

## 3.1.8

10a (והרחב מעשר ימעט) → 11b (דכיפה)

note: there is a special dispensation of פסי ביראות, detailed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> chapter; water wells on the road may be surrounded by poles (פסים) at particular intervals and the enclosed area is considered מותר בטלטול – this, to allow people to drink while on the road. The maximum gap between poles allowed is reflected in יהודה's opinion – 13.3 אמות.

## I. Analysis of 2nd clause of משנה: wider than 10 אמות

a. Question: how wide does יהודה allow?

i. Suggestion: פסי ביראות ק"ו from ק"ו – 13.3 אמות, inferred via ר' אחי (before יוסף)

1.If: פסי ביראות, where we allow פרוץ מרובה על העומד, may not be more than 13.3 אמות

2.Then: certainly מבו, where we do not allow פרוץ מרובה על העומד, may not be more than 13.3 אמות

a) Challenge: perhaps the reasoning is different – we only allow 13.3 in פ"ב because we allow פרוץ

i. But: in case of מבו, where we do not allow פרוץ מרובה, we may allow a wider opening than 13.3

b) Or: we may argue the opposite: since we don't allow פרוץ מרובה for מבו, we may not allow even 13.3

## II. Solution for wide entrance

a. לוי (perhaps quoted by שמואל): quotes ברייתא which, in case of 20-wide, suggests putting stick in middle

i. But: לוי himself maintains that we do not accept this ברייתא – (air on each side nullifies stick)

ii. Rather (שמואל בשם לוי): make a board ט"ט high x א"א and stand it up in the middle (→2 small entrances)

1.Or: solution of רב יהודה (if 15 wide) – set up board 3 אמות wide at point 2 אמות away from edge

2.Question: why not suggest 1.5+2 אמות space+1.5 board (to cover up to point of 10 אמות)?

a) Inference: רב יהודה must hold that עומד must be greater than פרוץ in one spot (not amalgamation)

b) Rejection: perhaps עומד מרובה works even with joining – but here, the air on both sides is מבטל

3.Question: why not use alternating אמות of wood and space (1/1/1/1) until reaching 10 אמות point?

a) Inference: רב יהודה holds that עומד כפרוץ is not considered sufficient (must be more than פרוץ)

b) Rejection: in this case, empty space on both sides cancels out עומד

4.Question: why not use 1 space, then 1.5+1 (space)+1.5

a) Answer: indeed – רבן didn't trouble him to make such an intricate solution

b) Challenge: why aren't we concerned that people may use smaller entrance, negating פתח?

c) Answer: people don't avoid normal-sized entrance in favor of a small one (e.g. 2 אמות)

i. Challenge: ר' אמי ור' אסי (above) breach of ג"ט invalidates מבו if standing wall is less than ט"ט

1.Answer: in that case, people will use smaller entrance to save steps; doesn't apply here

5.Tangent: re: פרוץ כעומד in case of toilet seat (for אהל – ב"מ א"ד – תוספתא כלים ב"מ א"ד) – conflicting reports רבין/דמי

a) דמי: 2 fingers of material on each side, 2 fingers of space in middle

b) רבין: 1.5 אצבעות on each side, 1 אצבע of space in middle

i. דמי: we don't disagree, just are representing a large one or a small one

1.אב"י: there is a disagreement, else רבין would've described 1.3 on each side and 1.3 space

2.דמי: if we disagreed, I would have used 1.6 on each side

a.Perhaps: they disagree about פרוץ כעומד

III. Analysis of 3<sup>rd</sup> clause in משנה – if there is צוה"פ, no need to narrow opening

a. Given: צוה"פ helps if too wide and אמלתרא helps if too high

b. Question: does צוה"פ help if too high; does אמלתרא help with excess width at opening?

i. ברייתא lists both (if too high or too wide) and then indicates if there is צוה"פ or אמלתרא – no need

ii. Assumption: both are "fixes" for both problems

1.Correction: אמלתרא only a "fix" for height

2.רב: corrected רב יהודה and taught that צוה"פ doesn't even help with excess width (if more than 10)

a) רב: דב יוסף from רב – if a חצר has more windows/spaces than wall, צוה"פ won't make it usable

i. Inference (via analogy): from מבו, where 10-width prohibits and צוה"פ doesn't fix that

1.Challenge: according to ר"מ, we don't allow a breach greater than 10 in ביראות

a. Yet: we certainly allow פרוץ מרובה על העומד in the case of פסים

b. Therefore: the analogy is faulty and perhaps צוה"פ would work in חצר with פרוץ מרובה

3.Support (for רב): walls that are made up of windows and openings are valid as long as הפרוץ על העומד

a) Assumption: they have צוה"פ; nonetheless, must be הפרוץ על העומד

b) Rejection: they have no צוה"פ – they are שימאי (no doorposts/roofbeam)

4. *observation*: פרוץ מרובה "צוה"פ as "fixing" ר' יוחנן

- a) *source*: story of "grape-vine" צוה"פ
- i. *details*: man took four poles on four sides of his field and strung a vine across them
  - ii. *דשב"ל* works as "fence" for כלאים (may plant other seeds there) and for שבת
  - iii. *ד' יוחנן* valid for כלאים – not for שבת (פרוץ מרובה על העומד)
    1. *Cannot be*: צוה"פ on the side (looped on the side of the poles)
      - a. *Reason*: ר"ח ruled that a צוה"פ on the side is invalid for שבת
    2. *Must be*: that it was looped on top
      - a. *Cannot be*: that the opening was 10 (or less) – ר' יוחנן would certainly permit
    3. *Rather*: it was more than 10 and ר' יוחנן rejects use of צוה"פ to fix opening wider than 10
    4. *Rejection*: it was looped on the side and ר' יוחנן and רשב"ל disagree about חסדא ר' ruling
  - iv. *Yet*: we find a contradiction within ר' יוחנן's words and within רשב"ל's rulings
    1. *רשב"ל (in name of his teacher)*: a פיאה (woven vines) is מחיצה for כלאים, not for שבת
    2. *ד' יוחנן* invalid מחיצה for either
      - a. *Note*: רשב"ל is not a contradiction; here he is representing his teacher's opinion
      - b. *and*: we can resolve ר' יוחנן – disallowed when greater than 10 and both are side-looped
        - i. *note*: source for distinction between 10/>10; story with יהושע ר'

#### IV. Three rules of הפתח צורת

- a. *ד"ח* may not be looped over side (as above)
- b. *Must be*: fit for a door (even a light one)
- c. *Must have*: hinge slot
- d. *Dispute*: ר' ניר' ששת whether cross bars have to touch top beam
  - i. *ד"נ* no need – and he ruled this way practically in ריש גלותא
  - ii. *ד"ש* must touch – had ר'נ's צוה"פ dismantled (and got in trouble with ריש גלותא as a result)
    1. *Related ruling*: an archway with a 10-high base is במזוזה חייב
      - a) *אב"י* they agree if there isn't 10 high or 3 at base, no מזוזה חייב
      - b) *Disagreement*: if base is 3 and archway is 10 high but opening isn't 4 wide
        - i. *But*: there is enough room in structure to theoretically carve out 4 wide
          1. חייב → חוקקין להלשים ד"מ
          2. פטור → אין חוקקין להלשים חכמים
          3. *Note*: ר'נ wanted this ברייתא kept "silent" as it supports ר'נ (use of theoretical space)