And Rav Nahman said that Rabba bar Avuh said:

If a projection four by four handbreadths in area extends from a wall, and one placed a ladder of any width against it, if the rungs of the ladder are less than three handbreadths apart, he has diminished the height of the wall by means of this ladder and projection.

The Gemara qualifies this statement: And we said this only in a case where one placed the ladder directly against the projection, so that the ladder serves as a passage to it. However, if he placed it adjacent to the projection, he has merely widened the projection, while the ladder remains separate from it. Consequently, the projection does not have any connection to the ground, and a projection that is not within three handbreadths of the ground does not diminish the height of a wall.

And Rav Nahman said that Rabba bar Avuh said: If a wall between two courtyards is nineteen handbreadths high, it requires one projection to render the use of the wall permitted. If there is a single projection in the middle of the wall, with a ladder of any width resting against it, it is considered a passageway between the courtyards, as the projection is within ten handbreadths of the top of the wall.

However, if the wall is twenty handbreadths high, it requires two projections to render the use of the wall permitted, one within ten handbreadths of the ground, and the other within ten handbreadths of the top of the wall. Rav Hisda said: And this applies only where he positioned the projections not directly one above the other, so that it is possible to use a ladder to climb from one projection to the other.

Rav Huna said: If a pillar in the public domain is ten handbreadths high and four handbreadths wide, so that it is considered a private domain, and one drove a stake of any size into the top of it, he has diminished its area. The usable area is now less than four handbreadths, and therefore the pillar is no longer considered a private domain.

Rav Adda bar Ahava said: This applies only if the stake is at least three handbreadths high. If it is less than three handbreadths high, it is considered part of the top of the pillar, based on the principle of lavud. This is in contrast to Abaye and Rava, who both say: Even if the stake is not three handbreadths high, the pillar is no longer considered a private domain.

**NOTES**

Diminishing by means of a projection – Some explain this differently from Rash: If a projection extends from a wall and a person places a ladder on it, it is no longer convenient to use the projection, it is as though its size were reduced. If, however, he positioned the ladder adjacent to the projection, then it is as though he has enlarged the projection, and it is certainly suitable for use (Rashba).

Two projections – Some explain that these projections are effective without a ladder, and they diminish the height of the wall because they can be used to scale the wall. However, since these projections are not very close to one another, they must be slightly tilted in order to allow one to use them to climb the wall, and they are not considered similar to an upright ladder (Ra’avad; Rashba).

Drove a stake into the pillar – The Rambam understands this case completely differently, and Rabbeinu Hananel seems to interpret it similarly, though he had a different version of the text. Rather than explaining that the stake was driven into the top of a pillar, he understands that the stake was inserted into its side, giving the stake the status of a projection in a wall. Therefore, the stake effectively diminishes the height of the wall. The dispute concerns the size of the stake required to diminish the height of the wall. One opinion maintains that it must be three handbreadths in size so that it can be used for climbing, while Rav Ashi holds, according to Rabbeinu Hananel’s version of the text, that even a stake of less than three handbreadths serves to diminish its height, because it can be utilized for hanging items (see Maggid Mishne).
He filled it entirely with stakes—לָא מְשַׁמֵּשׁ מִן הַלֶּא בְּרַסּוּלָּם. The image below illustrates a pillar entirely filled with stakes. It also shows, by means of the tallest stake, how a stake of this kind makes it inconvenient to place items on the pillar. This depiction is based on Rashi’s explanation. According to the Rambam (see Notes), the stake is inserted into the side of the pillar, and as a result the height of the pillar is considered diminished.

What is the reason for the opinion of Abaye and Rava? It is that the pillar is no longer fit to be used, as a surface of four by four handbreadths is suitable for use only when it is level. If it has even a small projection, it is no longer usable.

Rav Ashi said: Even a stake three handbreadths high does not diminish the area of the pillar. What is the reason for this? It is that it is possible to hang an item on it. Although it is no longer possible to rest objects on top of the pillar, it is still useful in some way.

Rav Aha, son of Rava, said to Rav Ashi: According to your opinion, if he filled it entirely with stakes, i.e., if he drove so many stakes into the top of the post that it was completely filled, what is the halakha?

