The Gemara wishes to clarify the baraita: What, is it not that when the baraita speaks of a cross beam that is drawn away from the alleyway walls, it is referring to a cross beam that is distanced from the alleyway walls and situated on the outside in the public domain, similar to the case of the cross beam resting on pegs mentioned above? And when it speaks of a cross beam that is suspended, isn’t it referring to a cross beam that is distanced from the alleyway walls and placed on the inside in the alleyway? This interpretation contradicts Rava’s statement above that disqualifies such a cross beam.

The Gemara rejects this interpretation: No, both this, the cross beam that is drawn away, and that, the crossbeam that is suspended, are located on the inside of the alleyway. The difference between them is that the cross beam that is drawn away is distanced from the wall from one direction, while a suspended cross beam does not lie on the alleyway walls at all, but is distanced from them from both directions.

Lest you say that if the cross beam is distanced from the wall from one direction, we say that the principle of lavud applies, and it is as if the cross beam is joined to the wall; but if it is distanced from the wall from two directions, we do not say that the principle of lavud applies. The baraita, therefore, comes and teaches us that there is no difference in this regard.

Rav Ashi said: The baraita refers to a cross beam that is drawn away from the walls and also suspended in the air! And what are the circumstances where this would be the case? For example, where he inserted two bent pegs on the tops of the two alleyway walls, and the height of the pegs from the top of the walls is less than three handbreadths, and their bend inward is less than three handbreadths, and a cross beam rests on top of them. Lest you say that we either say lavud, i.e., we consider the cross beam to be virtually extended and thus connected to the wall, or we say havut, pressed down, that we consider the cross beam to be pressed down vertically; but we do not say both lavud and havut. The baraita therefore teaches us that even in that case we say that any item adjacent to another with a gap of less than three handbreadths from this item is not required to bring a different cross beam.

However, if the distance is three or more handbreadths from the wall, he is required to bring a different cross beam in order to permit carrying in the alleyway. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, who holds that the principle of lavud applies to a gap of up to four handbreadths wide, says: If the cross beam is less than four handbreadths from the wall, one is not required to bring a different cross beam; but if the distance is four handbreadths from the wall, he is required to bring a different cross beam.

The principle of havut usually refers to something that is placed high up off the ground. The object is considered as though it were thrown to the ground. Tosafot ask: Why isn’t a cross beam higher than three handbreadths from the alleyway walls also permitted due to havut? Rifva answers that since the principle of joining (lavud) is applied, the principle of being pressed down (havut) cannot be applied as well. It is illogical to consider the cross beam as though it were pressed down from above to below, and then to extend the imaginary cross beam to the sides as well.

Drawn away or suspended – lavud or havut. Apparently, if it is permitted to carry in an alleyway where the cross beam is suspended in the air, it is certainly permitted to carry in an alleyway where the cross beam is drawn away. Why, then, are both halakhot needed? Had it only stated the halakha with regard to a cross beam that is suspended, the implication would have been that a cross beam that is drawn away is permitted, even if it is more than three handbreadths from the wall (Rav Yăakov Emden).
Rabbi Zakkai taught the following baraita before Rabbi Yohanan: The area between the side posts and beneath the cross beam has the legal status of a karmelit, and it is forbidden to carry in it. Rabbi Yohanan said to him: Exit and teach this halakha outside, i.e., this baraita is not in accordance with the accepted halakha, and therefore it should not be made part of the regular learning in the study hall.

The Gemara records a dispute with regard to the scope of Rabbi Yohanan’s statement: Abaye said: Rabbi Yohanan’s statement is reasonable with regard to the area beneath the cross beam, as only the area beneath the cross beam should be considered a private domain, but between the side posts, carrying is indeed prohibited, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Zakkai. And Rava said: The entire statement of Rabbi Zakkai is to be rejected, as Rabbi Yohanan asserted, and even in the area between the side posts carrying is permitted.

