The Gemara answers: Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, holds that the breach of an alleyway is also ten cubits. The Gemara raises a difficulty: But in accordance with whose opinion did we state this a fortiori inference? It is in accordance with the opinion of Rav Huna. But doesn’t Rav Huna himself hold that the breach of an alleyway is four handbreadths?

The Gemara answers: Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, did not come to explain Rav Huna’s position. Rather, he stated his own view, and he does not accept Rav Huna’s opinion with regard to the law of a breach in an alleyway.

Rav Ashi went further than Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, and said: Even if you say that the law with regard to a side post protruding four cubits into the alleyway applies in the case of an alleyway that is exactly eight cubits wide, in that it too does not require an additional side post. Whichever way you look at it, you are forced to arrive at this conclusion: If you say that the standing segment is equal to the breached segment, because its standing segment is greater than the breached segment; and if you say that the breached segment is greater, then the protrusion is deemed a side post, as its width must be less than four cubits.

What might you say that would require an additional side post? Would you suggest that there is yet another possibility, that the two are exactly equal, the standing portion and the breach? This is an uncertainty with regard to rabbinic law, as carrying in an alleyway is forbidden only by rabbinic law, and the principle is that where there is an uncertainty with regard to a rabbinic law, one may assume the lenient position, as opposed to an uncertainty arising with respect to a Torah law, where one assumes the stringent position.

The Gemara considers a new case: Rav Hanin bar Rava said that Rav said: With regard to an alleyway that was breached, if it was breached from its side, the side wall of the alleyway, carrying within the alleyway is prohibited if the breach is ten cubits wide. But if it was breached from its front, the wall that faces the public domain, carrying within the alleyway is prohibited even if the breach is only four handbreadths wide.

The Gemara poses a question: What is the difference such that carrying is prohibited due to a breach from the side only if the breach is ten cubits? This is because you say that up to ten cubits it is deemed an entrance. If the breach is in the front, let us also say it is an entrance, and carrying should be permitted if the breach is less than ten cubits.

Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, said: We are dealing with a case where the breach is in a corner. Since people do not make an entrance in a corner, a breach of this kind cannot be viewed as an entrance, and if the breach is larger than four handbreadths it must be sealed.

**HALAKHA**

An alleyway that is eight – מַאי אָמְרַתְּ – דְּשָׁווּ תַּרְוַיְיהוּ כִּי הֲדָדֵי, that is wider than eight cubits. The Gemara answers: Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, holds that the breach of an alleyway is also ten cubits. The Gemara raises a difficulty: But in accordance with whose opinion did we state this a fortiori inference? It is in accordance with the opinion of Rav Huna. But doesn’t Rav Huna himself hold that the breach of an alleyway is four handbreadths?

The Gemara answers: Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, did not come to explain Rav Huna’s position. Rather, he stated his own view, and he does not accept Rav Huna’s opinion with regard to the law of a breach in an alleyway.

Rav Ashi went further than Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, and said: Even if you say that the law with regard to a side post protruding four cubits into the alleyway applies in the case of an alleyway that is exactly eight cubits wide, in that it too does not require an additional side post. Whichever way you look at it, you are forced to arrive at this conclusion: If you say that the standing segment is equal to the breached segment, because its standing segment is greater than the breached segment; and if you say that the breached segment is greater, then the protrusion is deemed a side post, as its width must be less than four cubits.

What might you say that would require an additional side post? Would you suggest that there is yet another possibility, that the two are exactly equal, the standing portion and the breach? This is an uncertainty with regard to rabbinic law, as carrying in an alleyway is forbidden only by rabbinic law, and the principle is that where there is an uncertainty with regard to a rabbinic law, one may assume the lenient position, as opposed to an uncertainty arising with respect to a Torah law, where one assumes the stringent position.

