A Sage taught in the *Tosafot: And half of one half of its half,*¹⁴⁸ one-eighth of this loaf, is the minimum measure of food that contracts the ritual impurity of foods.⁹ The Gemara asks: *And our tanna,* in the mishna, for what reason did he not teach the measure of the impurity of foods? The Gemara answers: He did not state this halakha because their measures are not precisely identical. The measure for the impurity of foods is not exactly half the amount of ritually impure food that disqualifies one from eating teruma.

As it was taught in a *baraita:* How much is half a *peras*? Two eggs minus a little; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Yosei says: Two large eggs, slightly larger ones than average. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi measured the amount of half a *peras* after calculating the number of *kav* in the *se’ah* brought before him, and found it to be a little more than two eggs.⁸ The *tanna* asks: How much is this little more? One-twentieth of an egg.

In contrast, concerning the impurity of foods, it was taught in a *baraita:* Rabbi Natan and Rabbi Dosa said that the measure of an egg-bulk, which the Sages said is the amount that contracts the impurity of foods, is equivalent to it, i.e., the egg, and its shell. And the Rabbis say: It is equivalent to it without its shell.⁸ These amounts are not precisely half of any of the measurements given for half a *peras.*

As for the issue itself, Rafram bar Pappa said that Rav Hisda said: This *baraita* that clarifies the measure of half a *peras* is in accordance with the statements of Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Yosei, a measure that is identical to that of Rabbi Shimon in the mishna. But the Rabbis say: One and one half large egg-bulks. And who are these Rabbis? Rabbi Yoĥanan ben Beroka.

The Gemara registers surprise: This is obvious, as Rabbi Yoĥanan ben Beroka maintains that half a loaf is three egg-bulks, half of which is an egg-bulk and one half. The Gemara explains: The novel aspect of this teaching is not the amount itself; rather, he came to teach us that the measurement is performed with large eggs.

The Gemara relates that when Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said: A person named Bonyos sent Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi a measure [*moday*]¹ of a *se’ah* from a place called Na’usa, where they had a tradition that it was an ancient and accurate measure (Ritva). And Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi measured it and found it contained 217 eggs.

The Gemara asks: *This se’ah, from where* is it, i.e., on what measure is it based? If it is based on the wilderness se’ah, the standard measure used by Moses in the wilderness, which is the basis for all the Torah’s measurements of volume, the difficulty is that a se’ah is composed of six *kav,* where each *kav* is equivalent to four log and each log is equivalent to six egg-bulks. This means that a se’ah is equivalent to a total of 144 egg-bulks.

And half of one half of its half – *פרק VIII דף 83א עמוד א*

HALAKHA

Half of one half of its half contracts the ritual impurity of foods – הֲצִי חֲצִי חֶצְיָרּ לְטַמֵּא טוּמְאַת אֶכֶלִין. Food that is the volume of an egg without its shell is susceptible to contract ritual impurity of foods, in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis (Rambam *Sefer Tahara* 4:1).

LANGUAGE

Measure [*moday*] – מְדוֹיָא: From the Greek μοδίας, modios, a dry measure.

NOTES

¹⁴⁸ And half of one half of its half – מִשּׁוּם דְּלָא שָׁווּ תָּיְדָא וַחֲצִי חֲצִי חֶצְיָרּ לְטַמֵּא טוּמְאַת אֶכֶלִין. The early commentaries discuss the question of whether or not the measure for the impurity of foods is linked to the measure of a loaf of bread and half-a-loaf (*peras*). Some commentators accept this connection (Rashi, Tosafot, and others). Other authorities maintain that all the Sages agree that the minimum amount required for food to be susceptible to ritual impurity is the volume of an egg, even according to Rabbi Yoĥanan ben Beroka, as a different reason is offered for this minimum amount. In that case, there is no connection between the two measures (Ritva). Even so, this issue remains problematic. If the Ritva is correct, and there is no connection between the two, why does the Gemara inquire into the reason that the tanna did not teach this amount (*Bab. *)? One answer is that even though it would not have been accurate according to Rabbi Yoĥanan ben Beroka’s ruling, it would have been reasonable to expect the mishna to continue in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon and the others (Rashi).

