *Gemora* notes that Rava will answer that there also, it refers to a case where the *mavoi* opens out into a *karmelis* (and not a public domain).

The *Gemora* asks: Is this, however, permitted where the *mavoi* opens out into a public domain? The citizen then would be on the ground and the stranger is on the highest heavens (an expression noting the absurdity of the logic)!? [The reverse surely should be expected. If an opening to a *karmelis*, which is only a Rabbinically forbidden domain, requires a *lechi*; how much more so one that opens into a public domain, which is Biblically forbidden!]

The *Gemora* answers: Yes, the one kind has found its own kind and is awakened.

Rav Ashi replied (defending Rava from Rav Huna's challenge): This refers to a case where one side of the *mavoi* was lined with *lechis* (placed at distances of) less than four *tefachim* between each other along four *amos* of its length. According to Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, who ruled that (in respect of gaps less than four *tefachim*, the law of) *lavud* is applied, (the space bordered by the *lechis*) is deemed to be a *mavoi*, which (due to its size) requires an additional *lechi* to render it permissible, and according to the Rabbis who ruled (in respect of gaps more than three *tefachim*, the law of) *lavud* is not applied, no other *lechi* is required to render it permissible.

The *Gemora* asks: But even according to Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, why should this *mavoi* not be permitted as one having a *lechi* that may be seen from the outside (*for it was usual for the lechis to protrude into the street*), though it appears flush on the inside (*and therefore, no additional lechi should be required*)?

The *Gemora* answers: Isn't this explanation required only in respect of a statement of Rabbi Yochanan? But, surely, when Ravin came (*to Bavel*), he reported in the name of Rabbi Yochanan that a *lechi* that may be seen from the outside but is flush from the inside cannot be regarded as a valid *lechi*.

It was stated: A *lechi* that is seen from the inside but is flush from the outside is regarded as a valid *lechi*, but if it is seen from the outside and is flush from the inside, there is a difference of opinion between Rabbi Chiya and Rabbi Shimon the son of Rebbe. One maintains that it is regarded as a valid *lechi*, and the other maintains that it is not regarded as a valid *lechi*.

The *Gemora* notes: You may conclude that it was Rabbi Chiya who maintained that it is regarded as a valid *lechi*, for Rabbi Chiya taught a *braisa*: A wall of which one side recedes more than the other, whether (*the result is that*) the *lechi* (*formed by the recess*) can be seen from the outside and is flush from the inside, or whether (*a wall of a mavoi which is indented in the back; the result being that*) it can be seen from the inside and is flush on the outside, may be regarded as (*being provided with*) a *lechi*. This is indeed conclusive.

The *Gemora* asks: Didn't Rabbi Yochanan, however, hear this *braisa* (*as well*)? But (*what you might contend is*) that he did hear it, but he did not agree with it; is it then not possible that Rabbi Chiya also did not agree with it?

The *Gemora* answers: What is the logic behind this argument? It might well be contended that Rabbi Yochanan did not agree with it, and that it was for this

reason that he did not teach it (*this braisa*); but Rabbi Chiya - if it is a fact that he did not agree with it, what was the purpose for him to teach it?

Rabbah the son of Rav Huna said: A *lechi* that is seen from the outside though it is flush from the inside is regarded as a valid *lechi*.

Rabbah said: We, however, raised an objection against this traditional ruling (*from the following 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. 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?

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*).

The *Gemora* asks: But why shouldn't the principle of *lavud* be applied (*which would result that the projections of the walls of the smaller yard would be deemed joined to the walls of the larger one and thus form lechis*), so that the use of the smaller courtyard also might be permitted?

And should you reply that the walls were too far apart (*to apply the principle of lavud; i.e., they extended more than three tefachim*); surely Rav Adda bar Avimi taught the following *braisa* in the presence of Rabbi Chanina: The ruling applies to a case where the small courtyard was ten (*amos wide*) and the large one eleven *amos*? [*The common wall of the two courtyards was ten amos in length and extended on either side, in the larger*

courtyard only, to a length of eleven amos, so that the joint length of the remaining sections of this wall cannot be more than one amah, or six tefachim. Assuming that the small courtyard is centered between the walls of the larger one, this allows no more than about three tefachim for each side, from which, again, allowance must be made for the thickness of the projections, leaving a space of less than three tefachim, to which the principle of *lavud* may well be applied.]

Ravina replied: This is a case where the projections were removed by two *tefachim* from one wall and by four from the other.

The *Gemora* asks: Then let *lavud* be applied to one side and thereby the smaller courtyard would be permitted?

The *Gemora* answers: The *Mishna* is following the opinion of Rebbe, who holds that two *lechis* (one on each side) are necessary, for it was taught in a *braisa*: a courtyard (which opens into a public domain) is permitted with one *lechi*. Rebbe, however, maintains: Two are required. (9a – 10a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

There are three opinions quoted in the *Gemora* regarding whether or not it is permitted to carry directly under a *korah* or between two *lechis*. Rabbi Zakai stated that it is forbidden. Abaye understands that Rabbi Yochanan understands it is permitted to carry under a beam, but not between two *lechis*. Rava understands that it is permitted to carry in both cases.

The *Keren Orah* discusses at length the possible differences between a *korah* and a *lechi* that would affect this law. His understanding regarding a *korah* is as follows. As we know, the *Gemora* (5a) cites an argument regarding whether a *korah* acts as a wall or as a reminder.

It is possible that it is permitted to carry under a *korah* if one holds that the outside part of a *korah* goes down and forms a wall, closing the alleyway. This would mean that the inside part is within the alleyway. Alternatively, one can say that a *korah* acts to remind people that they can carry up to a certain point. If the reminder is affected by the outer part of the *korah*, one can clearly carry until that point. Clearly, if one holds the opposite of these two statements, that the wall or reminder is formed by the inner part of the *korah*, one cannot carry under the thickness of the *korah*.