The Gemara considers a new case: Rav Hanin bar Rava said that Rav said: With regard to an alleyway that was breached, if it was breached from its side, the side wall of the alleyway, carrying within the alleyway is prohibited if the breach is ten cubits wide. But if it was breached from its front, the wall that faces the public domain, carrying within the alleyway is prohibited even if the breach is only four handbreadths wide.

The Gemara poses a question: What is the difference such that carrying is prohibited due to a breach from the side only if the breach is ten cubits? This is because you say that up to ten cubits it is deemed an entrance. If the breach is in the front, let us also say it is an entrance, and carrying should be permitted if the breach is less than ten cubits.

Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, said: We are dealing with a case where the breach is in a corner. Since people do not make an entrance in a corner, a breach of this kind cannot be viewed as an entrance, and if the breach is larger than four handbreadths it must be sealed.

**NOTES**

The standing segment is equal to the breached segment – מעָרִיק הַבּוֹלֵט לְמָבוֹי. The discussion of the case where the standing portion of the wall and the breach are exactly equal is connected to a more general question raised in the Talmud: Is precision possible? Can two things be exactly equal to one another in length? Tosafot and other commentaries discuss at length the issue of whether it is possible for man-made things to be fashioned precisely or whether this is impossible. If this is in fact impossible, then since the two portions cannot be equal, carrying within the alleyway should be permitted in either case. It has been suggested that Rav Ashi made his comment only in accordance with the opinion of Rav Yehoshua, who holds that when the breached segment is equal to the standing segment, the wall is considered breached. However, according to those who disagree, his statement was unnecessary. The Rashba is uncertain whether it may be inferred from this discussion that a side post that protrudes past the midline of an alleyway always renders it permitted to carry in the alleyway, even in cases where the width of the alleyway greatly exceeds eight handbreadths. The Rambam maintains, based on Rav Ashi’s statement, that an alleyway of this kind is permitted, whatever its width.

An alleyway that was breached from its side – מַאי אָמְרַתְּ – דְּנַ׳ְשֵׁיהּ אָמַרד מַיְנִקָא הַבּוֹלֵט מִמַּר חַדְּדֵיהּ. It is prohibited to carry in an alleyway that was breached from the side, or one that was breached directly from the front and not at the corner (Magen Avraham), if the breach is ten cubits wide. This rule applies only if people do not regularly cross through the breach. However, if people regularly cross through it, it is prohibited to carry in the alleyway until the breach is repaired, even if the breach is only four handbreadths wide (Rema). This ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Rav Hanin bar Rava, either because the Talmud itself does not issue a final ruling and the halakha is lenient in matters of rabbinic law (Rosh), or because Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, who is a later authority, agrees with him (Vilna Gaon; Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 363:12).

The breach is in a corner – רָאָר אַטְטְרֵק הַבּוֹלֵט לְמָבוֹי. This phrase refers to an alleyway where part of the opening facing the publuc domain had been closed off. If the corner of these two adjoining walls is breached, then the Gemara terms this a breach in a corner.

Breached from its front – מַאי אָמְרַתְּ – דְּנַ׳ְשֵׁיהּ אָמַרד מַיְנִקָא הַבּוֹלֵט. Various opinions were offered with regard to the phrase. Breached from its front. Some commentators explained this as a case where the side wall of the alleyway was breached at the end that opens out into the public domain. Therefore, there was nothing left of the breach of an alleyway (cited by the Meiri). Other authorities taught that the above phrase means that the end wall of the alleyway was breached (Rema). RabbiEliyahu Hananel interpreted the phrase in the latter manner as well, and even had a variant reading that supports this interpretation. The Meiri also preferred this opinion, and the wording of the Jerusalem Talmud supports it as well.
Rav Huna disagreed with Rav Hanin bar Rava and said: There is no distinction between the side and the front, for in both this case and that, a breach of up to four handbreadths is allowed. And so Rav Huna said to Rav Hanin bar Rava: Do not dispute me, as Rav himself arrived at a place called Dambarya and performed an action, i.e., issued a practical ruling, in accordance with my opinion. Rav Hanin bar Rava said in response to him: No proof can be brought from that incident, for in that case Rav found an unguarded valley and fenced it in, i.e., Rav saw the need to add a safeguard and was therefore stringent in this case. His ruling, however, was not generally applied.

Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said: Rav Huna’s opinion stands to reason, as it was stated that the amora’im disagree about the following issue: With regard to a crooked, L-shaped alleyway that opens onto the public domain at both ends, Rav said: Its law is like that of an alleyway that is open on two opposite sides, and it must be treated in a manner suitable for such an alleyway, i.e., an opening in the form of a doorway must be constructed at both ends, or else such an opening must be constructed at the point where the two arms of the alleyway meet and a side post or a cross beam must be placed at each end. And Shmuel said: Its law is like that of an alleyway that is closed on one side, and all that is necessary is a side post or a cross beam at each end.¹

The Gemara clarifies the particular circumstances of the case: With what are we dealing? If you say that the width of the alleyway at the point of the turn is more than ten cubits wide, in this case, would Shmuel say that its law is like that of an alleyway that is closed on one side? With an opening of that size, it must be considered like an alleyway that is open on both ends.

Rather, are we not dealing with a case where the width of the alleyway at the point of the turn is ten cubits or less, and Rav nonetheless said that the law of such an alleyway is like that of an alleyway that is open on both ends. Apparently, a breach in the side wall of an alleyway renders it prohibited to carry even if it is only four handbreadths wide, in accordance with the opinion of Rav Huna.

And Rav Hanin bar Rava argues that the cases cannot be compared: It is different there, in the case of the L-shaped alleyway, for many people cross through the opening from one arm to the other. Since in practice the alleyway is open to regular traffic, the ruling is stringent even with regard to a small breach.

The Gemara asks: Can it be inferred from this that Rav Huna holds that even if many people do not cross through the opening, a breach of four handbreadths still prohibits carrying? What is the difference between this case and the case of the ruling of Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi cited earlier, that an upright board of four handbreadths suffices in order to allow a breach of up to ten cubits?

Rav found an unguarded valley – שְׁמוּאֵל אָמַר: תּוֹרָתוֹ כְּסָתוּםד אַמִּי וְרַבִּי אַסִי? לָא תִּ׳ְלוֹג עֲלַאי, וְרַב הוּנָא אָמַר: אֶחָד זֶה וְאֶחָד זֶה מִכְּלָל דְּרַב הוּנָא סָבַר אַב עַל גַּב דְּלָא הַם, רַב אָמַר: תּוֹרָתוֹ כִּמְ׳וּלָּשׁ, דְּרַב אִי ְלַע לְדַמְחַרְיָא וַעֲבַד עוּבְדָא לְרַב חָנָן בַּר רָבָא: לָא תִּ׳ְלוֹג עֲלַאי, וְרַב הוּנָא אָמַר: אֶחָד זֶה וְאֶחָד זֶה מִכְּלָל דְּרַב הוּנָא סָבַר אַב עַל גַּב דְּלָא הַם.

Background

Most commentaries and halakhic authorities understood the law of a crooked alleyway – הר ב עָה מָצָא suggested. Some commentaries explain that it refers to an arched alleyway. The debate between Rav and Shmuel also appears in the Jerusalem Talmud, where Rabbi Yohanan’s opinion aligns with that of Rav, while Reish Lakish’s opinion aligns with that of Shmuel. The ruling of the Jerusalem Talmud suggests that according to Reish Lakish, the inhabitants of each of the two segments of the alleyway can only carry in their own section, from the entrance to the point where the alleyway turns. Therefore, the inhabitants of the two sections are considered residents of two adjacent alleyways. Rabbi Yohanan maintains that since the inhabitants of the two sections of the alleyway share a common area, they are all prohibited from carrying until the middle section of the alleyway is treated like an alleyway that is open at both ends.