Rava said: From where do I know to say this, that carrying is permitted even between the side posts? For when Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said that Rabbi Yohanan said: A place that has an area of less than four by four handbreadths and is located between a public and private domain but belongs to neither has the status of an exempt domain with regard to carrying on Shabbat. Therefore, it is permitted for both the people in the public domain as well as the people in the private domain to use it for loading their burdens onto their shoulders, so long as they do not exchange objects with one another. Therefore, a place having an area of less than four handbreadths is not considered a karmelit, but rather an exempt domain, where carrying is permitted. Consequently, the area between the side posts should likewise be considered an exempt domain, and carrying should be permitted within it.

And Abaye said that this offers no proof, as there, with regard to Rav Dimi’s statement, the area being discussed is at least three handbreadths high, setting it apart from the other domains. It is therefore considered a domain in its own right, and has the halakha of an exempt domain.

The Gemara considers the position of Abaye: Abaye said: From where do I know to say this, that the area between the side posts has the halakha of a karmelit? For Rav Ḥama bar Guria said that Rav said: The area within the opening, i.e., the doorway between two entrance posts that serve as side posts to permit carrying in the alleyway, requires another side post in order to permit carrying there, for the entrance posts alone do not suffice. This demonstrates that it is forbidden to carry in the space between the side posts without another side post.

And if you say that this is a case where the doorway has an area four by four handbreadths, and therefore an additional side post is required to permit carrying there, this is not a valid argument. For didn’t Rav Ḥanin bar Rava say that Rav said: The area within the opening itself, even if it does not have an area of four by four handbreadths, requires an additional side post in order to permit carrying within it. This indicates that the area between the side posts is not to be used.

And Rava replies that a distinction must be made between the cases: There, the case of Rav’s ruling refers to a scenario where the alleyway’s entrance opens to a karmelit, and thus the space between the entrance posts is also viewed as a karmelit, and an additional side post is required.

The Gemara poses a question: But if the entrance opens to a public domain, what would be the halakha? Would it be permitted to carry there even without an additional side post? If so, it follows that the halakha of a karmelit is more stringent than that of a public domain. However, this seems untenable, for carrying in a karmelit is prohibited only by rabbinic decree, owing to the similarity between a karmelit and the public domain. This is similar to a situation where a permanent resident is down on the ground, while a stranger is raised up to the highest heaven, the very opposite of the appropriate state of affairs.

NOTES

Exit and teach outside – באר את התוכן מחוץ. This expression indicates that a certain source taught by the person who would recite the motenayag in the bet midrash has been totally rejected and should not be taught in the study hall. The practical implication is that one who seeks to clarify this baraita should do so outside the study hall’s walls. Indeed, the Gemara reports instances of Sages leaving the study hall to clarify for themselves ideas that were not taught there. The meaning of the expression in this context is that this baraita has no place within the framework of accepted halakha.

A permanent resident is on the ground – אָפַד הַנֵּיה. This expression is a translation, worded slightly differently, of a verse found in portions of rebus in the book of Deuteronomy: “The stranger that is in your midst shall rise above you higher and higher, and you shall come down lower and lower.” (Deuteronomy 28:4). Its meaning expresses astonishment and even bitterness over a state of affairs that seems to be the opposite of the proper order.

HALAKHA

Between the side posts – בֵּין לְחָיַיִם. It is permitted to carry between the side posts in an alleyway. This is in accordance with the opinion of Rava, whose opinion is followed when he disagrees with Abaye, and because his opinion accords with Rabbi Yohanan’s statement (Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ĥayyim 365:4).

An entrance that opens to a karmelit – הַקָּמֶלֶת הַקָּמֶלֶת. It is prohibited to use the space under a cross beam when the entrance opens to a karmelit as opposed to a public domain, because of the principle: It has found its own type and been awakened. This is in accordance with the statement of Rava. However, if the cross beam is four handbreadths wide and strong, it is considered like a roof. Thus, its outer edge closes off the alleyway, and it is permitted to use the space underneath it when the alleyway opens to a karmelit (Magen Avraham, Taz; Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ĥayyim 365:4).
The Gemara comments: *Yes, it is possible that this is the ruling, for we can say that it has found its own type and been awakened.*  

In other words, as the area within the entranceway is not a defined domain, it doesn’t have the status of an independent domain. Therefore, when it opens into a *karmelit*, to which it is similar, its status is negated, and it joins with the *karmelit* to form a single unit. However, when it opens into a public domain, it cannot join with it because it is not similar to a public domain, which has a totally different set of laws; and therefore it is considered part of the alleyway, and it is permitted to carry within it.