² A little more than two eggs – מִשּׁוּם דְּלָא שָׁווּ תָּיְדָא. Some commentators explain that this additional amount is referring to both egg-bulks together. In other words, one-fortieth of an egg-bulk is added to each egg-bulk (see Rash). However, it is more likely that the excess amount of one-twentieth is added to each egg-bulk. Consequently, the amount for two egg-bulks is one-tenth of an egg-bulk, as implied by Rashī’s calculation (Ritva).

³ An egg-bulk without the egg’s shell – בְּלִי לְמוֹדְיָא אֶכֶל בַּרְּאָסָטַרְתּ. Food is susceptible to ritual impurity when it consists of the measure of food eaten in one sitting. Since this measure was established as an egg-bulk, it must refer to the edible part of an egg, which excludes its shell (*Mein*).
Dough from which halla is separated – דִּירֵי מִכְּדִי מְצֵא מַשָּׁנֵי בְּדִילָה
The changing measurements – נִיבְּהוֹן מֵאָר שִׁבְעִים וְשָׁלֹשׁ רָוְיָא
The Gemara answers: Actually, this measure is based on the se’a of Tzippori, but you must bring the amount of the halla given to a priest, and add it to them. That is to say, although this measure is slightly larger than a se’a, if it is used for flour and you deduct the amount due as halla, you are left with exactly one se’a, or 207 egg-bulks.

The Gemara raises an objection: The amount of halla, how many egg-bulks is it? Approximately eight egg-bulks, one-twenty-fourth of 207. Yet in that case, it remains less than 217 egg-bulks, for even if we were to add another eight egg-bulks for halla to the 207 egg-bulks, we would have only 215 egg-bulks, almost 216 to be more precise, which is still less than 217.

Rather, you must bring the excess amounts of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, the little more he included in his measure, and add these to them. In Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi’s calculations, he did not factor in the halla that had to be separated. Instead, the egg-bulks he used to measure the se’a were small egg-bulks. Consequently, one-twentieth of an egg-bulk must be added for each egg-bulk. Since one-twentieth of 207 egg-bulks is roughly ten, the total amount equals 217 egg-bulks.

The Gemara raises an objection: If so, it is still slightly more than 217 egg-bulks, by seven-twentieths of an egg-bulk, to be precise. The Gemara answers: Since it is not more than 217 egg-bulks by a whole egg, he did not count it.

The Sages taught in a baraita: A Jerusalem se’a is larger than a wilderness se’a by one-sixth, and that of Tzippori is larger than a Jerusalem se’a by one-sixth. Consequently, a se’a of Tzippori is larger than a wilderness se’a by one-third.

The Gemara inquires: One-third of which measurement? If you say it means one-third of a wilderness se’a, now you must consider: One-third of a wilderness se’a, how much is it? Forty-eight egg-bulks, and yet the difference between the wilderness se’a and the Tzippori se’a is sixty-three egg-bulks. As stated above, a Tzippori se’a is 207 egg-bulks, whereas a wilderness se’a is only 144 egg-bulks.

But rather, this one-third mentioned in the baraita is referring to one-third of a Jerusalem se’a, which is 173 egg-bulks, as stated above. The Gemara again examines the calculation: One-third of that se’a, how much is it? Fifty-eight less one-third, and yet the difference between the wilderness and the Tzippori se’a is sixty-three. Rather, you must say that it is referring to one-third of a Tzippori se’a. One-third of that se’a, how much is it? Seventy less one-third, and yet the difference between the wilderness se’a and the Tzippori se’a is sixty-three egg-bulks. The difference between the measures is not exactly one-third according to any of the known se’a measurements.

Rather, Rabbi Yirmeya said that this is what the tanna is saying: Consequently, a se’a of Tzippori is larger than a wilderness se’a by sixty-three egg-bulks, which is close to one-third of a Tzippori se’a of sixty-nine egg-bulks. And one-third of it, sixty-nine egg-bulks, is close to half of a wilderness se’a of seventy-two egg-bulks.
The excess amounts of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi – (Rashi).

A little more than two eggs – שְׂתֵּי בֵּיצִים וְעוֹד. Although the final sum is accurate, the wording of the baraita remains difficult (see Tosafot). However, it can in fact be explained in a straightforward manner: One-third of the Tzippori se’a and half of the wilderness se’a – כַּבֵּיצָר בְּלִי ְלִי׳ָּתָרּ. Although the large Tzippori measure of 207 egg-bulks is the difference between the Tzippori and the wilderness measurements, which is 143 egg-bulks plus one-third of an egg-bulk. This interpretation fits the wording of the baraita precisely.