Notes

¹ The law of a crooked alleyway – שְׁמוּאֵל אָמַר: תּוֹרָתוֹ כְּסָתוּםד אַמִּי וְרַבִּי אַסִי? לָא תִּ׳ְלוֹג עֲלַאי, וְרַב הוּנָא אָמַר: אֶחָד זֶה וְאֶחָד זֶה מִכְּלָל דְּרַב הוּנָא סָבַר אַב עַל גַּב דְּלָא הַם, רַב אָמַר: תּוֹרָתוֹ כִּמְ׳וּלָּשׁ, דְּרַב אִי ְלַע לְדַמְחַרְיָא וַעֲבַד עוּבְדָא לְרַב חָנָן בַּר רָבָא: לָא תִּ׳ְלוֹג עֲלַאי, וְרַב הוּנָא אָמַר: אֶחָד זֶה וְאֶחָד זֶה מִכְּלָל דְּרַב הוּנָא סָבַר אַב עַל גַּב דְּלָא הַם.
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LANGUAGE

City entrances (abbulei) –

Rav Binyamin Mosafya and

others explain that this term comes from the Greek ἀψιλον, embolos, meaning a portico or a stopper. It is likely, however,

that its root is the Syrian dūlo, and it is possibly related to the

Hebrew uval, meaning stream (see Daniel 8:2).

One cannot render a public domain fit for carrying by means of an eiruv – Some of the geonim under-

stand that even according to the Gemara’s conclusion, there is no way whatsoever to establish a public domain fit

for carrying. Rabbi Yohanan’s statement does not mean that Jerusalem became a private domain through the locking of its

doors. Rather, due to its doors, it was no longer considered a full-fledged public domain (Me’iri).

The Gemara raises a fundamental question: Can a public domain be rendered fit for carrying by means of an eiruv? Wasn’t it
taught in a baraita: Furthermore, Rabbi Yehuda said:

One who has two houses opposite each other on the two sides of the public domain, and he wishes to carry from one house to

the other on Shabbat via the public domain, he may place a side post from here, on one side of one of the houses, and an additional

side post from here, on the other side. Alternatively, he may place a cross beam from here, from one end of one house, and an additional
cross beam from here, from the other side of the house, and then he may carry objects and place them in the area between them, for in this manner he turns the middle area into a private domain. The Rabbis said to him: One cannot ren-
der a public domain fit for carrying by means of an eiruv in this manner. Apparently, there is no way to establish an absolute public domain fit for carrying by means of an eiruv.

The Gemara questions its previous conclusion: And if you say that it is only in this manner, by way of a side post or a cross beam,

that a public domain cannot be rendered fit for carrying, but by

means of doors it can be rendered fit for carrying. But this is not true, as didn’t Rabbi bar bar Hanα say that Rabbi Yohanan said:

With regard to Jerusalem, were it not for the fact that its doors are locked at night, one would be liable for carrying in it on Shabbat, because its thoroughfares are regarded as a public domain? This shows that the presence of a door is not sufficient to render it permitted to carry in a public domain; rather, the door must actually be locked.

And similarly, Ulla stated: With regard to the city entrances (abbulei) of Mehoza, which meet the criteria for a public domain,

were it not for the fact that their doors are locked, one would be liable for carrying in them, because they are regarded as a public domain. Apparently, without the actual locking of doors it is impossible to establish a public domain fit for carrying by means of the symbolic partitions of a side post or a cross beam. If so, how can the Sages in the baraita argue about how to establish a public domain fit for carrying?
Rather, Rav Yehuda said: The wording of the baraita must be emended so that this is what it says: How does one render alleyways that are not themselves public domains but are open\(^{29}\) on two opposite sides into the public domain fit for carrying by means of an eruv?\(^{29}\)

He constructs an opening in the form of a doorway from here, on one side of the alleyway, and a side post or a cross beam from here, on the other side.

