A lengthy discussion of this baraita. A partition of less than three handbreadths — 

A partition from three to four handbreadths —

A partition consisting of boards that are each less than three handbreadths wide, in order for it to be a valid partition, there may not be a gap of three handbreadths between any two boards (Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'ah 296:45).

A partition from three to four handbreadths —

A length description of this baraita. A partition from three to four handbreadths is regarded as an inferior partition. A partition composed of boards more than three but less than four handbreadths wide is valid, even if it has gaps wider than three handbreadths, as long as none of the gaps is wider than its adjacent standing segments. However, that partition is regarded as inferior compared to one made up of components that are more than four handbreadths wide. When the standing components are wider than four handbreadths, the individual components are still regarded as significant and protect the crops facing them from becoming forbidden due to diverse kinds, even when the partition as a whole is invalid, either because of a ten-cubit gap or because of the sum of the gaps is greater than the sum of the standing segments.

A braid [pe’a] above them —

With regard to any partition that consists of boards that are four handbreadths wide, as well as boards from four to ten handbreadths wide, it is necessary that there not be a gap the full width of a board between one board and the next, so that the breached segment will not equal the standing segment. And if the breached segment equals the standing segment, then in the area opposite the standing segment, it is permitted to sow other species, as there is a partition there; however, in the area facing the breached segment it is prohibited. And if the sum of the standing segments is greater than the sum of the breached segments, sowing other species is permitted, even in the area opposite the breached part.

However, if, the partition was breached more than ten cubits, sowing diverse kinds is prohibited, as a breach of more than ten cubits invalidates the entire partition. But if there were pronged stakes stuck in the ground there, and one made them a braid [pe’a] of straw above them in the form of a doorway, even if the stakes were set more than ten cubits apart, sowing is permitted. The form of a doorway renders the partition valid, even if there is a breach wider than ten cubits.

The Gemara explains how the passage from the Tosafot of tractate Kilayim supports the opinion of Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, contrary to that of Rav Pappa. In any case, the first clause of the Tosafot teaches that if each of the boards that make up the partition is from three to four handbreadths wide, sowing other species is permitted, provided that there is not a gap the full width of a board between one board and the next. This is a conclusive refutation of the opinion of Rav Pappa, who permits carrying when the breach equals the standing segment of the partition.
Rav Pappa could have said to you: What does the baraita mean by a gap the full width of a board? It means a gap through which the board could easily be inserted and extracted, which is a gap slightly wider than the board itself.

The Gemara comments: So too, it stands to reason, from the fact that the Tosefta teaches later: If the breached segment is greater than the standing segment, it is prohibited to sow another species, even in the area opposite the standing portion. By inference, if the breached segment equals the standing segment, sowing other species is in fact permitted. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from here proof for the opinion of Rav Pappa.

The Gemara asks: Let us say that this conclusion is a conclusive refutation of the opinion of Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua. The Gemara rejects this: Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, could have said to you: And according to your reasoning, say the latter clause of the Tosefta as follows: If the sum of the standing segment is greater than the sum of the breached segment, sowing other species is permitted even in the area opposite the breached segment. This clause indicates that if the breached segment equals the standing segment, sowing other species is prohibited.

The Gemara points out that that analysis of the baraita leads to the conclusion that the latter clause poses a difficulty for Rav Pappa's opinion; the first clause poses a difficulty for the opinion of Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua.

The Gemara answers: The latter clause poses no difficulty to Rav Pappa. Since the first clause taught the expression: If the sum of the breached segment is greater than the sum of the standing segment, the latter clause of the baraita taught the parallel expression: If the sum of the standing segment is greater than the sum of the breached segment, even though the latter formulation is imprecise, as the same halakha applies even if the two are equal.

Similarly, the Gemara explains that the first clause does not pose a difficulty to Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua. Since the baraita sought to teach the expression in the latter clause: If the sum of the standing segments is greater than the sum of the breached segments, in the first clause taught the parallel expression: If the sum of the breached segments is greater than the sum of the standing segments, even though this formulation is imprecise, as the same halakha applies even if the two are equal.