Rav Huna, the son of Rav Yehoshua, said to Rava: And you do not hold that in the area between the side posts carrying is prohibited? But didn’t Rabbi bar bar Hana say that Rabbi Yohanan said: If an alleyway was lined with side posts, each one set more than three but less than four handbreadths apart from its neighbor, we have arrived in this matter at the dispute between Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel and the Rabbis with regard to the measure of *lavud*.

**How so?** According to Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, who said that if the gap between two items is less than four handbreadths, we say that the principle of *lavud* applies; all the side posts are considered a single side post. *He may* therefore only utilize the alleyway *up to the inner edge of the innermost side post*, but no more. However, according to the Rabbis, who say that we do not say the principle of *lavud* applies unless the gap is less than three handbreadths, he may *utilize the alleyway up to the inner edge of the outermost side post*. This discussion demonstrates that the argument revolves around the question as to which side post establishes the permitted area. But with regard to the area *between the side posts*, all agree that carrying is prohibited.

And Rava answers that there *too*, it refers to a case where the alleyway’s entrance *opens to a karmelit*.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: But if the entrance opens to a public domain, what is its legal status – would carrying be permitted? If so, the *halakha* of a *karmelit* is more severe than that of a public domain. Once again, this can be likened to a situation where a permanent resident is down on the ground, while a stranger is raised up to the highest heaven. The Gemara answers: Yes, indeed, this is the ruling, but one should not be perplexed, as we have explained: *it has found its own type and been awakened*.

The Gemara provides an alternative explanation of Rabbi Yohanan’s statement. **Rav Ashi said:** According to Rabbi Yohanan, carrying in the area between the side posts is actually permitted. The dispute between Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel and the Rabbis concerning the principle of *lavud* is in a case where there was an alleyway that *one lined with side posts, each positioned less than four handbreadths from the next*, and the side posts extend for a length of four cubits.

According to Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, who said that for a gap of up to four handbreadths we say that the principle of *lavud* applies, all the side posts are considered a single side post, and since the side post in that case is four cubits long, it is considered a separate alleyway; therefore, it requires an additional side post to permit carrying in it. And according to the Rabbis, who say that we do not say that the principle of *lavud* applies unless the gap is less than three handbreadths, this area does not require an additional side post to permit carrying within it.
The Gemara asks: And even according to the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Gamliel, why is another side post required? Let it have the same legal status as a side post that is visible from the outside, protruding from the wall of the alleyway, but appears to be even with the wall from the inside. Since it is evident from the outside that it is a side post and not part of the building, carrying is permitted there.

The Gemara answers: As Rav Ashi’s reason is only according to the opinion of Rabbi Yoĥanan, when Ravin came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, didn’t he say that Rabbi Yoĥanan said: If a side post is visible from the outside, protruding from the wall of the alleyway, but it appears to be even with the wall from the inside, it is not considered to have the legal status of a side post?

An amoraic dispute was stated: If a side post is visible from the inside, protruding from the wall of the alleyway, but it appears to be even with the wall from the outside, it is considered a side post. However, if a side post is visible from the outside protruding from the wall, but it appears to be even with the wall from the inside, there is a disagreement between Rabbi Hiyya and Rabbi Shimon, son of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, with regard to its status. One said: It is considered to have the legal status of a side post. And the other one said: It is not considered to have the legal status of a side post.

The Gemara clarifies: Conclude that Rabbi Hiyya is the one who said that it is considered to have the legal status of a side post, as Rabbi Hiyya taught: In the case of a wall at the entrance to an alleyway whose one side is more recessed than the other, whether the recess is visible from outside the alleyway but appears to be even from the inside, or the recess is visible from the inside but appears to be even from the outside, it is considered to have the legal status of a side post. The Gemara states: Indeed, conclude that Rabbi Hiyya is the one who said it has the legal status of a side post.