It was stated that the amora’im differed on how the halakha is to be decided with regard to this issue. Rav said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of the anonymous first tanna of the baraita, and it is sufficient to have the form of a doorway on one side and a side post or cross beam on the other side in order to render it permitted to carry in an alleyway that is open on two opposite sides to the public domain. And Shmuel says: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Hananya, following the position of Beit Hillel, who also require a door on one side.

A dilemma was raised before the Sages concerning the position of Beit Hillel: According to Hananya, in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel, must this door be locked or need it not be locked? Come and hear a proof from that which Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said, who, as mentioned earlier, rules in accordance with Beit Hillel: The door need not be locked. And similarly, Rav Mattana said that Shmuel said: The door need not be locked. Some say that Rav Mattana said: A case involving this very issue happened to me, and Shmuel said to me: The door need not be locked.

---

**HALAKHA**

*Alleyways that are open – מְבוֹאוֹת הַמְ׃וּלָּשִׁין*:

It is permitted to carry in an alleyway that is open at two opposite sides into the public domain or into a karmelit if an entrance in the form of a doorway is constructed at one end, and a side post or a cross beam is placed at the other end. This ruling is in accordance with the view of Rav, as his opinion is accepted in matters of ritual law (Shulḥan Arukh, Oraĥ Ĥayyim 364:1). 

**BACKGROUND**

*Alleyways that are open – מְבוֹאוֹת מְ׃וּלָּשִׁין*

According to Tosafot, an open alleyway is considered a full-fledged public domain, because the length of the public domain runs through the alleyway.

Alternatively an open alleyway may not be considered a public domain, in the case where the public domain does not pass through the alleyway. Rather, two public domains pass by the alleyway’s entrances.

---

**NOTES**

*Open alleyways – מְבוֹאוֹת מְ׃וּלָּשִׁין*

According to Rashi, since an alleyway does not have the requisite width of a public domain, i.e., a minimum of sixteen cubits, it is always considered an alleyway, even if the public regularly passes through it. Tosafot differentiate between various types of alleyways, because they do not accept Rashi’s position on this matter.
Doors that are fit to be locked — הלכַחָה. Some authorities state that the doors of a city that is considered public domain need not be locked, so long as it is possible to lock the doors, as in that case it is considered as if they are actually locked. This is in accordance with the Gemara’s understanding of Rav Nahman’s position (Shuĥan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 364:2).

The alleyway in Neharde’a — רַע הָנָךְ מְגָנְבַּיְתוֹ. According to Rashi, the two ends of the alleyway of Neharde’a did not open into two different public domains, in contrast to other crooked alleyways. Rather, the alleyway was shaped like the letter U, with both ends opening into the same public domain. According to Tosafot, the alleyway in Neharde’a was both an open and a crooked alleyway.

They raised a dilemma before Rav Anan with regard to this issue: Need the door be locked or need it not be locked? He said to them: Come and see these city entrances of Neharde’a that open on two opposite sides into the public domain, the gateways of which were filled up halfway with earth, so that the doors themselves could not possibly be locked. Mar Shmuel regularly goes in and out through them, but has never said anything to the people of Neharde’a about them. This shows that it is not necessary for the doors to be locked.

Rav Kahana rejected this proof and said: Those doors in Neharde’a were partially blocked, and therefore there was no need to lock them, but in general, the door of an alleyway that opens on both sides into the public domain must be locked.

The Gemara relates that when Rav Nahman came to Neharde’a, he said: Clear away the earth, so that the doors can be locked. The Gemara attempts to understand this ruling: The stringency of Rav, namely, that which he said, that an L-shaped alleyway is regarded like an alleyway that is open on two opposite sides. But this is difficult, for didn’t Rav say that the law follows the anonymous first tanna of the sifrei, who says that even an open alleyway itself does not require doors, and that an opening in the form of a doorway suffices?

