



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 Yochanan ben Berokah ruled. One taught: Their views are almost identical. But are they at all alike, seeing that the view of Rabbi Yochanan is that a kav provides four meals whereas that of Rabbi Shimon is that a kav provides nine meals? Rav Chisda replied: Deduct¹ a third² for the profit of the shopkeeper.³ But isn't the number of meals still nine according to the one Master and six according to the other? — Explain rather on the lines of another statement of Rav Chisda who said: Deduct a half for the profit of the shopkeeper. But don't they still amount to nine according to the one Master and to eight according to the other?⁴ This indeed is the reason why it was stated, 'Their views are almost identical'. Doesn't a contradiction, however, arise between the two statements of Rav Chisda?⁵ — There is really no contradiction since one statement refers to a place where the buyer supplies the wood⁶ while the other refers to one where the buyer does not supply the wood. (82b)

Half of this loaf is the size prescribed for a house afflicted with tzaraas, and the half of its half is the size that renders one's body tamei.

One Baraisa taught: And half of the half of its half is the size susceptible to tumah of food.⁷ But why didn't our Tanna mention the tumah of food? — Because their prescribed sizes⁸ are not in exact proportions. For it was taught: How much is half a peras? The size of two eggs minus a fraction; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. Rabbi Yosi ruled: Two large sized eggs. This was calculated by Rebbe to be the size of two eggs and a slight surplus. How much was that surplus? — A twentieth part of an egg. In respect of the tumah of food, however, it was taught: Rabbi Nassan and Rabbi Dosa explained that the size of the egg of which the Rabbis have spoken includes the egg itself and its shell,⁹ but the Sages explained: The egg only, exclusive of its shell.¹⁰

Rafram bar Pappa citing Rav Chisda stated: This is the ruling of Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Yosi, but the Sages ruled: The

¹ According to Rabbi Yochanan.

² Of the half-kav that is bought for a pundyon.

³ Though the shopkeeper buys at the rate of four se'ah for a sela, or half a kav for a pundyon, he sells at a higher price, leaving for himself a profit of one third of the purchase price. For each pundyon, therefore, he sells only two thirds of half a kav. Now, since $\frac{2}{3}$ of half a kav, or $\frac{1}{2} \times \frac{2}{3} = \frac{1}{3}$ of a kav, provide two meals, a kav obviously provides not four, but six meals.

⁴ Since according to Rabbi Yochanan the shopkeeper retains a profit of one half of his cost price, he would charge a pundyon not for half a kav (his cost price) but for a quarter of a kav (his selling price at a profit of fifty per cent); and since a quarter of a kav yields two meals a kav obviously yields $4 \times 2 = 8$ meals.

⁵ In one statement he asserts that a shopkeeper makes a profit of one third and in the other he raises it to one half.

⁶ For the baking of the bread. In such a case the profit of the shopkeeper is reduced to a third.

⁷ According to Rabbi Yochanan the size is three quarters of an egg. For, since he defined the size of a whole loaf as a quarter of a kav, or six eggs, the 'half of the half of its half' must be equal to $\frac{6}{2} \times \frac{2}{2} \times \frac{2}{2} = \frac{3}{4}$ of an egg. According to Rabbi Shimon, since a whole loaf is equal to $\frac{1}{3}$ of a kav, or $\frac{24}{3} = 8$ eggs, the 'half of the half of its half' must be equal to $\frac{8}{2} \times \frac{2}{2} \times \frac{2}{2} = 1$ egg.

⁸ That for (a) the tumah of one's body and (b) the tumah of food.

⁹ Lit., 'like itself and like etc. This size obviously is not exactly a half of any of the sizes prescribed by (a) Rabbi Yehudah, (b) Rabbi Yosi or (c) Rebbe for the tumah of one's body according to whom it should have been either (a) an egg minus a fraction or (b) a large sized egg and its shell, or (c) in egg and a twentieth.

