



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Eruvin, Daf ל"ג – Daf ט"ו

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H v'l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf ל"ג-----13-----

MISHUM R' YISHMAEL AMAR TALMID ECHAD...R' AKIVA OMER AHL ZEH V' AHL ZEH NECHLIKU...

- **Q: R' Akiva** is saying the same thing as the **T"K**?! **A:** They would argue whether a mavui entrance smaller than 4 tefachim needs to be adjusted (although it is unclear who would hold that it does and who would hold that it doesn't).
- A Braisa says, **R' Akiva** said, in truth **R' Yishmael** never said what the talmid attributed to him, but we pasken like that talmid.
 - **Q:** If **R' Yishmael** never said it, why would we pasken like that? **A: R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, **R' Akiva** didn't mean that we actually pasken like that. He just said that to sharpen the minds of his talmidim. **A2: R' Nachman bar Yitzchok** said, **R' Akiva** meant that the "svara" of this talmid makes sense, but never said that we pasken like the talmid.
- **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, whenever you find that a talmid said something of **R' Yishmael** in front of **R' Akiva**, that talmid is **R' Meir**, who learned by **R' Yishmael** and by **R' Akiva**.
 - We find this in a Braisa where **R' Meir** said, when I learned by **R' Yishmael** I would mix "kankantom" into the ink (which would make the ink unable to be erased) I used to write sefarim (on klaf), but when I learned by **R' Akiva** he forbade me to do so.
 - **Q: R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel in the name of R' Meir** said that when he learned by **R' Akiva** he would put "kankantom" into the ink, and when he learned by **R' Yishmael** he forbade him using it. From here it seems that **R' Meir** learned by **R' Akiva** before **R' Yishmael**, and that it was **R' Yishmael** who prohibited the "kankantom", not **R' Akiva**!? **A:** With regard to the order, we could say that originally **R' Meir** learned by **R' Akiva**, but found his logic too advanced to follow. He therefore went to learn by **R' Yishmael**, and eventually went back to learn by **R' Akiva**. The second question remains a question.
 - A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** said, **R' Meir** would say we may put kankantom into all ink except the ink used to write parshas sotah in the Sefer Torah (which needs to be erased into water for a sotah). **R' Yakov in the name of R' Meir** said, it may be mixed into all ink except for the parshas sotah specifically written to be used for a sotah.
 - **R' Yirmiya** explains, the machlokes is whether we can use the parshas sotah written in a Sefer Torah, for this purpose.
 - This could be the same machlokes as Tana'im in a Braisa. The **T"K** there says that a parshas sotah written for one sotah (which wasn't used at the end) may not be used for another sotah (because there must be specific intent, which would mean that using the parsha written in a Sefer Torah would also be no good). **R' Achai bar Yoshiya** says that it may be used for another sotah (no specific intent is needed, so presumably even the parsha written for a Sefer Torah will be good).
 - **R' Pappa** says, it could be all would agree that the parsha of a Sefer Torah could be used. Maybe the **T"K** doesn't allow using the parsha written for another woman, because that was written with specific intent for someone else, and that is a problem (but the parsha of a Sefer Torah would be different).
 - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** says, it could be that **R' Achai bar Yoshiya** only doesn't allow the parsha written for a Sefer Torah, because that wasn't written for the purpose of using it for a sotah.
 - According to **R' Achai bar Yoshiya**, the parshas sotah is different than a "get" (which must be written with intent), because the pasuk regarding a "get" says "v'kasav lah" – it

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

must be written for her. With regard to sotah, the pasuk says “v’asah lah” – it should be done for her, and the erasing process *is* done for her.

- **R’ Acha bar Chanina** says, **R’ Meir** was clearly superior to all the other **Rabanan**. The reason why we don’t always pasken like him is because he would so clearly explain both sides of the issue, and would be so convincing as to the merits of each side, that the **Rabanan** were never sure which way he actually paskened.
 - A Braisa says, his name was actually **R’ Nehorai**. He was called **R’ Meir** because he “lit up the eyes of the **Chachomim**” in halacha.
 - **Rebbi** said, the reason I am sharper than the other **Chachomim** is because I saw **R’ Meir** from the back. If I would have seen him from the front I would have been even sharper.
 - **R’ Avahu in the name of R’ Yochanan** said, **R’ Meir** had a talmid named **Sumchos** who would give 48 reasons why a tamei thing was tamei and why a tahor thing was tahor.
 - A Braisa says, there was a talmid who would give 150 reasons why a sheretz should be tahor.
 - **Ravina** said, I can give a reason for that. If a snake which kills and thereby increases tumah, is itself tahor, a sheretz, which does not kill and increase tumah, surely should be tahor.
 - The Gemara says the snake acts as a thorn – it kills. It is the Torah that decides that the dead person is tamei, not the snake.
- **R’ Abba in the name of Shmuel** said, **B”S** and **B”H** argued for 3 years. Finally a “bas kol” said, both are true Torah, but the halacha follows **B”H**. **B”H** merited to have the halacha like them, because they were easy going and patient, they would always teach their own views and the views of **B”S**, and they even taught the views of **B”S** before their own. We can learn from here, that one who lowers himself is raised up by Hashem, and one who raises himself is lowered by Hashem. Whoever looks for honor has honor run away from him, and whoever runs from honor has honor running after him. Whoever pushes for something to happen before its proper time does not succeed. Whoever waits for the proper time, succeeds.
 - A Braisa says, for 2 and a half years **B”S** and **B”H** argued. **B”S** said it would be better to have never been created and **B”H** said it is better that we were created. They finally came to the conclusion that it would be better to have never been created, but once we were created one should be certain to do teshuva and to do mitzvos.

-----Daf ט’---14-----

MISHNA

- A korah must be wide enough to hold half of a 3 tefach brick (i.e. 1.5 tefachim). Therefore, it is enough if the korah is one tefach wide (the Gemara will explain).
- The korah must be wide enough and strong enough to hold this half brick. **R’ Yehuda** says it needs to be wide enough but need not be strong enough. Therefore, even if the korah is made of straw or reeds we look at it as if it is made of metal. If the korah is bent, we look at it as if it is straight. If the korah is round (a round pole) we look at it as if it is flat, but it must have a circumference of 3 tefachim, which would mean that it has a 1 tefach diameter (which would be wide enough to hold a half brick).