The Gemara continues: Granted, according to Rav Pappa, who permits carrying in the case where the breaches equal the standing segments, the baraita makes sense, as far as there is a gap did not combine the case of boards less than three handbreadths wide with the case of boards three handbreadths wide and teach them in a single clause. According to Rav Pappa, there is a significant difference between the two situations. In a case where the boards are less than three handbreadths wide, the partition is invalid if there is a gap of three handbreadths between one bar and the next. However, if the boards are precisely three handbreadths wide, the partition is valid unless there is a gap of more than three handbreadths between them.

However, according to Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, who considers a partition invalid when its breached segments are equal to its standing segments, the baraita should have combined the case of boards less than three handbreadths wide with the case of boards exactly three handbreadths wide and taught them in the following single clause: Any partition made of boards less than three handbreadths wide or exactly three handbreadths wide, it is necessary that there not be a gap of three handbreadths between one board and another. According to Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, if a partition with boards three handbreadths wide is to be valid, the gap must be less than three handbreadths.
The Gemara explains why the two cases were not combined according to Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua. It is because the disqualification in the first clause is not similar to the disqualification in the latter clause. The reason for the disqualification in the first clause is because a valid partition must be constructed so that a goat would not be able to jump through the gap in one leap; the reason for the disqualification in the latter clause, where the boards are three handbreadths wide, is so that the breached segments will equal the combined standing segments. In practice, just as in the case of boards less than three handbreadths wide, the gap must be less than three handbreadths, so too, in the case of boards three handbreadths wide, the gap must also be less than three handbreadths. However, in terms of underlying reasoning, the case of boards three handbreadths wide must be categorized in the second grouping in the Tosefta, not the first. Therefore, no proof can be cited from here, neither in support of the opinion of Rav Pappa nor in support of the opinion of Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua.

The Gemara briefly discusses the ruling cited in the Tosefta that a breach of less than three handbreadths does not invalidate a partition. In accordance with whose opinion is that ruling? It is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, who say: In the case of a gap less than three handbreadths, we say, i.e., we apply, the principle of lavud, and the partitions are considered joined; however, if the gap is three handbreadths, we do not say lavud.

Say the latter clause with regard to a partition of boards as follows: In the case of any partition whose boards are three handbreadths wide, and any partition whose boards are from three to four handbreadths wide,

we have arrived at the opinion of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, who said: Concerning any gap less than four handbreadths wide, the principle of lavud is applied. As had it been taught in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, why does the baraita list from three to four handbreadths as a separate category? In the case of both three and four handbreadths, the halakhah is one and the same: The principle of lavud does not apply from three handbreadths upward.

Abaye said: From the fact that the first clause is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, the latter clause must also be in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis. And the Rabbis concede that with regard to any case where the halakha permits sowing other species in the area opposite the standing portion, if there is an area of four handbreadths, it is considered a significant partition, which permits sowing; and if not, it is not considered a significant partition and does not permit sowing. Accordingly, there is a difference between a fence of three handbreadths and one of four handbreadths, as even the Rabbis concede that a fence of four handbreadths is more significant.

Rava said: From the fact that the latter clause is in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, the first clause must also be in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel. And when Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said that we say the principle of lavud in the case of a gap up to four handbreadths wide, this applies above, off the ground, e.g., in the case of a cross beam suspended at a distance from the wall. However, below, near the ground, it is like a partition through which goats can pass, and therefore he too agrees that we do not say the principle of lavud in that case.
The Gemara returns to the dispute with regard to a breach equal to the standing segments of a partition and cites another proof. Come and hear that which was taught in the following baraita: With regard to an area enclosed by these walls, in a case where most of them consist of entrance and windows, it is permitted to carry on Shabbat within the area, provided that the standing segments are greater than the breached segments.