¹⁰ A size which is smaller even than half of the one prescribed by Rabbi Yehudah and much more so than those prescribed by the others.

size is one and a half large sized eggs. But who are the Sages? Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah of course;¹¹ isn't this then obvious?¹² — His purpose was to inform us that the eggs must be large sized. (82b – 83a)

When Rav Dimi came he related that Bonyos once sent to Rebbe a kundess¹³ of artichokes that came from Neussa, and Rebbe calculated its capacity to be two hundred and seventeen eggs. What kind of se'ah, however, was it? If it was the desert se'ah¹⁴ it should have contained a hundred and forty-four eggs,¹⁵ and if it was the Jerusalem se'ah¹⁶ it should have contained a hundred and seventy-three eggs,¹⁷ and if again it was the one of Tzippori¹⁸ it should have contained two hundred and seven eggs.¹⁹ It was in fact a Tzippori measure but the quantity of the challah was added to them.²⁰ But how much is the challah? Nine eggs;²¹ wouldn't then the number still be less?²² — The fact is that the surpluses spoken of by Rebbe were added to them.²³ If so, wouldn't the number be greater? — As it does not amount to the size of a whole egg²⁴ he does not reckon it. (83a)

Our Rabbis taught: The Jerusalem se'ah exceeds that of the desert one by a sixth, and that of Tzippori exceeds that of Jerusalem by a sixth. Thus it follows that the measure of Tzippori exceeds that of the desert by a third. A third of which? Would you suggest: A third of the desert measure? Observe then: How much is a third of the desert measure?

¹¹ Whose standard for eiruv, as explained by Rav Chisda, is that of a loaf of a quarter of a kav or six eggs, the half of the half of which is obviously $6/2 \times 2 = 1\ 1/2$ eggs.

¹² Apparently it is. What need then was there for Rav Chisda to repeat what he had once stated?

¹³ A Roman measure of the same capacity as a se'ah.

¹⁴ Sc. The se'ah measure used by the Jewish people in the time of Moshe in the wilderness.

¹⁵ A se'ah equals six kav = $6 \times 4 \log = 6 \times 4 \times 6 = 144$ eggs.

¹⁶ Which exceeds that of the desert by a fifth.

¹⁷ Since $144 + 144/5 = 144 + 28\ 4/5 = 172\ 4/5$ or 173 eggs approximately.

¹⁸ Which exceeded that of Jerusalem by a fifth.

¹⁹ $173 + 173/5 = 173 + 34\ 3/5 = 207\ 3/5$ or 207 eggs approximately.

²⁰ Rebbe's calculations which show a higher figure include also the quantity of the challah that is due from a se'ah or two hundred and seven eggs of dough.

²¹ A twenty-fourth part of the dough. $217/24 = 9\ 1/24$ or 9 approximately.

²² Than two hundred and seventeen.

Forty-eight eggs;²⁵ whereas the surplus amounts to sixty-three!²⁶ If again a third of the Jerusalem measure was meant, how much, [it could be retorted,] is a third of it? Fifty-eight minus one third;²⁷ whereas the surplus is sixty-three! Is then the reference to the measure of Tzippori? How much, [it may be asked,] is a third of it? Seventy minus one;²⁸ whereas the surplus is sixty-three! — Rather, explained Rabbi Yirmiyah it is this that was meant: It follows that the se'ah of Tzippori exceeds that of the desert by nearly a third of itself²⁹ and that a third of itself³⁰ is nearly equal to a half of the desert measure.³¹

Ravina demurred: Was any mention at all made of approximation? — Rather, explained Ravina, it is this that was meant: It follows that a third of the Tzippori measure together with the surpluses spoken of by Rebbe³² exceeds the half of the desert measure³³ by a third of an egg.³⁴

Our Rabbis taught: Of the first of your dough - only if it is of the size of your dough,³⁵ and what is the size of your dough? That of the dough of the Wilderness. And what was the size of the dough of the wilderness? The one which is described: Now an omer is the tenth part of an eiphah, from which it has been deduced³⁶ [that dough made of a quantity of] flour of seven quarters [of a kav]³⁷ and a fraction³⁸ is liable to the challah. This [quantity] is equal to six Jerusalem kav or five of

²³ Rebbe's surpluses which amount to $1/20$ of an egg for each egg amount to $1/20 \times 207$ or $10\ 7/20$ eggs for a se'ah of the size of 207 eggs (cf. P. 579, n. 17). $207 + 10\ 7/20 = 217\ 7/20$ or 217 approximately.

²⁴ It amounts only to seven twentieths.

²⁵ $144/3 = 48$.

²⁶ $207 - 144 = 63$.

²⁷ $173/3 = 57\ 2/3$.

²⁸ $207/3 = 69$.

²⁹ Since $207 - 144 = 63$ and $207/3 = 69$. 63 is nearly equal to 69.

³⁰ 69.

³¹ $144/2 = 72$. This figure is quite near to 69.

³² $(207 + 207 \times 1/20) \times 1/3 = (207 + 10\ 7/20) \times 1/3 = 217/3$ approximately = $72\ 1/3$ approximately.

³³ $144/2 = 72$.

³⁴ Since $72\ 1/3 - 72 = 1/3$.