GEMARA

- **Q:** How is a tefach enough? The korah should have to be a tefach and a half!? **A:** A tefach is enough because the quarter of a tefach on each side would be covered by cement that would hold the brick down to the korah.
- **Rabbah bar R’ Huna** said, the korah itself must be strong enough to hold the half brick, but if the korah is laying on brackets, the brackets need not be strong enough to hold the half brick in addition to the korah. **R’ Chisda** says they do need to be strong enough to hold the half brick as well.
- **R’ Sheishes** says, if one places a mat over a korah (intending to thereby make an actual wall), and the mat is 3 tefachim off the ground, one may not carry in that mavui because the korah is no good (it is covered and can’t act as a reminder) and the wall is no good (it is 3 tefachim off the ground and is therefore not considered to be a wall).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, if a korah doesn't reach all the way from one wall to the other, or if 2 korahs, each attached to opposite walls, come short of meeting in the middle, if the space is less than 3 tefachim, the halacha of lavud makes it into a good korah. If it is more, it is not a good korah. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says if the space is less than 4 tefachim the korah is good. If there are 2 korahs next to each other, neither of which is a tefach wide, if together they are a tefach wide, they are a good korah. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, if these 2 korahs are spread apart so that they can hold a brick that is 3 tefachim long, it is good for a korah as well. If one of these narrow korahs is higher than the other, **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** says we view them as if they are on an equal level, and the korah is good, as long as the higher one is not more than 20 amos high and that the lower one is not within 10 tefachim to the ground.
 - **Abaye** said, **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** agrees with his father in part (in our Mishna **R' Yehuda** said we view the korah "as if" it is something that it truly is not, which is what **R' Yose** says here) and disagrees with him on one point (**R' Yehuda** allows a korah to be above 20 amos).

R' YEHUDA OMER, RACHVA AHF AHL PI SHE'EINA BRI'AH

- **R' Yehuda** taught our Mishna to **Chiya the son of Rav**, in front of **Rav**, that even if the korah is not strong enough to carry the half brick it is good. **Rav** said, the proper halacha is that it must be strong enough.
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Illai** says in the name of **Rav** that a korah which is 4 tefachim wide need not be strong enough to carry a half brick!? **A:** If it is 4 tefachim wide it need not be strong. If it is less, it must be strong.

HUYSA SHEL KASH...

- The chiddush of this is, that we even say "we look at it as if it is strong" when we have to look at it as a different material (from straw to metal).

AKUMAH, ROYIN OSAH K'ILU HEE P'SHUTA

- The Mishna is teaching us like the din of **R' Zeira**, that if the bend is beyond the mavui, or higher than 20 amos, or lower than 10 tefachim, we look at the bend as if it is non-existent and if the 2 sides of the korah (on either side of the bend) are within 3 tefachim of each other, the korah is a good korah. We say this even when the bend is outside the mavui and we are not concerned that one will be led to carry underneath the bend (in the reshus harabim).

AGULAH, ROYIN OSAH K'ILU HEE MIRUBA'AS

- This case is stated to teach us that a circumference of 3 tefachim yields a width (diameter) of 1 tefach. We learn this from the psukim that describe the round pool of water that Shlomo Hamelech had constructed.
 - **R' Chiya** taught a Braisa: The pool that Shlomo made held 150 mikvaos (2,000 "bas" or 6,000 se'ah).
 - **Q:** A mikvah has a measurement of 1x1x3 amos, which we know holds 40 se'ah. The measurements of Shlomo's pool was 10x10x5 amos (500 cubic amos). We only need 450 cubic amos to fit 150 mikvaos worth of water?! **A:** The pool was round, and therefore was smaller than the measurements given (the measurements given were for the square large enough to hold this round pool).
 - **Q:** A square is 25% more than the circle that fits within it. If so, only 125 mikvaos worth of water could fit into the pool?! **A:** **Rami bar Yechezkel** said that the pool's three lower amos were square and the upper part was round. Thus, it held more than the 125 mikvaos worth of water that a circle of that size would hold.
 - **Q:** Another pasuk says that it held 3,000 "bas"? **A:** That is the amount of solids that it could have held with over-heaping.
 - **Abaye** says, from here we see that one can fit 1/3 more solid than liquid into a given place (the amount able to be heaped over the rim is equal to 1/3 of the total amount it can hold).

MISHNA

- The lechis must be 10 tefachim tall, but their width and thickness can be any amount. **R' Yose** says it must be 3 tefachim wide.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna (which uses the plural form “lechis”) must follow **R’ Eliezer** who says that 2 lechis are required!
A: The Mishna is referring to the lechis of mavuis in general, not to one particular mavui.
 - **Q:** If so, why doesn’t the previous Mishna says “koros”?! **A:** This Mishna means to say – the lechis that **R’ Eliezer** and the **Chachomim** argue about need to be 10 tefachim tall....
- **Q:** How wide is “any amount”? **A:** **R’ Chiya** taught, even the width of a string is enough.
- A Braisa says, if one places the lechi halfway into the depth of the mavui (towards the back wall), he may only carry in that back half, and we are not afraid that it will lead him to carry in the front half as well.
- **Rava** said, if one lifts a lechi 3 tefachim off the ground, or moves it 3 tefachim away from the mavui wall, it is not a valid lechi. Even according to **R’ Shimon ben Gamliel** who says that lavud takes effect up to 4 tefachim, lavud would not work here to connect the lechi to the ground because once it is that high, animals can pass underneath and it loses its din as a wall.