The Gemara analyzes the formulation of the baraita: Can it enter your mind that the baraita is referring to a case where most of the walls are entrances and windows? If so, the standing segments are certainly not greater than the breached segments. Rather, emend the baraita as follows: Carrying in the area enclosed by these walls, to which one added many entrances and windows, is permitted, provided that the standing segments are greater than the breached segments.

The Gemara draws an inference: If the standing segments equal the breached segments, carrying is prohibited in that enclosure. This is a conclusive refutation of the opinion of Rav Pappa. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, it is a conclusive refutation. Nevertheless, the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rav Pappa.

The Gemara wonders: A conclusive refutation and the halakha? The Gemara answers: Yes, that is the case, because the precise reading of the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rav Pappa. As we learned in the mishna the following phrase: Provided ... there will not be breaches in the partition greater than the built segment. This is clearly indicating that if the breached segments are equal to the built segments, carrying is permitted, as maintained by Rav Pappa.

MISHNA If a caravan is camped in a field, and the travelers seek to construct partitions to render the area fit for one to carry within it on Shabbat, one surrounds the area with three ropes, one above another, and a third one above the other two. One is permitted to carry within the circumscribed area provided that there will not be a gap of three handbreadths between one rope and the next. The measure of the ropes and their combined thickness must be greater than a handbreadth, so that the entire partition, consisting of three ropes and the empty spaces between them, will be ten handbreadths high.

Alternatively, one may surround the area with boards that stand upright, provided that there will not be a gap of three handbreadths between one board and the next.

When the Sages issued this ruling, they spoke exclusively of a caravan; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda, who maintains that a partition of this kind, which consists of only horizontal or vertical elements, is permitted exclusively in exigent circumstances. Otherwise, full-fledged partitions are required. However, the Rabbis say: They spoke of a caravan in the mishna only because they spoke in the present, citing the most typical case. Those traveling in caravans were typically unable to erect full-fledged partitions, so they would surround their camps with ropes or boards. However, the halakha in the mishna applies in all cases.

The mishna cites an additional dispute: Any partition that is not constructed of both warp and woof, i.e., vertical and horizontal elements, is not a partition; this is the statement of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda. He holds that the vertical boards and the horizontal ropes are not considered a partition, even in the exigent circumstances of a caravan. However, the Rabbis say: One of the two elements, either vertical or horizontal, is sufficient.

GEMARA Rav Hamnuna said that Rav said: It was concluded in the previous mishna that the Rabbis said that in the case of a partition that consists only of warp, i.e., vertical, elements, if the standing segment of the partition is greater than the breached segment, the fence is considered standing. Rav Hamnuna raised a dilemma: What is the halakha in the case of a partition that consists only of woof, i.e., horizontal, elements? Is it also considered standing if the standing segment is greater than the breached segment, or not?
Abaye said: Come and hear a resolution to this dilemma from the mishna: The measure of the ropes and their combined thickness must be greater than a handbreadth, so that the entire partition will be ten handbreadths high. And if it is so that, in a case where the standing segment is greater than the breached segment, the partition is considered standing even in the case of a fence that consists of horizontal elements, why do I need ropes with a combined thickness of greater than a handbreadth?

Instead, let one leave a space slightly less than three handbreadths, and place a rope of any size, leave another space slightly less than three handbreadths, and place another rope of any size, leave a third space slightly less than four handbreadths, and place a third rope of any size. The ropes between which there is a space less than three handbreadths should be considered joined, based on the principle of lavud. The entire partition should be considered standing because the standing segment, measuring six handbreadths, is greater than the breached segment, which measures four handbreadths.

The Gemara presents a difficulty: And how can you understand that this would be effective? Where does he position the space of slightly less than four handbreadths? If he positions it at the bottom, its legal status is like that of a partition through which goats pass, which is not a valid partition.

If he positions it at the top, then the air on this side, above the uppermost rope, and on that side, below that rope, come and negate it. As there are more than three handbreadths between them the upper and lower ropes, they are not joined together based on the principle of lavud. The four handbreadths below the uppermost rope and the airspace above it combine to negate the connection.