The Gemara rejects this conclusion: And Rabbi Yoĥanan, who explicitly said that a side post of that kind is not considered a side post, did he not hear this halakha? The Tosefta was widely known. Rather, he heard it, but he does not hold in accordance with it. Perhaps, then, Rabbi Hiyya also does not hold in accordance with it.

The Gemara answers: What is this comparison? Granted, Rabbi Yoĥanan does not hold in accordance with that halakha. That is why he did not teach it. But Rabbi Hiyya, if it is true that he does not hold in accordance with it, why would he teach it?

Rabba bar Rav Huna said: If a side post is visible from the outside, protruding from the wall of the alleyway, but appears to be even with the wall from the inside, it is considered to have the legal status of a side post. Rabbi said: And we raise an objection to our own halakha from a mishna: With regard to a small courtyard that was breached along the entire length of one of its walls so that it opens into a large courtyard, in the large one it is permitted to carry and in the small one it is prohibited to carry. This is because the breach is considered an entrance of the large courtyard. The wall of the smaller courtyard was breached along its entire length, therefore there is no visible partition from inside the smaller courtyard. However, the partition is noticeable from the outside, i.e., in the large courtyard, since the breach is flanked on both sides by the remaining segments of the wall of the large courtyard. And if it is so, that a partition that is visible from the outside is considered a partition, carrying in the small courtyard should also be permitted in this case, as the wall is visible from the outside but appears to be even from the inside.
NOTES

Where the walls of the small courtyard protrude into the large one – לֶחִי הַנִּרְאֶה מִבִּ׳ְנִים וּמִבַּחוּץ. The geonim, who might have had a variant reading of this text, explain that this is a case where the walls of the smaller courtyard protrude three handbreadths into the larger one, and the principle of l'vud should be applied to the length of the walls rather than to their width.

Rabbi Zeira said: This mishna is referring to a case where the walls of the small courtyard protrude into the large one, i.e., the breached wall of the small courtyard is not in line with the wall of the large one. Therefore, even when viewed from the outside there are no walls visible, and that is why carrying is prohibited there.

The Gemara asks: And let us say that the principle of l'vud applies, and then carrying will be permitted even in the small courtyard. The ends of the breached wall should be considered attached to the side walls of the large courtyard, rendering the wall of the large courtyard visible. Then it will be permitted to carry in the small courtyard based on the principle governing side posts visible from the outside.

And if you say that the walls of the smaller courtyard are too separate from the walls of the larger courtyard, such that the distance between the walls is too great for the principle of l'vud to apply, didn’t Rav Adda bar Avimi teach before Rabbi Hanina: The small courtyard of which they speak is referring even to one ten cubits wide; the large one is referring even to one eleven cubits wide? Apparently, this halakha applies even when the difference in width between the courtyards is a single cubit, which is six handbreadths. Assuming the small courtyard is located equidistant from the ends of the large courtyard, only three handbreadths separate it on each side from the wall of the large one. Therefore, the principle of l’vud applies.

Ravina said: It is a case where the walls of the smaller courtyard are separated from this wall of the larger courtyard by two handbreadths and from this wall of the larger courtyard on the other side by four handbreadths. Since there is a distance of more than three handbreadths, the principle of l’vud does not apply.

The Gemara asks: And let us say that the principle of l’vud applies from one direction, then carrying will be permitted even in the small courtyard.

BACKGROUND

Where the walls of the small courtyard protrude – מַעֲנָבִים מִחוּץ. In the image below, there is a small courtyard adjacent to a large one. The wall between them has been breached and the walls of the small courtyard protrude into the large one. Therefore, when viewed from inside the small courtyard, it appears to be entirely open into the large one.

And let us say the principle of l’vud applies – וְלֵימָא לָבוּד. If the principle of l’vud is applied and the walls of the smaller courtyard attach to the adjacent, parallel walls of the larger courtyard, then the walls of the smaller courtyard no longer protrude into the larger one, and it is considered like the typical case of a small courtyard that opens into a large one.