Rav Ashi said to him: Did you not hear that which Rabbi Yoḥanan said? He said that a pit and its embankment of stone around the edge join together to complete the measure of ten handbreadths. Similarly, the width of the embankment joins with the diameter of the pit to complete the measure of four by four handbreadths necessary to define the pit as a private domain.

There, too, one can raise the question: But why? He cannot use the embankment, as most of the area is the empty space of the pit. Rather, what have you to say, i.e., how can you solve this problem? The solution is that he places an item, e.g., a board, over the mouth of the pit, and then he can make use of it. Here, too, he places an item over the stakes and can make use of the pillar.

Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: If a wall is ten handbreadths high, it requires a ladder fourteen handbreadths high, so that one can place the ladder at a diagonal against the wall. The ladder then functions as a passageway and thereby renders the use of the wall permitted. Rav Yosef said: Even a ladder with a height of thirteen handbreadths and a bit is enough, as it is sufficient if the ladder reaches within one handbreadth of the top of the wall.

Abaye said: Even a ladder that is only eleven handbreadths and a bit suffices, as the ladder will still reach a height of over seven handbreadths, i.e., within three handbreadths of the top of the wall.

Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, said: Even if the ladder is only seven handbreadths and a bit, it is sufficient, as he can stand the ladder upright against the wall. Since it will reach within three handbreadths of the top of the wall, the principle of lanud applies. Therefore, even a ladder placed in this manner is considered a valid passageway between the two courtyards.

Similarly, Rav said: An upright ladder effectively diminishes the height of a wall, as it creates a passageway. I received this teaching as a tradition, but I do not know what the reason is, as people do not generally climb ladders positioned in this manner.

Shmuel said: Does Abba, i.e., Rav, actually not know the reason for this matter? The reason here is as just as it is in the case of a platform above another platform. Even though it is not easy to climb, since it provides steps that can be climbed, albeit with difficulty, it is considered a valid passageway.

Rabba said that Rabbi Hyya said: The trunks of palm trees in Babylonia that were placed next to a wall between two courtyards so that people could climb on them and pass from one courtyard to another do not need to be established permanently and attached to the ground; rather, they serve to diminish the wall as they are. What is the reason for this? It is that their heaviness establishes them as connected to the ground. Although it is permitted to handle them, nevertheless, since their weight makes them difficult to move, they are considered fixed in place.
And similarly, Rav Yosef said that Rabbi Oshaya said: Ladders in Babylonia do not need to be established and fixed permanently in place. What is the reason for this? It is that their heaviness establishes them, as the ladders in Babylonia were typically large and heavy.

The Gemara comments: With regard to the one who said that Babylonian ladders do not need to be fixed in place, all the more so would he agree that the trunks of palm trees, which are placed there from the outset for this purpose, are considered fixed, as both are extremely heavy and also designed to remain in place. On the other hand, the one who said that the trunks of palm trees need not be fixed permanently in the ground, spoke only with regard to palm trees. However, as for ladders, no, they are not considered fixed in place. A ladder, even a heavy one, is designed to be moved from place to place.

Rav Yosef raised a dilemma before Rabba: If there is a narrow ladder measuring less than two handbreadths wide on one side, and a similarly narrow ladder on the other side, and there are rungs of woven straw in the middle between them which would not support a person’s weight, what is the halakha? Are the two ladders considered a single unit, forming a ladder four handbreadths wide, which serves to diminish the height of the wall?

Rabba said to him: The sole of the foot cannot climb upon them. A person usually places his foot in the middle of a ladder. Since the middle of this ladder is made of straw, then although it appears to be four handbreadths wide, it is not fit for use and does not diminish the height of the wall.

Rav Yosef continued to ask: And what if there were rungs of straw on one side and rungs of straw on the other side, and a narrow ladder less than four handbreadths wide in the middle, and their combined width is four handbreadths? What is the halakha in this case? Rabba said to him: The sole of the foot can climb upon them, and the ladder appears to be four handbreadths wide. Therefore, it serves to diminish the height of the wall.

**BACKGROUND**

Rungs of woven straw in the middle between them. The image below shows two narrow ladders held together by rungs of straw or another weak material, which would not support a person’s weight. This illustration is in accordance with Rashi’s explanation.

