

# CHAVRUTA

## SHABBAT – DAF PEH HEH

Translated by: *Chavruta staff of scholars*  
Edited by: *R. Shmuel Globus*

**And the Rabbis knew that five** species spread about a vegetable patch of **six tefachim** on a side **do not take nourishment together.** i.e. they do not draw nourishment from the same ground.

\*

The Gemara asks for clarification: **From where** do we learn **that this knowledge which the Rabbis had is something** to be relied on without question? Is it supported by a verse, and therefore inarguable, or is it a mere estimate?

The Gemara says that it is supported by a verse, **for said Rabbi Chiya bar Abba in the name of Rabbi Yochanan:** The source is in the verse **that is written** (Devarim<sup>1</sup> 19:14) **“Do not seize your friend’s boundary** [by planting a tree next to your friend’s land, which would weaken his land by drawing nourishment from it,] **which the first** [settlers of the land] **established.”**

This means that **the boundary established by the first** settlers of the land, who knew from what distance a tree draws nourishment, **you must not seize.** Thus we see that this is established knowledge.

\*

**What is the meaning of “...which the first settlers of the land established?”**

The Gemara answers this question by citing another question. **Said Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachmani in the name of Rabbi Yochanan:** **What is the meaning of the verse that is written** (Breishit<sup>2</sup> 36:20) **“These are the children of Seir the Horite (haChori), the settlers of the land”?**

**Are everyone** else **“settlers of the sky”**, such that the verse must tell us that they were settlers of the land? Everybody dwells in the land.

**Rather** the verse is coming to teach us **that they were expert in the settlement of the land.** **They used to say: the length of this measuring rod is the distance for an olive tree.** I.e. it is equal to the distance from which an olive tree draws nourishment. **The**

---

<sup>1</sup> Deuteronomy

<sup>2</sup> Genesis

## PEREK 9 – 85A

length of this measuring rod is for a grapevine, and the length of that measuring rod is for a fig tree.

And “Chori”—that they would smell (*merichim*) the land and thereby determine what plants would grow well in a given place.

And “Hivvite (*Chivi*)?” Why is Anna—the last of the sons of Seir mentioned in the above verse—referred to as a “*Chivi*” in verse 2 of the same chapter? **Said Rav Papa: Because they would taste the ground like a snake (*chiviya*)** which licks the ground, and they would thereby determine the nature of the land.

**Rav Acha bar Yaakov said:** They were called “*Chori*” because they became free (*bnei chorin*) of their property. They were conquered by the children of Eisav<sup>3</sup>, and lost their possessions to them.

\*\*\*

**Said Rav Asi: The vegetable patch** that may contain five species of plants within a square of six by six *tefachim* must have an **interior of six by six *tefachim* aside from its boundaries.** I.e. it must be a clearly defined vegetable patch of six by six *tefachim* with a square of unplanted land all around it.

**A Baraita taught similarly: A vegetable patch** must have an **interior of six *tefachim*.**

The Gemara asks for clarification. **Its boundaries—how much?** How wide must the unplanted land around the vegetable patch be?

We learn the width of the unplanted area from a Mishnah<sup>4</sup>. **As it was taught in a Mishnah: Rabbi Yehudah says: The width** of the boundaries must be **equal to the width of the sole** of a foot.

**Said Rabbi Zeira, and some say it was Rabbi Chanina bar Papa: What is the reason of Rabbi Yehudah?**

**Because of the verse which is written** (Devarim 11:10) “**And you shall water it with your foot like a vegetable garden.**” Why does it say that one shall water it “with his foot?” To teach you that **just as a foot is a tefach** in width, **so too is the boundary** of a vegetable patch **a tefach** in width.

\*

---

<sup>3</sup> Esau

<sup>4</sup> Tractate Kilayim 3:3

## **PEREK 9 – 85A**

**Said Rav:** This halachah of a **vegetable patch**—in reference to an **unplanted area it was taught**. One may only plant a vegetable patch in this fashion if there are not other vegetable patches around it. For if there would be other vegetable patches around it, the species on the edges of the first vegetable patch would be only two *tefachim* away from the species on the edges of the other vegetable patches.