The Gemara answers: They required doors in accordance with the opinion of Shmuel, who said that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Hananya. But this too is difficult, for if the doors were required in accordance with Shmuel’s opinion, didn’t Shmuel say that an L-shaped alleyway is regarded like an alleyway that is closed on one side, which does not need any doors at all? The Gemara explains: The doors were required in accordance with the opinion of Rav, who said that an L-shaped alleyway is regarded like an alleyway that is open on two opposite sides. Therefore, they adopted the stringencies of both Rav and Shmuel: Rav’s stringency that an L-shaped alleyway is deemed an open alleyway, and Shmuel’s stringency that an open alleyway requires a door.

The Gemara describes a certain crooked, L-shaped alleyway that was in Neharde’a, upon which they imposed the stringency of Rav and the stringency of Shmuel, and required it to have doors. The Gemara attempts to understand this ruling: The stringency of Rav, namely, that which he said, that an L-shaped alleyway is regarded like an alleyway that is open on two opposite sides. But this is difficult, for didn’t Rav say that the law follows the anonymous first tanna of the sifrei, who says that even an open alleyway itself does not require doors, and that an opening in the form of a doorway suffices?

The Gemara answers: They required doors in accordance with the opinion of Shmuel, who said that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Hananya. But this too is difficult, for if the doors were required in accordance with Shmuel’s opinion, didn’t Shmuel say that an L-shaped alleyway is regarded like an alleyway that is closed on one side, which does not need any doors at all? The Gemara explains: The doors were required in accordance with the opinion of Rav, who said that an L-shaped alleyway is regarded like an alleyway that is open on two opposite sides. Therefore, they adopted the stringencies of both Rav and Shmuel: Rav’s stringency that an L-shaped alleyway is deemed an open alleyway, and Shmuel’s stringency that an open alleyway requires a door.

A crooked alleyway that was in Neharde’a — ימי רבי נחמן הכהן. According to Rashi, this crooked alleyway was in the shape of the letter U, with both its ends facing the same public domain. Rashi found it necessary to explain it in this manner because the Gemara states that doors were required, implying two doors. Tosafot disagree and say that an alleyway of this kind would be considered closed even according to Rav; rather, the alleyway in Neharde’a actually required only one door, in accordance with Rabbeinu Hananel’s text of the Gemara. Therefore, Tosafot suggest a crooked alleyway of a different shape, i.e., one that is also an open alleyway, with regard to which all agree that two doors are required (see illustrations in the Background notes).

In accordance with Rav and Shmuel — ימי רבי נחמן הכהן. Rif explains that the inhabitants of Neharde’a ruled in accordance with Rav, as the law follows him. However, since Neharde’a was Shmuel’s place of residence, they did not want to dismiss his words entirely, so they acted stringently in accordance with his opinion as well.
The Gemara poses a question: **But do we adopt the respective stringencies of two authorities who disagree on a series of issues?**

Wasn’t it taught in a baraita: The **halakha** is always in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel, but one who wishes to act in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai may do so, and one who wishes to act in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai and also the stringencies of Beit Hillel, he is a wicked person. And if he wishes to adopt both the stringencies of Beit Shammai and also the stringencies of Beit Hillel, with regard to him the verse states: "The fool walks in darkness" **(Ecclesiastes 12:14).** Rather, he should act either in accordance with Beit Shammai, following both their leniencies and their stringencies, or in accordance with Beit Hillel, following both their leniencies and their stringencies.

The Gemara first raises a problem concerning the wording of the baraita: The **halakha** is itself difficult to understand, because it contains an internal contradiction between its clauses: You first said that the **halakha** is always in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel, and then you reversed that and said that one who wishes to act in accordance with the view of Beit Shammai may do so.

The Gemara answers: **This is not difficult.** Here, the baraita’s statement that a person may act as he wishes was made before the Divine Voice emerged and announced that the **halakha** is always in accordance with Beit Hillel; and here, the statement that the **halakha** is always in accordance with Beit Hillel was made after the Divine Voice issued this ruling.

And if you wish, say a different answer: Both this statement and that statement were made after the Divine Voice announced that the **halakha** is in accordance with Beit Hillel,