Straw rungs on each side and a ladder in the middle. The image below depicts a narrow ladder with weak additions made of straw added to its rungs, which would not support a person’s weight (in accordance with the explanation of Rashi).

**HALAKHA**

Their heaviness establishes them. Heavy ladders and stumps of palm trees that are placed next to a wall serve to diminish its height. Even though it is permissible to move them, their weight establishes them as fixed in place (Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Eiruvin 3:7).

Rungs of straw and a narrow ladder. If there are two ladders alongside one another, each of which is less than two handbreadths wide, and one connects them with straw rungs, they do not serve to diminish the height of the wall. However, a ladder less than four handbreadths wide that one increased to the size of four handbreadths by attaching straw rungs on each side effectively diminishes the height of the wall (Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 372:13).

**NOTES**

Some commentaries interpret this case in an entirely different manner, explaining that there is a straw partition separating two courtyards, with ladders leaning against it from both sides. Rav Yosef asked whether these ladders can be considered a passageway, to which Rabba replied that since one cannot climb the ladders due to the instability of the straw partition, they are insignificant. Rav Yosef then inquired as to the ruling in a case where the ladders are leaning on a section of the partition made of stable material, while the rest of the partition is made of straw. Ravba answered that in that case the ladders are effective, since it is possible to climb them (p’rinn; Ra’avad).
One dug out grooves in the wall – אֲשֵׁרָר חֲ ָ וֹ לוֹרַשְׁלִים בַּכּוֹתֶל
Some interpret this case differently: The ladder is four handbreadths wide, but very short, and it is completed by hollowing out additional rungs in the wall above the ladder to a height of within ten handbreadths of the top of the wall (Rashba, MeI‘in). Rabbeinu Hananel explains that the phrase dug out to complete indicates that there is a hole in the wall that one sought to widen to a measure of four by four handbreadths so that it may serve as a window. According to this explanation, Rabba’s answer is that if one hollowed out a space of four handbreadths within ten handbreadths of the ground, it is sufficient. However, if one wishes to hollow out a proper entrance in the wall, it must reach the full height of a person. The reason is that since he has decided to make an entrance, it must be one through which people can pass.

Asheira – אֲשֵׁרָר. The assumption is that this tree is no longer growing, but has fully dried out or has been up-rooted from its place. Otherwise, two questions are relevant here, since it is both an asheira and a tree that may not be climbed on Shabbat.

Dug in the wall to complete the measure – יָצָא מִפְּעָלָג בַּכּוֹתֶל: The illustration below depicts grooves hollowed out in a wall to complete the required width of a narrow ladder.

Rav Yosef further asked: If the ladder resting against the wall was less than four handbreadths wide, and one dug out grooves in the wall\(^6\) as extensions of the rungs of the ladder to complete the measure,\(^8\) how high must this hollowed-out section be to consider the ladder a valid passageway between the two courtyards? Rabba said to him: If it is ten handbreadths high and four handbreadths wide, it is considered a passageway.

Rav Yosef said to him: If there was no ladder, and one dug out the entire ladder in the wall, so that all the steps are grooves in the wall, how much must he hollow out? Rabba said to him: Those steps must reach the full height of the wall. Rav Yosef asked: And what is the difference in this case? Why must the steps reach higher in this case than in the case where the hollowed-out section was merely an extension of an existing ladder? Rabba said to him: There, where there is a ladder, it is easy to climb to the top of the wall; however, here, where there are only grooves in the wall, it is not easy to climb. If one cannot reach the top of the wall, the steps are not considered a passageway between the courtyards.

Rav Yosef raised a dilemma before Rabba: If one designated a tree as a ladder, what is the halakha? Given that it is prohibited to climb a tree on Shabbat, if a tree stands next to a wall and it is easy to climb, is it considered with regard to the halakhah of Shabbat as an opening in the wall that can serve as a passageway between the two courtyards?

Let the dilemma be raised according to the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, who maintains that a joining of Shabbat boundaries [eiruv telumin] placed in a tree is valid; and let the dilemma be raised according to the opinion of the Rabbis, who disagree.