R’ YOSE OMER RACHBAN SHLOSHA TEFACHIM

- **R’ Yosef in the name of R’ Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** says, we do not pasken like **R’ Yose** who prohibits preparing a “hilmei” mixture on Shabbos which will be used to dip bread into, and we do not pasken like **R’ Yose** regarding his din about a lechi. **R’ Huna bar Chinina** said to **R’ Yosef**, you told us this regarding “hilmei” but you never told us this regarding lechi! **R’ Yosef** asked, we don’t pasken like him regarding “hilmei” because the **Rabanan** argue on him. The same reasoning applies to lechi!? **R’ Huna** answered back, by lechi we have **Rebbi** who follows **R’ Yose**.
 - **R’ Rechumei** taught the following version of the previous conversation. **R’ Yehuda the son of R’ Shmuel bar Shilas in the name of Rav** says, we do not pasken like **R’ Yose** regarding “hilmei” or regarding lechi. They said to him, did you (**R’ Yehuda**) really say this halacha? He said, I did not. **Rava** responded, he most definitely did teach that to us! The reason **R’ Yehuda** reversed his psak is because **R’ Yose** was known to always have superior reasoning and we therefore pasken like him even when he is opposed by the **Rabanan**.
 - **Rava bar R’ Chanan** asked **Abaye**, how do we pasken? He answered, go look how everyone conducts themselves. People use lechis of “any amount”.
 - Some say this question was asked of **Abaye** regarding whether we pasken like the **T”K** who says to make a “shehakol” when drinking water or like **R’ Tarfon** who says to make a “borei nefashos” when drinking water. **Abaye** told him, go look how everyone conducts themselves. People make a “shehakol” before they drink and a “borei nefashos” after they drink.

-----Daf 10-----15-----

- Regarding a lechi at the entrance to a mavui that was not placed there for purposes of being a lechi: **Abaye** says it has the din of a lechi. **Rava** says it does not get the din of a lechi.
 - If he did not intend to rely on this as a lechi at the onset of Shabbos, and on Shabbos he needs to use it as a lechi to permit him to carry in the mavui, all agree that he cannot use it as a lechi. The machlokes is where he relied on it as a lechi at the onset of Shabbos: **Abaye** says it functions as a lechi and **Rava** says it does not (because initially it wasn’t set into place as a lechi).
 - The Gemara felt that just as they argue regarding a lechi, the same machlokes would take place regarding a wall that was not initially put there to be used as a wall. Based on that, the Gemara brings a series of attempted proofs/questions:
 - **Q:** A Mishna says, if one makes a succah using trees as its walls it is a kosher succah. We see that they are considered walls although they were not put in place with that intent?! **A:** We are discussing where the trees were planted with the purpose of using them for walls. The chiddush is that we are not concerned that he will come to use the trees on Yom Tov.
 - **Q:** If the corner boards enclosing the area around a well are made using an existing tree, a gate or a wall of reeds, it is considered to be a good corner board. We see the existing tree and row of reeds are considered a wall?! **A:** Here too we are discussing where they were planted for this

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

purpose. The chiddush is that the reeds spaced less than 3 tefachim apart are considered to be a solid wall.

- **Q:** A tree whose branches project out and then down (and reach to within 3 tefachim to the ground) create an enclosure which permits one to carry on Shabbos?! **A:** Here too it was planted for this purpose. Still, he may only carry in this area if it is less than 2 “beis se’ah”, because it was planted primarily for use outside of this area (it is intended as a place for a watchman to stay when he is focused on staying outside and watching the fields), and therefore is limited to this size.
- **Q:** A Braisa says that if someone makes his Shabbos residence on a mound that is 10 tefachim high and between 4 square amos and 2 “beis se’ah” in area, or in a depression in a rock which is deep 10 tefachim and between 4 square amos and 2 “beis se’ah” in area, or in a clearing in a field of grain between 4 square amos and 2 “beis se’ah” in area surrounded by grain which is 10 tefachim high, these areas are considered “walled” and he may carry in the area and walk beyond them up to 2,000 amos. A mound and a depression were not “made” to act as walls!? **A:** All agree that a wall not made to be used as a wall is still considered to be a wall. They only argue regarding a lechi. **Abaye** says the purpose of a lechi is to act as a wall, and therefore, just like a wall, a lechi that was not placed there to act as a lechi is still considered to be a lechi. **Rava** says, the purpose of a lechi is to act as a reminder. If it was not placed there to act as a lechi, there is no reminder.
- **Q:** A Braisa says that if bricks protrude out of the side of the wall into the entranceway and the bricks are less than 3 tefachim apart, they can act as a lechi?! **A:** We are discussing a case where they were initially put there to act as a lechi. The chiddush is that one may think the person put them there to allow for future building. The Braisa teaches that it is a good lechi.
- **Q:** A Braisa taught by **R’ Chiya** says that a mavui wall that is indented, either facing inside the mavui or outside the mavui, it acts as a lechi (even though it seems that it was not made to act as a lechi)?! **A:** Here too, it was constructed initially to act as a lechi. The chiddush is that even when it is only noticeable from the outside, it is still considered to be a good lechi.
- **Q:** **Rav** was sitting in a mavui and asked his attendant for water. The lechi then fell down and **Rav** instructed the attendant to stop carrying. **R’ Huna** asked, why can’t we just rely on the tree that stood at the entrance of the mavui? **Rav** replied, we did not rely on that at the onset of Shabbos! It seems that if he had relied on it, it would be a good lechi!?
 - We can’t say that **Abaye** and **Rava** only argue in a case where one did not rely on it from before Shabbos, but if one did all would agree that it is a good lechi, because we find that **Abaye** and **Rava** argued about a pole at the entrance to a certain mavui that was not placed there to act as a lechi. In that case they certainly relied on it before Shabbos and still they argued.

MISHNA

- A lechi may be made of anything, including a live object (an animal). **R’ Meir** says a live object may not be used.
- A live object which is over a meis becomes a “cover” to the meis and becomes tamei through that. **R’ Meir** says the object remains tahor.
- We may write a “get” on a live objects. **R’ Yose Haglili** says such a “get” would be passul.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says: **R’ Meir** says, a living object may not be used as a wall for a succah, as a lechi for a mavui, or as a corner board to enclose a well, and if it acts as a cover to a meis it does not become tamei. They said in the name of **R’ Yose Haglili** that one may also not write a “get” on them.
 - **Q:** What is **R’ Yose Haglili**’s reasoning? **A:** The pasuk regarding “get” says “sefer”. One would think it may only be written on klaf. The pasuk therefore says “v’kasav lah” which teaches that it can be written on anything. If so, the word “sefer” only excludes writing a “get” on a living object, or on food.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The **Rabanan** say, the pasuk doesn't say "basefer" – in a sefer, which would suggest like this drasha. The pasuk says "sefer", which teaches that the "get" must be written in a way that makes a separation between the husband and wife.
- The **Rabanan** use the word "v'kasav" to teach that a divorce may only take place via a written document, not via money. We would think that just like marriage comes about through a document or money, through a hekesh we should say that a "get" can be done in the same way.
 - **R' Yose Haglili** learns this from the words "sefer krisus" – only a document can make a divorce.
 - The **Rabanan** use the word "krisus" to teach that it must be a document that fully severs the relationship (it can't be made on a condition that obligates the woman to do something or not to do something forever).
 - **R' Yose Haglili** learns that from the fact that the pasuk says "krisus" when it could have just said "kares".
 - The **Rabanan** don't darshen these extra letters of the word.