The Gemara objects: **But there is the “space of the corners?”** Why not arrange the vegetable patch with one seed in the center, and the four rows each running from a corner along the edge, so that one row would go from the southeast corner towards the west, one from the southwest corner towards the north, one from the northwest corner towards the east, and one from the northeast corner towards the south? If one did that, one could then arrange the surrounding patches with their rows running perpendicular to the rows of the first patch, and the various species would not look mixed.<sup>5</sup>

**Said the scholars of the House of Rav, in the name of Rav:** The Mishnah is referring to a case where **he filled up the corners**. The patch is arranged with a seed of one species in the center, a row of a second species running from the northwestern corner to the northeastern corner, a row of a third species running from the southwestern corner to the southeastern corner, a seed of a fourth species in the center of the western side, and a seed of a fifth species in the center of the eastern side. Therefore, one cannot plant to the north or south of the patch, lest the species on those sides of the patch appear to be mixed with the species planted in the adjacent patches.<sup>6</sup>

\*

The Gemara objects again. What forced Rav to read the Mishnah in this way? **Let the gardener plant from outside, and not fill up the inside!** Why should the gardener plant the rows running from one corner to the other? Let him plant as explained above, and he will then be permitted to plant other vegetable patches adjacent to the first.

### **Ammud Bet**

The Gemara answers. There is a Rabbinical **decree** that one may not plant other patches adjacent to the first, **lest he fill up the corners**.

---

<sup>5</sup> With this scheme, in order to prevent the outer rows of a given vegetable patch from appearing mixed, each row would have to be half a *tefach* wide and two and a half *tefachim* long. If they would be either longer or wider, they would necessarily be within three *tefachim* of each other.

<sup>6</sup> With both arrangements, the central vegetable patch and the vegetable patches surrounding it would be arranged in the same way. With the first arrangement, this would result in any given row only being near rows which run perpendicularly to it, which is permitted so long as they are at least one *tefach* distant from each other. With the second arrangement, this would result in the southern and northern rows being near rows which run parallel to them, which is only permitted if there is a distance of three *tefachim* between them.

## PEREK 9 – 85B

The Gemara objects. What difference does it make if the gardener fills up the corners of the vegetable patches or not? The vegetable patches are clearly defined, and even if **it is nothing but the corner of one vegetable** garden protruding into another vegetable garden, it should be permitted! As we are about to see, if two vegetable gardens are set at a diagonal to each other, so that the corner of one protrudes into the second, there is no problem of *kilayim* (forbidden mixture of plants). For each garden is clearly defined. Why should our case, where each vegetable patch is clearly defined—and there is even a space of two *tefachim* between the two vegetable patches—be any worse?

**Did we not learn in a Mishnah: If the corner of a vegetable garden was protruding into another field, it is permitted, because the corner looks like the end of a separate field.**

The Gemara answers: **There is no halachah of a protruding corner in a vegetable patch.** Because of the small size of a vegetable patch, if the corner of one protrudes into another vegetable patch, the various species look mixed.

\*\*\*

The Gemara has now concluded its discussion of Rav's interpretation of the Mishnah, and begins to discuss Shmuel's interpretation.

**And Shmuel said:** Even in reference to a vegetable **patch amongst** other vegetable patches, **it was taught.** That is to say, the Mishnah even permits a person to plant a five-species vegetable patch when there are other vegetable patches nearby.

The Gemara objects. **But they are mixed together!** Since the rows of adjacent vegetable patches are only two *tefachim* away from each other, they will appear mixed, and should be forbidden.

The Gemara answers. Our Mishnah is referring to a case where the gardener **plants a row** in one vegetable patch **this way** i.e. running along a north-south axis, and the adjacent **row** in the other vegetable patch **that way** i.e. running along an east-west axis. Since the adjacent rows are not running parallel to each other, but perpendicular to each other, they do not appear mixed. Shmuel does not agree with Rav that the Rabbis were concerned that the gardener might fill up the corners by planting individual rows all the way from one corner to the other along the edge of the vegetable patch.