The Gemara elaborates: Let the dilemma be raised according to the previously stated opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi only stated there that with regard to anything that is prohibited on Shabbat due to a rabbinic decree [shevu‘], the Sages did not prohibit it during twilight. Therefore, in Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi’s opinion, it is permitted to use an eiruv that was deposited in a tree, as the use of a tree is prohibited on Shabbat by rabbinic decree. However, this applies only in that case, as the eiruv takes effect during the twilight period. Since there is doubt with regard to whether that period is considered day or night, the decree is not in force, and the eiruv is therefore valid. However, in this case, where the opening must be valid for the entire day, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi would not rule that the decree does not apply. Since it is prohibited by rabbinic decree to climb a tree on Shabbat, a tree cannot be considered a valid passageway.

Or perhaps it may be argued that even according to the opinion of the Rabbis, this tree is considered an opening. They may have said that a joining of Shabbat boundaries placed in a tree is not valid only because the eiruv must actually be accessible during twilight, and in that case it is not, due to the rabbinic decree. However, in this case, where it is not necessary to make actual use of the tree, they would agree that a tree that serves as a ladder is a valid entrance, but a lion crouches upon it. Just as a lion crouching at an opening does not thereby nullify its status as an entrance, although in practice no one can pass through it, so too, in the case of the tree, the prohibition against climbing it does not nullify its status as a passageway.

Rav Yosef further inquired: If one designated a tree worshipped as part of idolatrous rites [asheira],\(^4\) from which it is forbidden to derive benefit, as a ladder, what is the halakha? Is it considered a valid passageway in the wall with regard to the halakhah of Shabbat? Here, too, let the dilemma be raised according to the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, and let the dilemma be raised according to the opinion of the Rabbis.

NOTES

\(^{4}\) From which it is forbidden to derive benefit, not nullify its status as a passageway.
A lion crouches upon it—אֵין נִצְבַּה— leukemia. It was clear to those asking the question that a lion actually crouching in an entrance would not nullify its status as an entrance. Therefore, the question here is whether the prohibition involved in climbing a tree affects its status as a passageway, or whether this is considered an external factor, similar to a lion crouching at an entrance. According to Rav, the prohibition to use a tree on Shabbat is an external factor, as the tree itself is not prohibited, and the prohibition to use it can be viewed as secondary. However, the prohibition to derive benefit from an ashera affects the status of the tree itself to the extent that it is considered as though the tree were not there at all. Rav Hisda maintains that since the prohibition with regard to an ashera does not belong to the category of Shabbat laws, it does not affect the tree’s status as an opening with regard to Shabbat. By contrast, a Shabbat prohibition does nullify a tree’s status as an entrance, at least for the day of Shabbat itself (see Me’iri).

The Gemara elaborates: Let the dilemma be raised according to the previously stated opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Yehuda only stated there that it is permitted to acquire, i.e., make use of, a house for the purposes of establishing an eiruv even if it is among the items from which it is prohibited to derive benefit, such as a grave. This statement applies only there, with regard to acquiring an eiruv in that location, since after the eiruv has acquired a place of residence for him, it is not important to him that it is guarded. He requires the grave only for the moment of the acquisition of the eiruv, and what happens to it afterward is of no consequence to him. However, here, since one desires the continued presence of the ladder, it is possible that even Rabbi Yehuda would agree that one may not rely on an ashera, as one may not climb and make use of it, since it is prohibited to derive benefit from it.

Or perhaps it may be argued that even according to the opinion of the Rabbis it is prohibited to use a grave to acquire an eiruv, here they would agree that the ashera is an opening, but a lion crouches upon it, and this does not nullify its status as an opening.

Rabba said to him: A tree is permitted for use as a ladder, but an ashera is prohibited. Rav Hisda strongly objects to this: On the contrary, a tree, with regard to which a Shabbat prohibition causes it to be prohibited, should be prohibited, so that it will not be said that a Shabbat prohibition has been disregarded in a case involving the halakhot of Shabbat.

And the converse is also true: An ashera, with regard to which something else, a halakha unrelated to the halakhot of Shabbat, causes it to be prohibited, should not be prohibited. Rather, it should be considered an opening with regard to Shabbat.