Ravina raised an objection to the opinion of Rabbi Yirmeya: Does the baraita state either: Close to one-third of a Tzippori se’a or: Close to half of a wilderness se’a? The wording of the baraita indicates an exact amount. Rather, Ravina said that this is what the tanna is saying: Consequently, one-third of a Tzippori se’a together with the excess amounts of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi is greater than half of a wilderness se’a of seventy-two egg-bulks by only one-third of an egg. In other words, a Tzippori se’a of 207 egg-bulks added to the excess amounts of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi of one-twentieth of an egg-bulk for each egg-bulk amounts to a total of 217 egg-bulks, one-third of which is seventy-two and one-third egg-bulks.

Our Sages taught a baraita: The verse states: “You shall set apart a cake of the first of your dough as a gift; like the gift of the threshing floor, so shall you set it apart” (Numbers 15:20).

NOTES

The excess amounts of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi – (Rashi).

A little more than two eggs – שְׂתֵּי בֵּיצִים וְעוֹד. Although the final sum is accurate, the wording of the baraita remains difficult (see Tosafot).

One-third of the Tzippori se’a and half of the wilderness se’a – כַּבֵּיצָר בְּלִי ְלִי׳ָּתָרּ. Although the large Tzippori measure of 207 egg-bulks is the difference between the Tzippori and the wilderness measurements, which is 143 egg-bulks plus one-third of an egg-bulk. This interpretation fits the wording of the baraita precisely.

Ravina raised an objection to the opinion of Rabbi Yirmeya: Does the baraita state either: Close to one-third of a Tzippori se’a or: Close to half of a wilderness se’a? The wording of the baraita indicates an exact amount. Rather, Ravina said that this is what the tanna is saying: Consequently, one-third of a Tzippori se’a together with the excess amounts of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi is greater than half of a wilderness se’a of seventy-two egg-bulks by only one-third of an egg. In other words, a Tzippori se’a of 207 egg-bulks added to the excess amounts of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi of one-twentieth of an egg-bulk for each egg-bulk amounts to a total of 217 egg-bulks, one-third of which is seventy-two and one-third egg-bulks.

Our Sages taught a baraita: The verse states: “You shall set apart a cake of the first of your dough as a gift; like the gift of the threshing floor, so shall you set it apart” (Numbers 15:20).

NOTES

The residents of a courtyard and... a balcony – עֲשָׂרָר טְ׳ָחִים – לַמִּרְ׳ֶּסֶת, ׳ָּחוֹת סֶלֶכֶת שֶׁל יְרוּשַׁלְמִית, שֶׁרֵן חֲמִשָּׁר. The chapter began with a discussion of the halakhot governing the joining of Shabbat limits, a natural extension of the previous chapters, which focused on the required measures for merging courtyards that open into an alleyway and a joining of houses in a courtyard. Now, however, the mishna returns to the main topic of these chapters, the halakhot of the joining of courtyards.

Forgot and did not establish an eiruv – שֶׁפֶר אֶלָּו מִלְּא יְדוּתָר. Rashi and most commentators explain that the residents of the courtyard and the balcony established separate eirevot. However, Rabbi Zeraaya HaLevi maintains that the same halakha applies even if they did not establish an eiruv at all. Tosafot Yom Tov addsuces proof for Rashi’s explanation from the phrase: Forgot and did not establish an eiruv. The seeming redundancy of this double expression indicates that the inhabitants prepared some sort of eiruv, albeit not a complete one. Had they established no eiruv at all, the mishna would simply have stated that they did not establish an eiruv.

BACKGROUND

A balcony with stairs leading to a courtyard – חָצֵר וְאַ ְשֵׁי מִרְ׳ֶּסֶת. The residents on the upper story access the balcony and the courtyard via stairs.

HALAKHA

What is the quantity of dough from which hala is must be separated? The amount of “your dough.” And how much is “your dough”? This amount is left unspecified by the verse. The Gemara answers: It is as the amount of the dough of the wilderness. The Gemara again asks: And how much is the dough of the wilderness?

The Gemara responds: The Torah states that the manna, the dough of the wilderness, was “an omer a head” (Exodus 16:16). A later verse elaborates on that measure, as it is written: “And an omer is the tenth part of an efa” (Exodus 16:36). An efa is three se’a, which is eighteen kav or seventy-two log. An omer is one-tenth of this measure. From here, this calculation, Sages said that dough prepared from seven quarters of a kav of flour and more is obligated in hala. This is equal to six quarter-kav of the Jerusalem measure, which is five quarter-kav of the Tzippori measure.