MISHNA

- A caravan that has encamped for Shabbos may make a 10 tefachim high wall around them out of the equipment of the animals and they may carry within that area, as long as the empty spaces do not exceed the "walled" areas.
 - Any space that is 10 amos wide or less is permitted because it is considered to be an entranceway. If an opening is more than 10 amos, it will prohibit carrying in the encampment.

GEMARA

- If the walled areas equal the open areas: **R' Pappa** says it is mutar to carry in the entire enclosure (Hashem told Moshe Rabbeinu do not leave most of the enclosure open), and **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** says it is assur (Hashem told Moshe, fence in most of the enclosure).
 - **Q:** Our Mishna says, "as long as the empty spaces do not exceed the "walled" areas". It seems that if they are equal it is ok!? **A:** The inference should be that if the walled areas are more than the empty spaces it is mutar.
 - **Q:** Then the Mishna should say that if they are equal it is assur!? **A:** This remains problematic – **KASHYEH.**
 - **Q:** A Mishna says, if one covers his succah with s'chach that is passul (e.g. spits or sides of a bed), if he leaves space in between these pieces equal to these pieces and fills those spaces with kosher s'chach, it is a kosher succah. We see that an equal amount is good enough!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing where enough room is left for pieces equal to the size of the passul s'chach, plus room is left to be able to place the kosher s'chach in and remove it. Thus, when filled with kosher s'chach, there is more kosher than passul.
 - **Q:** It is possible for there to be exactly the same amount of space?! **A:** **R' Ami** says we are talking where he purposely made the spaces larger than the passul s'chach. **A2: Rava** says the Mishna is discussing where he places the kosher s'chach on top of, and perpendicular to, the passul s'chach. Therefore, to fill the gaps there is more kosher than passul s'chach.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, a caravan that is encamping for Shabbos and surrounds itself with camels or equipment must make sure that the empty spaces are not equal to the animals or equipment surrounding the encampment?! **A:** The Braisa means to prohibit leaving space equal to the animals or equipment plus extra space to allow movement in and out. It is prohibited because there is more empty space than closed space.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says that there are 3 categories of walled areas when it comes to planting kilayim: 1) if the wall segments are less than 3 tefachim, there must be less than 3 tefachim in between segments (so that lavud will apply) for it to be considered a wall; 2) if the wall segments are between 3 tefachim and 4 tefachim, not including 4 tefachim, the spaces in between can't be as large as the segments, and if the empty spaces are larger than the segments, one may not even plant opposite the wall segments (seemingly contradictory statements will be explained); 3) if the segments are between 4 tefachim and 10 amos, the spaces in between can't be the same size as the segments, and if they are, one may plant another species opposite the wall segments, but not opposite the empty spaces. The Braisa continues: a) if there is more "wall" than empty spaces one may even plant opposite the empty spaces, b) if there is a space larger than 10 amos, one may not even plant next to the wall segments, c) if one makes a tzuras hapesach in these openings larger than 10 amos, one may plant even opposite the opening.
 - **Q:** Section "2" of the Braisa says the spaces can't be as large as the wall segments! This is problematic for **R' Pappa**! **A:** It means that the spaces can't be as large as the walls plus space to allow for putting in and taking out (which would make the spaces larger than the walled areas). It makes sense to say this is what the Braisa means, because the section continues that if the empty spaces are larger than the wall segments it is no good. It seems that if they are equal it would be good.
 - **Q:** How will **R' Huna** understand this section? **A:** **R' Huna** will say, section "a" of the Braisa says "if there is more wall segments than empty spaces one may even plant opposite the empty spaces". It seems that if the spaces are equal it would not be permitted.
 - **Q:** Section "2" is problematic for **R' Huna** and section "a" is problematic for **R' Pappa**?! **A:** **R' Pappa** says, since section "2" uses the phraseology of the empty space being larger than the walls, section "a" therefore uses similar phraseology of there is more wall than empty spaces. **R' Huna** says the same thing, only in reverse (section "2" phraseology follows that of section "a").
 - **Q:** According to **R' Pappa** the case of a wall segment that is exactly 3 tefachim cannot be included in section "1", because wall segments of 3 tefachim can have empty spaces of 3 tefachim. However, according to **R' Huna**, wall segments of 3 tefachim can only have spaces of less than 3 along with them, so they should be included in section "1"?! **A:** The Braisa kept them separate because they would be passul for different reasons (wall segments under 3 tefachim with a space of 3 tefachim are passul because there is no lavud, and wall segments of 3 tefachim with a space of 3 tefachim are passul because it is a case of spaces being equal to walled areas).
 - **Q:** The Braisa first says that lavud applies for less than 3 tefachim (that follows the **Rabanan**). The Braisa then says, a wall segment less than 4 tefachim is insignificant (which follows **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**)?! **A:** **Abaye** said, it all follows the **Rabanan**. The **Rabanan** say, anything less than 4 tefachim is considered insignificant with regard to kilayim, and one may not plant opposite it, but a wall of 4 tefachim is significant. **Rava** said, the entire Braisa follows **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**, and he only says lavud applies up to 4 tefachim when it is higher off the ground (e.g. whether a korah is considered to be touching a wall), but when it is close to the ground he agrees that a space of 3 tefachim cannot be considered a closed space (because animals can fit through).
- A Braisa says, an enclosure made of many entranceways and open windows is permitted as long as the walled sections are more than the empty spaces.
 - We see that if they are equal it will be passul! This refutes **R' Pappa**. However, we pasken like **R' Pappa**.
 - **Q:** We refute him but pasken like him? **A:** Our Mishna is mashma more like **R' Pappa**, and therefore we pasken like him.