Indeed, it was also stated: When Ravin came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said that Rabbi Elazar said, and some say that Rabbi Abbahu said that Rabbi Yohanan said: Anything with regard to which a prohibition of Shabbat causes it to be prohibited, should not be prohibited. Conversely, anything with regard to which something else causes it to be prohibited is permitted.

However, in contrast to Rav Yosef, Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak taught as follows: These questions are indeed dependent on the known disputes. Whether a tree serving as a ladder constitutes a valid opening is the subject of a dispute between Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi and the Rabbis; Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi permits it and the Rabbis prohibit it. The debate with regard to whether or not an ashera is considered an opening is the subject of a dispute between Rabbi Yehuda, who permits using items from which it is prohibited to derive benefit for the sake of an eiruv, and the Rabbis, who prohibit making an eiruv with such items.11

MISHNA
With regard to a ditch between two courtyards that is ten cubits deep and four handbreadths wide, it is considered a full-fledged partition, and the residents of the courtyard establish two eiruvin, one for each courtyard, but they may not establish one eiruv. Even if the ditch is filled with straw or hay, it is not regarded as sealed and is therefore not nullified. However, if the ditch is filled with dirt or pebbles, the residents establish one eiruv, but they may not establish two eiruvin, as the ditch is nullified and considered nonexistent.

If one placed a board four handbreadths wide across the ditch so that he could cross it, and similarly, if two balconies, extrast, meaning a balcony or area that protrudes from a building.

NOTES
11 A board across a ditch —דֶּרֶךְ יַד לֵיתָר: If a board four handbreadths wide is placed across a ditch that separates two courtyards, it is considered a passageway between the courtyards, and the residents of the two courtyards may establish one eiruv if they wish. The same applies if the residents sealed the ditch along a length of four handbreadths with material that would render it nullified (Rama, based on Ritva and Beit Yosef; Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 372:17).

Two balconies —גְּזוּזְטְרָא: If a plank four handbreadths wide is placed between two balconies that face each other, the residents of the two balconies may establish a single eiruv (Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 372:1).

LANGUAGE
Balcony (gezuzot) —גְּ злоּזְתָּא. From the Greek ἐξωστρά, meaning a balcony or area that protrudes from a building.
A house that one filled – אериו השלא לוכד וארו. If one filled a house with straw and hay that he subsequently nullified, it is as though the house were nonexistent. Therefore, the ritual impurity imparted by a corpse found inside is not contained by the house, rather, it extends in all directions (Rambam: Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tamud Me’iri 7:6).

**HALAKHA**

A board across a ditch – סֶר עַל חָרִיץ. If one filled a house with straw and hay that he subsequently nullified, it is as though the house were nonexistent. Therefore, the ritual impurity imparted by a corpse found inside is not contained by the house, rather, it extends in all directions (Rambam: Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tamud Me’iri 7:6).

The Gemara wonders: Does hay not constitute a proper filling to seal the ditch?

Didn’t we learn in the following mishna: With regard to a haystack ten handbreadths high that stands between two courtyards, the residents of the two courtyards establish two eiruvin, but they may not establish one eiruv. This indicates that hay can create a valid partition.

Abaye said that the matter should be understood as follows: With regard to a partition, everyone agrees that hay is a partition and that it divides between the courtyards as long as it is placed there. But with regard to filling the ditch so that it is considered sealed, one must distinguish between two cases: If one explicitly nullified the hay and decided to leave it there, it fills and seals the ditch; however, if he did not nullify it but intends to remove the hay from the ditch, it does not fill it, and the ditch is not considered sealed.

It is written in the mishna: If the ditch is filled with dirt or pebbles, it is considered sealed. The Gemara asks: Does this apply even if one did not specify his intention to leave it there? Didn’t we learn in a mishna with regard to the ritual impurity of a corpse: If there is a house that one filled with hay or pebbles, and he nullified the hay or pebbles and decided to leave them in the house, then the house (Rambam) is nullified and is no longer considered a house with partitions? Generally, a house containing a corpse is ritually impure on the inside but does not impart impurity to the surrounding area. However, in this case, the house is considered an enclosed grave that imparts ritual impurity to its surroundings.

And one can infer from the mishna: If he nullified the hay or pebbles, yes, the house is nullified and considered sealed.

**GEMARA**
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