

For it does not have the required amount

דלית בה שיעורא –

OVERVIEW

The גמרא included salt as one of the items which are ממעט בחלון. The גמרא asked, but salt is harmful to the wall (window sill) so he will remove it. The גמרא answered that the salt was resting on a potsherd. The גמרא asked, so the חספא can be חוצץ (without the salt). The גמרא answered that it did not have the proper שיעור. In our text the גמרא continues להבירו בין פצים ליתן כדי ליתן חרס¹. Our תוספות offers an alternate גירסא.

פירוש² דאין שיעור לחספא למעט מפותח טפח -

The explanation of דלית ביה שיעורא is that there is not sufficient חספא to make the opening less than a טפח -

ולא גרסינן כדתנן³ דמה ענין זה לשיעורי שבת אלא וכדתנן בוי"ו -

And so therefore the text does not read 'כדתנן', for what connection is there between the issue here (regarding חציצה) to the measurements for שבת, חיובי שבת, rather the גירסא is 'וכדתנן' with a 'וי"ו' (before כדתנן) -

והכי פירושו⁴ ואמאי מלח ממעט -

And this is the explanation of (the flow in) the גמרא; but why is salt ממעט -

הא כי שקיל חספא כשיצטרך לו יסיר גם המלח כדי שלא יזיק את הכותל⁵ -

Since when he will need the חספא and remove it, he will also remove the salt so it should not harm the wall -

ואהא מייתי וכדתנן⁶ כלומר דמיירי נמי דלית ביה כדי ליתן בין פצים להבירו -

¹ That רה"ר is discussing the שיעור required to be חייב for carrying out a חספא on שבת to (from) a ר"ר. In those days when they wanted to open a window in a wall, they made the window frame by placing vertically two parallel boards at a specific distance from each other and then fill the space between them (on top and on bottom) with a חספא. The size of this חספא is the minimum size required to be חייב for carrying a חספא on שבת. Anything smaller is insignificant for a חספא.

² By saying 'פירוש' our תוספות is negating the explanation (of דלית ביה שיעורא (רש"י בד"ה דלית) that לית ביה שיעורא means that the חספא per se is too small and so cannot be considered a חציצה. This is not true, for the size of the חוצץ is irrelevant; what is important is that it is large enough that when it is placed in the window, the part remaining open is less than a פותח טפח.

³ If the explanation of דלית ביה שיעורא would be like the explanation תוספות rejected (in footnote # 2), then the גירסא of 'וכדתנן' would be correct; we are saying that just like for שבת there is a חייב להוצאה, that same שיעור applies to שיעור להוצאה. However תוספות rejected this פירוש, for there is no connection between שיעור להוצאה and the שיעור of חציצה, therefore the term כדתנן is inappropriate for it suggests that the two cases (שבת and חציצה) have the same שיעור (when in fact there is no real שיעור for the חוצץ per se).

⁴ תוספות is explaining why we cite the משנה regarding a חספא on שבת, since it has no intrinsic connection to our case.

⁵ This is an implicit question which we are to ask on our own. The 'וכדתנן' is answering this implicit question.

⁶ The 'וכדתנן' does not explain the meaning of שיעורא לית ביה (which is as תוספות explained it), rather the גמרא cited the

And in order to answer this implicit question, the גמרא **cites** this משנה **saying** 'וכדתנן', **meaning, that our case in the ברייתא is also discussing a case where the חספא is not large enough to place between one post and the other -**

דאין ראוי לכלום ולא שקיל ליה⁷ -

So since this חספא is not fit for anything, therefore he will not remove it -

תוספות offers an alternate גירסא thereby justifying the גירסא of 'כדתנן':

ואית ספרים דלא גרסי חספא גופיה תיחוץ אלא גרסינן ותיפוק ליה משום חספא -

And there are some text, which do not read 'חספא גופיה תיחוץ', rather they read, 'ותיפוק ליה משום חספא' -

כלומר ותיפוק ליה שיסיר המלח כשיסיר חספא⁸ -

This means that you can know that he will remove the salt when he removes the חספא, so how can the salt be ממעט if eventually it will be removed when he needs the חספא -

ומשני דלית בה שיעורא כדתנן כולי' ולא שקיל ליה :

And on this explicit question the גמרא answered that it doesn't have the sufficient size, as we learnt, etc. and therefore he will not remove it.

SUMMARY

The חספא is not ממעט, since it is so small that (without the מלח) the opening will still be more than a טפח.

THINKING IT OVER

Is it more logical that the גמרא asks that the חספא should be חוצץ (as our גירסא has it), or that the גמרא asks, how can the מלח on the חספא be ממעט, since he will remove the חספא (the גירסא of the ספרים); which is the more obvious question?

⁷ 'וכדתנן' to answer the implicit question that he will remove the חספא (and the מלח) so how can it be ממעט?!

⁷ כדתנן means we are proving something, which makes sense according to the rejected פי' (in footnote # 2) that we are trying to prove the שיעור of a חספא. However 'וכדתנן' means that the fact in this case is similar to the facts in the other case, but we're not trying to prove anything.

⁸ According to this גירסא the גמרא is explicitly asking the implicit question we mentioned before (in footnote # 5), however the גמרא never asked (according to this גירסא) that חספא גופיה תיחוץ.

⁹ Anything smaller than בין פצים לפצים is never used, so he has no need for it. The משנה is a direct answer to a direct question; therefore it can state כדתנן (without a preceding וי"ו).