MISHNA

- We may make "walls" out of 3 strings placed within 3 tefachim to each other, with the thickness of the strings combined equaling a little more than a tefach, and in that way creating a "wall" that is 10 tefachim high.
- We may make a "wall" of reeds placed within 3 tefachim to each other.
- **R' Yehuda** said these "walls" were only allowed for caravans that encamp for Shabbos. The **Chachomim** say it is allowed for general use and they speak in terms of a caravan, because they are the people who usually need

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

these methods. **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** says even a caravan may not use a “wall” which is not made of vertical and horizontal pieces. The **Chachomim** say only vertical **or** horizontal is needed.

GEMARA

- **R' Hamnuna in the name of Rav** said, “if the walled areas are more than the empty spaces” is a method that works for vertical walls.
 - **Q: R' Hamnuna** asked, does it work for horizontal walls? **A: Abaye** said, from the fact that our Mishna requires the strings to have a combined thickness of more than a tefach, it seems that the method won't work for horizontal walls. If it would work, then if the bottom string is placed within 3 tefachim to the ground and the second string is placed within 3 tefachim to the first string, lavud makes that entire section into a “wall”. Therefore, the 3rd string should be able to be placed 4 tefachim away and the “wall” should be good because we have more walled area than empty space!
 - **Q: Abaye's** proof is not valid, because having a space of 4 tefachim would not work in this case. If it was on the bottom, it would be large enough for animals to pass and would therefore not be considered a wall. If it was on top, the space on each side would be larger than the upper rope and would be mevatel the rope (once the space is 3 tefachim it can be mevatel the smaller thing in between). If it is in the middle, then we would only have the walled sections (the 2 sections of 3 tefachim) greater than the empty space (the section of 4 tefachim) when the walled sections are combined, and that doesn't work! **A: R' Hamnuna** was asking about a case where he had a mat that was 7 tefachim plus a minute amount, and he cut out a 3 tefach section of this mat, leaving a section of 4 tefachim on top, an empty space of 3 tefachim and then a minute amount on the bottom. If he takes this mat and places it within 3 tefachim to the ground, since the “walled” sections are greater than the empty space, **R' Hamnuna** was asking whether it is good. **A2: R' Ashi** says **R' Hamnuna** was asking where he had a full 10 tefach wall that was 3 tefachim or more off the ground.

MAKIFIN B'KANIM...

- **A:** A Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** allows such an enclosure for individuals besides a caravan!? **A:** Like **R' Nachman or R' Bibi bar Abaye** said elsewhere, people of a caravan can use these inferior walls even for areas greater than 2 beis se'ah if they need a larger area. Others may only use an area which is enclosed by such a wall if it is 2 beis se'ah or less.
 - **R' Nachman or R' Bibi bar Abaye** said this to explain why **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** in our Mishna only allows using inferior walls for a caravan, but in a Braisa he allows using inferior walls for individuals as well.
 - The Braisa referred to says that **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** says that a single person may have inferior walls to enclose an area of 2 beis se'ah. The same would be for 2 people. Three people would get the din of a caravan and would be allowed to enclose 6 beis se'ah with these inferior walls. The **Rabanan** say all people can enclose as large of an area as they need with these inferior walls, as long as there is no empty space of 2 beis se'ah left in the enclosed area.
 - **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbeinu Shmuel** paskened that that a single person may have inferior walls to enclose an area of 2 beis se'ah. The same would be for 2 people. Three people would get the din of a caravan and be allowed to enclose 6 beis se'ah with these inferior walls.
 - **Q:** He is paskening against the **Rabanan!**? **A:** He retracted and said that a single person may have inferior walls to enclose an area of 2 beis se'ah. The same would be for 2 people. Three people would get the din of a caravan and be allowed to enclose as large an area as they need with these inferior walls.
 - **R' Nachman** paskens like **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** with regard to one or 2 people, because **R' Yehuda** holds like that as well.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Gidel in the name of Rav** said, there are times when 3 people can enclose an area of 5 beis se'ah with inferior walls and may not carry within them, and there are times when they can enclose 7 beis se'ah and may carry within them.
 - **R' Ashi** explains, this is what **Rav** meant. Both cases are discussing where they enclosed an area of 7 beis se'ah. In the first case they only need 5 beis se'ah for their use and the other 2 remain empty, therefore they are prohibited to carry even in the 5. The second case is where they need 6 beis' se'ah for their use. There are no 2 beis se'ah that are left empty and therefore the entire area of 7 is mutar.
 - **Q:** A Braisa taught that 2 beis se'ah maynot be left empty. Presumably that means that each person is allowed an area of 2 beis se'ah, and therefore 3 people can have an area of 6 beis se'ah (plus less than 2 more so that there is no area of 2 beis se'ah empty)?! **A:** The Braisa means that there can't be 2 beis se'ah empty of keilim. It is not an automatic amount given based on the number of people. It is based on actual requirements.
- If there were 3 people at the onset of Shabbos (which allows the area enclosed by these inferior walls to be as large as they need) and one of them died on Shabbos (2 people may only enclose an area of 2 beis se'ah), or if there were 2 people at the onset of Shabbos and an additional person came, there is a machlokes between **R' Huna** and **R' Yitzchak** how this is treated: one says it is dependent on the situation at the onset of Shabbos, and the other says it is dependent on the number of people there at any given time.
 - We can bring a proof that **R' Huna** is the one who says we look at the situation at the onset of Shabbos. **R' Huna** told **Rabbah**, if one made an eiruv based on an opening between two areas and the opening became closed up on Shabbos, it is still permitted to transfer via that eiruv because the entrance existed at the onset of Shabbos. We see that **R' Huna** is the one who says that we look at the situation at the onset of Shabbos.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that they argue in the same machlokes as **R' Yose** and **R' Yehuda**, who argue in the case of a mavui whose walls partially collapsed on Shabbos. **R' Yehuda** says it is still mutar to carry there on that Shabbos, because it was mutar at the onset of Shabbos. **R' Yose** says that it is even assur to carry on the remaining part of that Shabbos, because the situation has changed. Maybe **R' Huna** holds like **R' Yehuda** and **R' Yitzchak** holds like **R' Yose**? **A:** **R' Huna** would say that **R' Yose** only holds that way in that case because the walls are no longer intact, but where the walls are intact and only the number of residents have changed it could be he would agree to **R' Huna**. **R' Yitzchak** would say, **R' Yehuda** only holds that way in that case because the number of residents remains constant, but where the number of residents would change, it could be he would agree to **R' Yitzchak**.

