The Chicago Center
Digest
Mishna Berura
THE DAILY RESOURCE FOR MISHNA BERURA YOMI
Fri, Nov 29 2024 ■ כ"ח חשון תשפ"ה
סימן שס"ג סעיף י"ז-כ"ב

Overview

Siman 363 Seif 17:

The width of the beam is a *tefach* with no minimum concerning its thickness other than it must be strong enough to hold an אריח which is half a brick that is three *tefachim*. If it is four *tefachim* wide it is not necessary for it to be strong enough to hold an אריח.

- If the entrance to the *mavoi* is ten *amos* it is unnecessary for the beam to be capable of holding bricks for that entire length. Instead, it is sufficient if it holds bricks for a distance of nine *amos* and two small amounts so that it could connect the rest of the way with *lavud*. The reason it must be strong enough to hold bricks is so that it could serve as a reminder that it was placed there to permit the *mavoi*. (M.B. 59)

Siman 363 Seif 18:

Beam supports, meaning, if the beam is held in place with supports that protrude from the wall that are not a *tefach* wide or three *tefachim* long, some maintain that they must be strong enough to support the beam and half a brick. Others maintain that it is sufficient if it can support just the beam.

- A beam must be permanent in order to serve as an effective reminder but supports do not serve as reminders and are thus treated more leniently. One should be stringent in accordance with the first opinion. (M.B. 62)

Siman 363 Seif 19:

If the beam is round it must contain a circumference of three *tefachim* so that its width is one *tefach*.

Siman 363 Seif 20:

If it is bent and the bend extends outside of the *mavoi*, higher than twenty *amos* or lower than ten *tefachim*, we look at the bend as though it was not there and measure the section that remains. If that space is less than three *tefachim* it is valid but if not it is invalid.

- The reason is that we apply the principle of *lavud*. (M.B. 65)
- The concern applies when part of the beam is outside of the permitted range but if it is all within the permitted range it is permitted since we can look at it as though it is straight. (M.B. 66)

Siman 363 Seif 21:

If it extends from one wall but does not reach the other wall, for example, it is supported by posts or if there are two beams which extend from the opposite walls and meet in the middle, if there are not three *tefachim* between them it is valid but if there are three *tefachim* it is invalid.

- Even if the beam does not connect with either wall since we say *lavud* in two directions. (M.B. 67)

Siman 363 Seif 22:

If one placed two beams next to one another and neither one is capable of holding an אריח, if the two of them could hold an אריח widthwise, which is a *tefach* and there are not three *tefachim* between them, it is not necessary to bring another beam but if not another beam is necessary. Some maintain that they must be within a *tefach* of one another.

- The two pieces should combine to the thickness of a *tefach*. (M.B. 69)
- *Lavud* is inapplicable in this case since we need a beam that is strong and if they are spread apart they will not be able to support a beam. (M.B. 71)

Halacha Highlight

Using a round beam

Shulchan Aruch Siman 363 Seif 19
אם היתה הקורה עגולה
If the beam was round

Shulchan Aruch (סע' י"ט) addresses the circumstance in which one used a round log as the beam to enclose a *mavoi* on the fourth side. Shulchan Aruch rules that as long as the round beam is three *tefachim* in circumference it is valid as a beam for a *mavoi* since it will have a diameter of one *tefach* which is the minimum width for a beam to enclose a *mavoi*. Mishnah Berurah (ס"ק ס"ג) notes that the minimum size of a *tefach* is necessary so that the beam could support a brick and if the beam is round, it will not be able to support a flat brick and thus it should be invalid. Therefore, he emphasizes that as long as the round beam can be cut into a section that is flat and would be able to support a beam, it is sufficient.

Sha'ar HaTziyun (סי' שע"ב ס"ק י"ח) references Rambam's commentary to the Mishnah in which he states that the ratio of 3 *tefachim* of circumference will not produce a diameter of 1 *tefach* and therefore, a round beam of three *tefachim* should not be valid. Nevertheless, Sha'ar HaTziyun asserts that one need not be so precise since Chazal relied on this ratio for matters of *halacha* due to the difficulty in being more precise. Furthermore, it is possible that they had a tradition from Har Sinai that one may rely on these ratios even for Biblical matters but certainly for Rabbinic matters one may rely on this ratio. Chazon Ish (או"ח סי' קל"ח סק"ד) explains that the intent of the Torah is for us to become more refined individuals by the observance of the Torah. Furthermore, in order to fulfill the *mitzvos* as well as the inner secrets of the Torah, one does not lose anything if he approximates rather than relies on precise measurements. The allowance to be slightly off also affords those who are less sophisticated to be able to comply with these *halachos*.