From here the Sages also said: One who eats roughly this amount each day, is healthy, as he is able to eat a proper meal; and he is also blessed, as he is not a glutton who requires more. One who eats more than this is a glutton, while one who eats less than this has damaged bowels and must see to his health.

MISHNA

If both the residents of houses that open directly into a courtyard and the residents of apartments that open onto a balcony from which stairs lead down to that courtyard forgot and did not establish an eiruv between them, anything in the courtyard that is ten handbreadths high, e.g., a mound or a post, is part of the balcony. The residents of the apartments open to the balcony may transfer objects to and from their apartments onto the mound or post. Any post or mound that is lower than this height is part of the courtyard.

The residents of a courtyard and the residents of a balcony forgot and did not establish an eiruv – שֶׁפֶר אֶלָּו מִלְּא יְדוּתָר. With regard to a mound or a post that is located in a courtyard and belongs to both to the courtyard and the balcony, both of whose residents did not establish a joint eiruv, if the mound or post is not ten handbreadths high, the residents of the courtyard render it prohibited for the residents of the balcony to carry any utensil that was located in the house when Shabbat began and vice versa. If the post is four handbreadths away from the house, some commentators state that it belongs to both groups because the inhabitants of the balcony can use it by throwing objects onto it (Oraĥ Ĥayyim, citing the Bet Yosef). Other authorities maintain that if the post stands at a distance of four handbreadths from the balcony or if it is lower than ten handbreadths from the balcony, it may be used exclusively by the residents of the courtyard (Tur and other authorities; Shulĥan Arukh HaRav). If the post is ten handbreadths higher than the courtyard but within ten handbreadths of the height of the balcony, and the post is within four handbreadths of the balcony, use of the post is granted to the residents of the balcony (Shulĥan Arukh, Oraĥ HaYamim 372).
A similar halakha applies to an embankment that surrounds a cistern or a rock: If the embankments that surround a cistern or rock are ten handbreadths high, they belong to the balcony; if they are lower than this, they may be used only by the inhabitants of the courtyard.

In what case are these matters, the halakha that anything higher than ten handbreadths belongs to the balcony, stated? When the mound or embankment is near the balcony. But in a case where the embankment or mound is distant from it, even if it is ten handbreadths high, the right to use the embankment or mound goes to the members of the courtyard. And what is considered near? Anything that is not four handbreadths removed from the balcony.

GEMARA The Gemara comments: It is obvious that if the residents of two courtyards established separate eiruvin, and the residents of both courtyards have convenient access to a certain area, the residents of this courtyard through an entrance, and the residents of that courtyard through another entrance, this is similar to the case of a window between two courtyards. If the residents did not establish a joint eiruv, the use of this window is prohibited to the residents of both courtyards.

It is similarly obvious that if a place can be used by the residents of this courtyard only by throwing an object onto it and by the residents of that courtyard only by lowering, but it cannot be conveniently used by either set of residents, then this is equivalent to the case of a wall between two courtyards. If there is a wall between two courtyards, it may not be used by either courtyard. Likewise, if a place can be used by the residents of this courtyard only by lowering an object down to it and by the residents of that courtyard by a similar act of lowering, this is comparable to the halakha of a ditch between two courtyards, which may not be used by the residents of either courtyard.

The ruling in each of the aforementioned cases is clear. What is the halakha concerning a place that can be used by the residents of this courtyard only by lowering an object down to it and by the residents of that courtyard only by throwing an object onto it, this is governed by the ruling of Rabba bar Rav Huna, who said that Rav Nahman said: This place may be used only by those who have access to the area by way of an entrance. Likewise, a place that can be conveniently used by the residents of this courtyard through an entrance but can be used by the residents of that courtyard by throwing an object onto it, this is governed by the ruling of Rav Sheizvi, who said that Rav Nahman said: This place may be used only by those who have convenient access to it.

In order to decide between these two opinions, the Gemara attempts to adduce a proof from the mishna: If the residents of houses that open directly into a court yard and the residents of apartments that open onto a balcony from which stairs lead down to that courtyard forgot and did not establish an eiruv between them, anything in the courtyard that is ten handbreadths high belongs to the balcony, while anything that is less than this height belongs to the courtyard.
The Gemara first explains: It might have entered your mind to say: What is the meaning of the balcony mentioned in the mishna?