V'CHACHOMIM OMRIM ECHAD MISHNEI DIVARIM

- **Q:** These **Chachomim** are saying the same thing as the first **Chachomim**?! **A:** The first **Chachomim** only allow an individual to use these inferior walls when he is travelling and must stop for Shabbos. The second **Chachomim** even allow use of these walls by an individual who is in a typical, residential area.

MISHNA

- The **Rabanan** allowed 4 things for an army camp (that has gone out to war) that are typically assur: 1) they may bring wood from anyplace and don't have to be concerned for stealing, 2) they do not have to wash their hands before eating, 3) they may eat "demai" (food of an "ahm ha'aretz" from which we are not positive that ma'aser has been taken), 4) they don't have to make an eiruv (an eiruvi chatzeiros).

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, an army that has gone out to a discretionary war is allowed to take even dry wood wherever they find it (even though it is possible the owners had left them there to dry for firewood). **R' Yehuda ben Teima** says, they may also set up camp wherever they want (even on private property), and they are buried wherever they are killed.
 - **Q:** Yehoshua, upon entering Eretz Yisrael, had set up that people may collect wood from the property of others?! **A:** Yehoshua had allowed for the taking of bushes that are typically not used by the owners. Our Mishna allows the army to take any type of wood. **A2:** Yehoshua allowed taking wood that was still

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

attached to the ground, our Mishna allows even where the owner had cut the wood off. **A3:** Yehoshua had allowed taking moist wood, our Mishna even allows the taking of dry wood.

R' YEHUDA BEN TEIMA OMER...

- **Q:** This is obvious, because the killed soldiers have a din of a “meis mitzvah”, who is allowed to be buried wherever he is found!? **A:** The soldiers are allowed to be buried there even if they have family who will bury them. A “meis mitzvah”, on the other hand, is someone who doesn't have family to deal with his burial.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that a meis mitzvah is moved to the side of the road, or to a less developed field and not buried exactly where he is found!? **A:** **R' Bibi** says, this Braisa is talking about a meis mitzvah who is found lying across the entire road. The meis must be moved to allow Kohanim to walk over this road. Once the meis is moved, we may move it to the side of our choice.

U'PITURIN M'RICHTZAS YADAYIM

- **Abaye** said, washing before meals is what the **Rabanan** said the army need not do. However, washing after meals (“mayim achronim”) is obligatory even for them.
 - **R' Chiya bar Ashi** explains that mayim achronim removes the dangerous salt that remains on the fingers after eating and can cause blindness.
 - **Q: R' Acha the son of Rava** asked **R' Ashi**, if one measures salt (but did not eat), must he wash his hands? **A:** He said that he absolutely must.

UMIDEMAI

- **B”S** prohibit giving poor people and soldiers to eat from demai. **B”H** allow it.

UMILE'AREIV

- In the **Yeshiva of R' Yannai** they said that the soldiers need not make an eruvei chatzeiros (it is only D'Rabanan) but they must make an eruvei techumin, because **R' Chiya** taught in a Braisa that one gets malkus D'Oraisa for going beyond the techum without an eruvei techumin.
 - **Q: R' Yonason** asked, the issur of going beyond the techum is written with the word “ahl”, and we don't give malkus for an issur that is termed with the word “ahl”?!
 - **Q: R' Acha bar Yakov** asked, we find that the issur of following types of sorcery is written with the word “ahl” and all agree that malkus is given! **A: R' Yonason** meant that the issur of techum is also used to teach that transferring from one reshus to another on Shabbos is assur, and that issur is punishable with the death penalty, and we have a rule that a pasuk which teaches that something is punishable by death cannot also teach that it is punishable with malkus. To that question **R' Ashi** says that although the pasuk teaches about transferring from reshus to reshus, the words of the pasuk (“ahl yeitzei”) refer to leaving the techum and that issur is not punishable with the death penalty (and can therefore teach that it is punishable with malkus).

HADRAN ALACH PEREK MAVUI!!!

-----Daf 17-----18-----

PEREK OISIN PASSIN -- PEREK SHEINI

MISHNA

- We may enclose an area around a well that is in the reshus harabim to permit drawing water from that well on Shabbos. **R' Yehuda** says we do so by placing 4 double boards (“L” shaped boards) at the 4 corners – 4 boards that look like 8 boards. **R' Meir** says it must be 8 boards that look like 12 boards (the 4 double boards which themselves look like 8, plus 4 additional straight boards – one on each side).
- The height of these boards must be 10 tefachim, the width of the boards must be one amah, and the thickness can be any minute amount.
- **R' Meir** says, in between the double boards there can be as much room as is needed to fit two teams of oxen, 3 oxen to each team. **R' Yehuda** says we may leave enough room for 2 teams of 4 oxen each. The space left is for

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

teams of oxen where the oxen are tied together, not loose, and for teams that are travelling in opposite directions.