If he positions it in the middle, then the standing segment of the partition is greater than the breached segment, provided that the standing portions on the two sides of the breach are combined. However, if each side is considered separately, the breach is greater than the standing portion. If it is nevertheless deemed a partition, conclude from it that even if the standing segment is greater than the breached segment only when the standing segments on the two sides of the breach are combined, the partition is considered standing. However, that circumstance was raised as a dilemma and remained unresolved.

Rather, Rav Hamnuna raised the following dilemma: What is the halakha in a case where one brought a mat that is seven handbreadths and any additional amount, and carved in it a hole three handbreadths wide, and left four handbreadths above the hole and any additional amount below it, and positioned the mat less than three handbreadths off the ground?

Rav Ashi said: The dilemma he raised is with regard to the legal status of a ten-handbreadth partition suspended off the ground. That dilemma is similar to that which Rabbi Tavla raised as a dilemma before Rav: Does a suspended partition act as if it were a partition when it reaches the ground and render it permitted for one to carry in a ruin? Rav said to him: A suspended partition renders it permitted for one to carry only when it is suspended over water, as there is a leniency introduced by the Sages with regard to water.

The standing segment is greater than the breached segment on the two sides – why is it a partition suspended off the ground? Some commentators explain that the uncertainty with regard to cases where the standing segments of the partition on the two sides of the breach are greater than the breached segments pertains exclusively when the standing segments themselves are greater or only due to the principle of lavud, e.g., in the case of ropes surrounding the camp. There is no uncertainty in cases where the standing segments are actually greater than the breached segments.
Two bet se’a – רבי יהודה א איש
The area required to grow two measures of grain is equal to the size of the courtyard of the Tabernacle. This was the measure determined for a courtyard because the halakhot of carrying objects on Shabbat from one domain to another were derived from the Jewish people’s journeys in the wilderness. From there it was also derived that the area of a courtyard is two bet se’as (Rif; Rabbeinu Hananel).

Three assume the status of a caravan – רבי יוסי
In the Jerusalem Talmud, it is stated that a gentile is not counted as one of the three people for the purpose of this halakha. The Rambam, based on an unresolved dilemma raised in the Jerusalem Talmud, rules that a minor cannot be counted for this purpose either.

The Gemara asks: Where was this statement of Rav Nahman, and some say of Rav Beivai bar Abaye, stated? It was stated with regard to this ruling at the end of the mishna: Any partition that is not made of both vertical and horizontal elements is not a partition; this is the statement of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda.

The Gemara asks: Did Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, actually say this? Wasn’t it taught in a baraita: For both an individual and a caravan, partitions made of ropes are effective? And what, then, is the difference between an individual and a caravan? With respect to an individual, the halakha applies solely to a caravan, he means that it applies only in the case of a caravan, regardless of the size of the area in question. However, in the case of an individual, a partition of that kind is effective only if it encloses an area up to two bet se’a.

This is the statement of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda.

And the Rabbis say: With regard to both an individual and those traveling in a caravan, one provides them with space to satisfy all their needs, provided that there will not be an unoccupied space of two bet se’a. They may not enclose an area that is two bet se’as larger than the space that they require. Apparently, Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, relies on the ruling that ropes render an area fit for one to carry within it, even for an individual.

Rav Nahman, and some say it was Rav Beivai bar Abaye, said: The opinion of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, in the mishna was necessary only to provide them with the space to satisfy all their needs in the case of a properly constructed partition consisting of both horizontal and vertical elements. A partition consisting of exclusively horizontal or vertical elements renders an area of six bet se’a fit for one to carry within it, only in the case of a caravan.

Rav Nahman taught in the name of Rabbeinu Shimuel: With regard to an individual, the halakha provides him with an area of two bet se’a. With regard to two individuals, the halakha provides them with an area of two bet se’a as well. Three individuals assume the legal status of a caravan, and the halakha provides each of them with an area of two bet se’a, for a total of six bet se’a.