³⁵ Need challah be set apart.

³⁶ Since an omer is a tenth part of an eiphah which equals three se'ah, an omer = $3/10$ se'ah = $3 \times 6/10$ kav = $3 \times 6 \times 4/10 \log = 36/5 = 7\ 1/5$ log = (since a log = 6 eggs) 7 log and $1\ 1/5$ of an egg.

³⁷ Corresponding to seven log.

³⁸ $1\ 1/5$ of an egg.

the Tzipori kav. From this it has been inferred³⁹ that if a person consumes such a quantity of food he is sound in body and happy in mind. He who consumes a greater quantity is a glutton and he who consumes less suffers from bad digestion. (83b)

MISHNAH: If the tenants of a courtyard and the tenants on its gallery⁴⁰ forgot to join together in an eiruv,⁴¹ any level⁴² that is higher than ten tefachim belongs to the gallery,⁴³ and any lower level belongs to the courtyard.⁴⁴ The bank around a cistern, or a rock, that is ten tefachim high belongs to the gallery but if it is lower it belongs to the courtyard. This, however, applies only to one that adjoins the gallery, but one that is removed from it, even if ten tefachim high, belongs to the courtyard. and what object is regarded as adjoining? One that is not further than four tefachim. (83b)

GEMARA: It is quite obvious that if an area is easily accessible to two courtyards⁴⁵ the law is exactly the same as in the case of a window between two courtyards; that if it is accessible to either courtyard only through thrusting the law is exactly the same as in the case of a wall between two courtyards; that if it is accessible to either only by means of lowering their things the law is identical with that of a trench between two courtyards; that if to the one it is easily accessible but to the other it is accessible only by means of thrusting, the law is identical with that which Rabbah son of Rav Huna cited in the name of Rav Nachman; that if it was easily accessible to the one while to the other it was accessible only by means of the lowering of objects, the law is identical with the one which Rav Shizbi cited in the name of Rav Nachman what, however, is the law where it is accessible to one by means of lowering and to the other by means of thrusting?⁴⁶ — Rav ruled: Both are forbidden [access], but Shmuel ruled: Access to it is granted to the tenants that can use it by means of lowering things since to them its use is comparatively easy while to

others its use is comparatively difficult, and any area the use of which is convenient to one and difficult to another is to be assigned to the one to whom its use is convenient.

We learned: If the tenants of a courtyard and the tenants on its gallery forgot to join together in an eiruv any level that is higher than ten tefachim belongs to the gallery and any lower level belongs to the courtyard. Assuming that by gallery was meant the tenants of an upper story and that the reason why they are described as the gallery is because they ascend to their quarters by way of the gallery, does it not clearly follow that any area that is accessible to one by means of lowering and to the other by means of throwing up is assigned to the one who uses it by means of lowering? — As Rav Huna explains [below that the reference is] to those who dwelt on the gallery so [it may] also here [be explained that the reference is] to those who dwelt on the gallery. If so, read the final clause: And any lower level belongs to the courtyard; but why, seeing that it is easily accessible to both? — The meaning of to the courtyard is to the courtyard also, and both are forbidden access to it. This is also borne out by a process of reasoning, since in a subsequent clause It was stated: This, however, applies only to one that adjoins the gallery, but one that is removed from it, even if ten tefachim high, belongs to the courtyard. For what could be the meaning of the phrase, to the courtyard? If it be Suggested that the meaning is: To the courtyard and that its use is permitted, [it could be objected:] Why, seeing that it is a domain common to the two of them? Consequently it must be admitted That to the courtyard means: To the courtyard also and that both are forbidden access to it, so it should here also be explained that the meaning of the phrase, to the courtyard is: To The courtyard also and that both are forbidden access to it. This is conclusive. (83b – 84a)

³⁹ Since the quantity mentioned represents the usual size of dough consumed by a person in twenty-four hours.

⁴⁰ Above it. Tenants whose house doors opened into galleries above courtyards had no direct access to the public domain except through the courtyard into which they gained entry by means of a ladder.

⁴¹ But separate eiruvim were prepared for each group of tenants.

⁴² Such as a mound or a pillar.

⁴³ The tenants of the gallery but not those of the courtyard may, therefore, use it.

⁴⁴ Whose tenants may use it, but not those of the gallery.

⁴⁵ Each of which had a separate eiruv. Lit., '(accessible) to this by a door and to this by a door'.

⁴⁶ Do the tenants of the two courtyards respectively impose restrictions upon each other, because neither can conveniently use that area, or is a distinction drawn between the respective degrees of inconvenience?