- The minimum area that the enclosure around the well must be, is large enough to fit the head and most of the body of a cow to enter the area and drink. It is mutar to increase the enclosed area as much as needed as long as boards are added to ensure that the opening between boards never exceeds the allowable amount according to **R' Meir** or **R' Yehuda**. **R' Yehuda** says the enclosed area may only be increased to a maximum of 2 beis se'ah. The **Rabanan** said to **R' Yehuda**, the limit of 2 beis se'ah is only for an enclosed garden or "karfaf" (areas not enclosed for living purposes). But, an area enclosed to allow animals to fertilize, or as a corral, or a backyard or courtyard, may even be as large as 5 or 10 beis kor, and therefore an area enclosed for a well would be the same, and can be increased to any amount needed as long as boards are added so that no opening exceeds the allowable width.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Our Mishna seems to disagree with **Chananya**, who says in a Braisa that one may enclose a "bor" (watering hole) with strings, but not with boards? **A:** It could be that a bor is treated one way and that **Chananya** would agree with our Mishna regarding a "be'air" (a well) that it may be enclosed with boards.
- **Q:** Our Mishna seems to disagree with **R' Akiva**, who says in a Mishna that a public well, a public bor, and a private well may be enclosed with boards, but a private bor must be enclosed with full walls. Our Mishna only allows using boards for wells, not for any type of bor?! **A:** Our Mishna agrees that a public bor can be enclosed with boards. The reason it does not mention it is because it only mentions a well, whose halacha does not vary whether it is public or private. However, a bor, which has a different halacha depending on if it is public or private, is not discussed in the Mishna.
- **Q:** Our Mishna seems to disagree with **R' Yehuda ben Bava** who says in a Mishna that boards may only be used to enclose a public well, and yet our Mishna says that "wells" (which would seem to include a private well also) may be enclosed with boards?! **A:** Our Mishna may agree that only public wells may be so enclosed. It uses the plural "wells" because it refers to public wells in general, but is not meant to include private wells.
- **Q:** What does the word "diyumdin" mean? **A:** **R' Yirmiya ben Elazar** says, it means 2 boards ("dyu amudin").
 - A Mishna says, inferior figs are not subject to demai (because the ahm haratzim will give ma'aser from these inferior figs), except for the "diyufra" figs (because they are better figs). **Ulla** explains "diyufra" means that it produces fruit twice per year.
 - **R' Yirmiyah ben Elazar** says, Hashem created Adam with "dyu partzuf" – two forms: a male form on one side and a female form on the other.
 - "Vayiven Hashem Elokim es Hatzelah" – **Rav** and **Shmuel** argue: one says Hashem created 2 forms, and the other says Hashem created Adam with a tail that He later made into Chava.
 - **Q:** "Achur Vakedem Tzartani" – makes sense if He created 2 forms, but if it was just a tail, what does this pasuk mean? **A:** **R' Ami** explains this pasuk to mean that man was "achur" – last to be created, and "kedem" – first to be punished at the time of the mabul.
 - **Q:** "Vayitzer" with 2 yuds: makes sense if He created 2 forms, but if it was just a tail, why the 2 yuds? **A:** We can answer like **R' Shimon ben Pazi** said, that this refers to the double edged sword that a person faces every day: the yetzer harah gives him ta'avah for aveiros and HKB"H will punish him if he follows those ta'avos.
 - **Q:** "Zachar U'nikeivah Bar'am" – if it was only a tail, what does this mean? **A:** **R' Avahu** explains that Hashem had a "thought" to create them separately, but then created just Adam and had Chava come from Adam so that man and woman should be one, inseparable entity, not 2 unique entities.
 - "Vayisgor Basar Tachtena" – if there were 2 forms, new basar had to be put to replace half of Adam; if it was a just a tail, the place of the tail needed new basar to replace that missing piece.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- “Vayiven Hashem Elokim es hatzela” – if it was a tail, that’s why it had to be built – “vayiven”. If it was already 2 forms, “vayiven” means Hashem braided Chava’s hair to make her desirable to Adam.
 - **R’ Chisda** says, Hashem “built” Chava like a storehouse (narrow on top and wider on the bottom) so that her body could carry a child during pregnancy.
- “Vayivi’eha el ha’Adam” – Hashem acted as the arranger and guarantor for the wedding. This teaches that one should get involved with such arrangements.
- **Q:** According to the view that Hashem created 2 forms, which form walked in front? **A: R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** says, Adam walked in front, because one is not supposed to walk behind a woman.
 - A Braisa says, a person who gives money to a woman slowly, so that he can look at her, will suffer in Gehinnom, even if he is otherwise full of Torah and ma’asim tovim.
 - **R’ Nachman** says, Manoach (Shimshon’s father) was an ahm ha’aretz, because the pasuk tell us “vayelech Manoach acharei ishto”. **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** says, it says similar psukim by Elkana and Elisha and it means they followed the advice of a woman. By Manoach it can mean that as well.
 - **R’ Ashi** says this concept can be seen from Rivka as well, because it says she followed Eliezer, not the other way around.
 - **R’ Yochanan** says, go behind a lion rather than a woman, behind a woman rather than an avodah zarah, behind avodah zarah rather than a behind a shul while the tzibur is davening.
 - Walking behind a shul is not a problem if you are carrying something, if there is another door, if you are riding an animal, or wearing tefillin (these show you are not shunning the tefilla).
- **R’ Yirmiya ben Elazar** says, all the 130 years that Adam was in cheirem for having eaten from the “eitz hada’as” he bore spirits and sheidim.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, Adam was extremely righteous. When he saw that he brought about death to this world he fasted for 130 years, was not with his wife for 130 years and wrapped thorny braches around himself for 130 years. If so, how could he have bore spirits? **A:** They came about through zerah that was released from him involuntarily.
- **R’ Yirmiya ben Elazar** says, we only partially praise a person in his presence, but fully praise him not in front of him. We see this from the pasuk which praises Noach more extensively than Hashem praised Noach to his face.
- **R’ Yirmiya ben Elazar** says, the dove came back to the Teivah with an olive branch in its mouth. The dove was thereby saying to Hashem, I rather eat bitter food (the olive branch) directly from You, than eat sweet food given to me by man.
- **R’ Yirmiya ben Elazar** says, a pasuk teaches us that a house which has Torah learned in it at night will never be destroyed.
- **R’ Yirmiya ben Elazar** says, from the day of the Churban HaBayis, we no longer say the 4 letter Name of Hashem. We use “Kah” – a two letter Name (“Kol haneshama tihalel **Kah**”).
- **R’ Yirmiya ben Elazar** says, when Bavel was cursed its neighbors were cursed, however, when Shomron was cursed its neighbors were blessed.