Rav Nahman was asked: Did you abandon the majority opinion of the Rabbis and act in accordance with the individual opinion of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda?
HALAKHA

The measure of the enclosure of a field – ישועה חדקך ברכה

If one or two people seek to enclose an area for themselves with ropes for Shabbat, they may enclose only an area of two Beit se’arim. If a group of three people seek to do so, they may enclose enough space to satisfy all their needs. However, if the enclosed area is six Beit se’arim and it includes a vacant area of two Beit se’arim, it is prohibited to carry in the entire area, in accordance with the conclusion of Rav Nahman (Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 362:2).
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Because his father holds in accordance with his opinion – ונשוא

It is clear that the final conclusion is that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. Nevertheless, the statement of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, was cited because it is clearer.

HALAKHA

For three people it is prohibited to carry even in an area of five Beit se’arim –玮ר יאחישר מבית סאה. What is this teaching? If three people made an enclosure consisting of only horizontal or only vertical partitions, and the enclosed area is less than six Beit se’arim, they are all permitted to carry in the entire area. However, if they enclosed an area greater than six Beit se’arim, and this enclosure includes an unoccupied, unused area of two Beit se’arim, it is prohibited to carry in the entire enclosure (Beit Yosei). This halakha is derived from the statement of Rav Giddel, as explained by Rav Ashi. According to this approach, the Rabbis are not more stringent than Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, as an enclosed area of up to six Beit se’arim is permitted in any case. The Gemara asks: What is the difficulty? Perhaps this is what Rav Giddel holds in accordance with his opinion?

The Gemara asks: Is that to say that the first clause of Rav Nahman’s ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, and the latter clause is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis?

The Gemara answers: Yes, because his father, Rabbi Yehuda, holds in accordance with his opinion6 with regard to areas enclosed for the sake of an individual. This being the case, their opinion on this matter is that of the many.

Rav Giddel said that Rav said: At times, for three people it is prohibited to carry even in an area of five Beit se’arim7 at times, it is permitted for them to carry even in an area of seven Beit se’arim. These statements appear irreconcilable, and his colleagues said to him: Did Rav actually say that? He said to them: I swear by the Torah, the Prophets, and the Writings, that Rav said so.

Rav Ashi said: What is the difficulty here? Perhaps this is what he is saying: If they needed six Beit se’arim, and they enclosed seven, they are permitted to carry even in all seven, as one empty Beit se’arim does not render it prohibited for one to carry in the rest of the area. If, however, they needed only five Beit se’arim, and they enclosed seven, carrying even in five is prohibited, as there is an unoccupied space of two Beit se’arim.

The Gemara asks: However, with regard to that to which the baraita is teaching, that the partition renders the area fit for one to carry within it provided that there will not be an unoccupied space of two Beit se’arim, what, is it not in fact referring to space unoccupied by people? In other words, isn’t the baraita teaching that the enclosed area may not be two Beit se’arim larger than a measure of two Beit se’arim per person? Accordingly, if three people enclosed an area of seven Beit se’arim, it should always be permitted for them to carry there, as they are entitled to six Beit se’arim and only one Beit se’arim is unoccupied. The Gemara answers: No, it means unoccupied by utensils. Although they would be entitled to six Beit se’arim if needed, since they need only five in practice and a space of two Beit se’arim remains unoccupied, the effectiveness of the partitions is negated and carrying therein is prohibited.

It is stated: If there were three people in a caravan and one of them died on Shabbat, or if there were two people, and others were added to them on Shabbat, Rav Huna and Rabbi Yitzḥak disagree with regard to the area in which they are permitted to carry on Shabbat. One said: Shabbat determines the status of the area. The halakha is determined in accordance with the prevailing situation at the onset of Shabbat. And one said that the residents, i.e., the actual number of people present at any given moment, determine the status.