Therefore, Shmuel understands the Mishnah as permitting a five-species vegetable patch surrounded by other vegetable patches, provided that the rows of adjacent vegetable patches run perpendicularly to each other. For example, one patch may have a row going from its southeastern corner two and a half *tefachim* towards the southwestern corner, while the patch to its south would have a row going from the northeastern corner two and a half *tefachim* towards the southeastern corner.

## PEREK 9 – 85B

The Gemara has now finished discussing Shmuel's interpretation of the Mishnah.

\*\*\*

**Said Ula:** In the West i.e. in the land of Israel **they posed an inquiry: If he tore a row** i.e. plowed and planted a row of land **across the whole** vegetable patch, with the newly plowed row going through the center point which had been planted with a seed, **what is the halachah?** Does the vegetable patch retain its permitted status, or does it now look like a mixture, and become forbidden?

**Said Rav Sheshet:** The mixture of the newly planted row **comes and nullifies the entire line.** That is, the vegetable patch now appears mixed, and is forbidden.

**Rav Asi said:** The mixture of the newly planted row **does not nullify the line.** That is, the vegetable patch still retains its original permitted status.

\*

**Ravina contradicted Rav Ashi,** from a Mishnah<sup>7</sup>: **If someone plants two rows of cucumbers, two rows of gourds, and two rows of Egyptian beans** in a large field, **it is permitted** even though there is not the normal space between adjacent rows of different species. But if someone plants a single **row of cucumbers, a single row of gourds, and a single row of Egyptian beans** within that distance of each other, **it is forbidden.** From this we see that one row creates a forbidden mixture.<sup>8</sup> If so, why is our case of a single row permitted, according to Rav Asi?

The Gemara answers: **This case** of the Mishnah, which involves cucumbers and gourds, **is different. For there are long vines** which make the rows look mixed.

**Said Rav Kahana in the name of Rabbi Yochanan:** **Someone who wants to fill his garden with many types of vegetables** should **make** his garden full of small vegetable **patches,** with each patch **six by six tefachim.** Then, he should plant each vegetable patch with a **circle** which has a diameter of **five tefachim,** **and he may fill up the corners however he likes.** Since the circular portion of each vegetable patch is clearly recognizable, he may plant the remaining corners of each square vegetable patch without leaving any room between the species planted in the circles and the species planted in the corners.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> In tractate Kilayim 3:4

<sup>8</sup> Two rows have a more lenient halachah than one row because two rows give the impression of being a "field" in their own right.

<sup>9</sup> Since the corner areas curve around the circles, they do not appear to be mixed with the circles, with each other, or with the plants planted in the *tefach* wide boundaries around each vegetable patch.

## **PEREK 9 – 85B**

The Gemara objects: Granted that the circles and corners do not appear mixed, **there are** still the plants planted **in between** the vegetable patches, in the boundaries. The plants in the boundary area of a vegetable patch would appear mixed with the plants in the corners of the square of the patch.

The Gemara answers: **Said the scholars of the House of Rabbi Yannai:** We are dealing with a case where **he left unplanted the boundaries in between** the vegetable patches.

**Rav Ashi said:** Alternatively, **if they** i.e. the rows in the boundary-section of the vegetable patch **were planted on a north-south axis, he should plant them** i.e. the rows of plants in the vegetable patch itself **on an east-west axis.** In this way the separation between them will be clear, and they will not appear mixed.

**Ravina contradicted Rav Ashi,** from a Baraita: The **area needed for work for vegetables** i.e. the area next to a vegetable patch which must be left unplanted so that it not appear mixed with **another** type of **vegetable** is defined by a vegetable patch of **six** by six **tefachim** with five species in it, **and we see them** [i.e. they appear **like a square board.**

From this Baraita, Ravina derives that **if it** i.e. the vegetable patch **is like a board, it is permitted, but if not**—if it is in the form of a circle—**it is forbidden.** How can the law which Rav Kahana taught in the name of Rabbi Yochanan be reconciled with the Baraita?]