-----Daf 19-----

- **R’ Yirmiya ben Elazar** said, come and see how different the conduct of dealing with Hashem versus dealing with humans. When one is punished by a human king, they place a piece of wood in his mouth to prevent him from cursing the king. On the other hand, when one is punished by Hashem, he knows how true the judgment is, and he remains silent and acts as if he is bringing a korbon to Hashem.
 - **R’ Yehoshua ben Levi** says this same idea that sinners accept the judgment put on them.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: Reish Lakish** said that sinners continue to sin after they die by not accepting the judgment as righteous (the pasuk uses a present tense term to denote their sinning, which means they continue to sin)!? **A:** Sinners who are Yidden accept the judgment. Sinners who are goyim never do. This makes sense based on another statement of **Reish Lakish** where he says that sinners who are Yidden will be saved from Gehinom.
 - **Q:** A pasuk is mashma that the Jewish sinners are subject to Gehinom!? **A:** Initially they are put in Gehinom, but Avrohom Avinu comes and takes them out, except for the sinner who was mezaneh with a non-Jewish woman, because his “bris” gets covered over and Avrohom does not recognize him as a Jew.
 - **A: R’ Kahana** answers, the fact that the pasuk uses a present tense word to state that they are “sinning” does not mean that they continue to sin. We see that the pasuk says Hashem “takes” us out of Mitzrayim – in the present tense, although it obviously refers to something that happened in the past. The same can be said for the sinners.
- **R’ Yirmiya ben Elazar** said, there are 3 entrances to Gehinom: one in the desert (used for Korach), one in the sea (as mentioned by Yonah), and one in Yerushalayim.
 - **Q:** We find that there are other entrances, because **R’ Meryon in the name of R’ Yehoshua ben Levi** says that there is an entrance to Gehinom in between 2 palm trees in the valley of Ben Hinom?! **A:** That is the same entrance that we mentioned is in Yerushalayim.
 - **R’ Yehoshua ben Levi** says, Gehinom has 7 names: Sheol, Avadon, Be’air Shachas, Bor Shaon, Tit Hayaven, Tzalmaves, Eretz Hatachtis.
 - **Q:** What about the name “Gehinom”? **A:** That is a descriptive name describing its depth, but not a proper name.
 - **Q:** What about the name “Tafteh”? **A:** That is also a descriptive name saying that it is a place for one who is seduced by his yetzer harah.
 - **Reish Lakish** says, if the entrance to Gan Eden is in Eretz Yisrael then it must be at “Beis Shean” (which has superior fruits). If it is in Arabia, it is in Beis Gorem (which has superior fruits). If it is in between the rivers, it is in “Dumaskinin”.
 - **Abaye** would praise the fruits on the south side of the Paras River in Bavel. **Rava** would praise the fruits of Harpanya.

U’BEINEIHEM KIMLO SHTEI...

- **Q:** The Mishna said that the oxen in each team must be tied together and not loose. If they are tied, they are obviously not loose?! **A:** The Mishna teaches that it can’t be viewed “as if they are tied” (i.e. close together). They must be viewed as if they are actually tied (which makes for a smaller measurement).

ACHAS NICHNESES V’ACHAS YOTZEIS

- A Braisa explains, the measurement of the “head and most of the body of a cow” is 2 amos. The width of a cow is 1 and 2/3 amos, which according to **R’ Meir** gives a measurement of “approximately” 10 amos for the teams of oxen and according to **R’ Yehuda** is “approximately 13 or 14 amos”.
 - **Q:** According to **R’ Meir** it is exactly 10 amos!? **A:** Since we must say “approximately” for **R’ Yehuda**, we say it for **R’ Meir** as well.
 - **Q:** According to **R’ Yehuda** it is more than 13 and less than 14. So what does the Braisa mean? **A: R’ Pappa** explains, it means that it is between 13 and 14 amos (it is actually 13 and 1/3 amos).
- **R’ Pappa** explains, if a well is 8 amos (and we need 2 amos on each side of the well to allow the animals to stand) all agree that only the double corner-boards are needed, because the distance between them will only be 10 amos. If the well is 12 amos, which means the corner-boards will be 14 amos apart, all agree that an additional straight board is needed on each side. The machlokes is when the well is between 8 and 12 amos. In that case the distance between corner-boards is more than 10 but less than 13 and a 1/3 amos. **R’ Meir** says additional boards are needed and **R’ Yehuda** says that no additional boards are needed.
- **Abaye** asked **Rabbah**:
 - **Q:** According to **R’ Meir**, if the opening between the corner-boards is more than 10 amos, but instead of placing additional boards he increased the length of the corner boards to decrease the opening to 10

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

amos, is that good enough? **A:** He answered, the Mishna says that one must “increase the boards”, which means that the corner-boards are increased.

- **Q:** Maybe it means that other boards must be added!?
- Another version of the above answer had **Rabbah** answering that the Mishna is mashma that one must add boards, and not just extend the corner-boards. The Gemara then says, that the Mishna actually is mashma that the boards may just be extended.
- **Q:** According to **R’ Yehuda**, if the opening between the corner-boards is more than 13 and 1/3 amos, must he add boards or must he extend the corner-boards? **A:** He answered, a Braisa says that **R’ Yehuda** limits the size of the area that may be enclosed using this method. **R’ Yehuda** says, this is different than a typical case of enclosing an area because a typical case uses walls and here we are using corner-boards. If **R’ Yehuda** held that he must extend the corner-boards, when enclosing a large area those corner-boards would be very long boards – to the point that they would actually be walls, and it would be no different than the typical case! It must be that he requires additional boards to be brought in, rather than increasing the corner-boards.
 - **Q:** Even with increasing the corner-boards it is different than the typical case, because the typical case has openings that may be a maximum of 10 amos, and this case may have openings to a maximum of 13 and 1/3 amos.
- **Q:** If there is a mound 10 tefachim high at one of the corners, can it be considered one of the corner-boards (it is not square and doesn’t have the “L” shape that a corner-board needs, but it is wide enough to have the dimensions of the corner-boards)? **A:** He answered, it would be dependent on a machlokes in a Braisa whether a round rock may be viewed as an “L” shaped corner-board. **R’ Shimon ben Elazar** says we do not (because we would have to view two imaginary actions being done here – making it square and then making it L-shaped) and **R’ Yishmael** says that we would view it as an L-shaped board. The machlokes would apply to a mound as well.
- **Q:** A corner-board made of reeds placed within 3 tefachim to each other – is that a good corner-board? **A:** He answered, we learned this in a Braisa which permits a tree or wall of reeds to act as a corner-board. Presumably it is talking about separate reeds that are within 3 tefachim to each other.
 - **Q:** It could be the Braisa is referring to a bush of reeds (attached on the bottom). Even though you may say that is the same thing as a tree, so why would the Braisa mention it, it could be the Braisa mentions 2 types of “trees”.
 - Others had the version that the question was regarding a bush of reeds, whether it can be considered a corner-board. The answer was from the Braisa that permits “reeds” which presumably means a bush of reeds. The Gemara then says, that refers to single reeds, not a bush. The Gemara asks that single reeds are the same thing as a fence (which the Braisa mentions separately)! The Gemara answers that the Braisa mentions two types of fences.