Perek VIII
Daf 84 Amud a

NOTES

The difficulty raised against Rav – רַ וּשְׁיָר עַל רַב: A similar question appears in the Jerusalem Talmud, in which the difficulty is resolved by claiming that the dispute between Rav and Shmuel is limited to a case where the distances for lowering and throwing are equal. Consequently, if the post is closer to the balcony and within three handbreadths of it, and the post is higher than ten handbreadths from the courtyard, Rav would concede that its use is reserved exclusively for the residents of the balcony.

A post in a courtyard – עַמּוּד שֶׁלְּיָד מִרְ׳ֶּסֶת: Some commentaries accept the explanation in the Jerusalem Talmud that the residents of both the courtyard and the balcony have the right to use the post on weekdays. However, if the post belongs exclusively to one group of residents, the other group cannot impose restrictions upon them, even if their use is more convenient for the other group than for its owners.

HALAKHA

Those who live in the balcony – אַ ְשֵׁי חָצֵר וְאַ ְשֵׁי מִרְ׳ֶּסֶת שֶׁשָּׁכְחוּ וְלֹא עֵירְבוּ: With regard to the use of a mound or post in a courtyard, the same halakha applies to the residents of a balcony as to those who live in the upper story. In accordance with the opinion of Rav Huna, if the mound or post is ten handbreadths high, the right to use it belongs solely to the residents of the balcony or upper story (Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayim 295:2).

It is referring to the residents of an upper story above the balcony; and if so, why do we call the upper story a balcony? Because the residents of the upper story ascend and descend to and from their apartments by way of the balcony. From here the Gemara infers: With regard to any place that can be used by one set of residents only by lowering an object down to it and by another set of residents only by throwing an object down to it, we grant Shabbat use of it to those who can use it by lowering, as the residents of the upper story use the area ten handbreadths high so by means of lowering. Apparently, the mishna supports Shmuel and presents a difficulty to Rav.

The Gemara rejects this argument: As Rav Huna said with regard to a different issue discussed in a subsequent mishna, that the tanna is referring to those who live in apartments that open directly onto the balcony rather than those who live in an upper story; here too, the tanna is speaking of those who live in apartments that open directly onto the balcony. In this case, the use of a ten handbreadths high is convenient for the residents of the balcony, as it is on their level; whereas its use is relatively inconvenient for the residents of the courtyard. Consequently, the right to use this area is granted to the residents of the balcony.

The Gemara raises an objection: If so, say the next clause of the mishna: Anything that is lower than this, i.e., lower than ten handbreadths, its use belongs to the courtyard. But why should this be the halakha? This is similar to a case of residents of two courtyards who have equally convenient access to a certain area. The residents of this courtyard access the area through one entrance, and the residents of that courtyard access the area through another entrance. In our case, the use of the area is equally convenient for the inhabitants of both the balcony and the courtyard; why should the latter be granted exclusive right of use?

The Gemara answers: What is the meaning of the phrase to the courtyard? It means also to the courtyard. In other words, even the residents of the courtyard can make use of this mound or post, and therefore residents of both the courtyard and the balcony are prohibited. If residents of two domains can conveniently use a single area and they did not establish an eiruv between their domains, they are all prohibited to carry in that area.

The Gemara comments: So too, it is reasonable to explain the mishna in this manner, as it was taught in the latter clause of the mishna: In what case is this statement said? When the mound or embankment is near the balcony; but in a case where it is distant from it, even if it is ten handbreadths high, its use belongs to the courtyard. What, then, is the meaning of the phrase to the courtyard in this context? If you say it means to the residents of the courtyard, and therefore the use of the mound or embankment is permitted to them, why should this be so? It is the domain of the residents of both the courtyard and the balcony, as the mound or embankment is positioned near enough to the balcony for its residents to use it as well.

Rather, what is the meaning of the phrase to the courtyard? It means also to the courtyard. And, consequently, as the residents of both the courtyard and the balcony can use it, both are prohibited to carry there on Shabbat. Here too, in the earlier part of the mishna, what is the meaning of the clause to the courtyard? It likewise means also to the courtyard, and therefore both sets of residents are prohibited to carry. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from this that this is the correct interpretation of this phrase.