



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Shabbos Daf Gimmel

- **Q: R' Masna** asked **Abaye**, each case of D'Rabanan that we mention in the Mishna is truly a D'Rabanan for the pauper *and* for the B"HB. If so, there are really *four* D'Rabanan isurim for each. When added to the 2 D'Oraisa isurim for each, there should be 12 cases in the Mishna, not just 8 as the Mishna states!? **A:** The Mishna only lists the cases of D'Rabanan which can lead to a D'Oraisa (i.e. an "akira", that can lead to a complete melacha), but where one does just the "hanacha" by itself, which can't lead to a complete melacha (because the "akira" was already done by someone else), those cases are not discussed in the Mishna. Therefore, there are only 8 total cases, not 12.
 - A Braisa says, **Rebbi** explains that the reason why there is no chiyuv D'Oraisa when one person does the akira and another does the hanacha is, that the pasuk of "ba'asosa" teaches that one is only chayuv for doing a *complete* melacha, not for doing just one part of a melacha.
- **Q: Rav** asked **Rebbi**, if one doesn't lift objects from the R"HY, but rather another lifted them onto his back for him and he then walked into the R"HR, is that considered an akira of the items, or does one need to lift the objects themselves to make an akira? **A: Rebbi** answered, that is definitely an akira and he would be chayuv. This case is different than the case of placing something into one's hand (where the hand that it is being placed into is not considered to be making an akira) because a hand is not considered to be "resting" and therefore moving the full hand does not make an akira. A person's body is considered to be "resting" and moving it with objects on it is therefore considered to his having made an akira on those objects.
- **Q: Abaye** said, we see from our Mishna that the hand of a person does not get the status of the reshus that the person is standing in (e.g. when the B"HB places something into the hand of the pauper which is in the R"HY, he is not considered to have placed something into the R"HR, which is where the pauper is standing, and the case of the pauper placing something into the hand of the BH"B teaches that the BH"B's hand does not get the status of his R"HY). **Abaye** asked, do we give the hand the status of a "karmelis" and prohibit him (e.g., the pauper) from bringing his full hand back into the R"HR, in the case where he stretched his full hand into the R"HY but didn't empty it there? **A:** The Gemara brings a proof from 2 seemingly contradictory Braisos. They discuss a case where one stretched his hand full of stuff from the R"HY to the R"HR, but didn't empty the contents out. One Braisa says he may bring his hand back to the R"HY, and one says he may not. Maybe they argue regarding whether we give his hand the status of a karmelis and prohibit him from bringing the hand back and we see it is the subject of a machlokes among Tanna'im.
 - This is not a proof. It could be that all agree that the hand is considered to be a karmelis. The Braisa that prohibits returning the hand is where it is within 10 tefachim to the ground, and thus in the R"HR. The Braisa that permits its return is talking about where the hand was above ten tefachim off the ground, and therefore not in the R"HR (which only goes up to 10 tefachim), and it is therefore permitted. Or, it could be that both Braisos are discussing a case of where the hand is below 10 tefachim, and all agree that it does not get the status of a karmelis. The Braisa that prohibits does so because it is talking about where the hand was stretched out on Shabbos (and the prohibition is a penalty for having done so), whereas the Braisa that permits it is discussing where the hand was stretched out before Shabbos (in which case there is no need to penalize).

- **Q:** The Gemara asks, it would make more sense to make a penalty in a case where it was stretched out before Shabbos, because in that case if he keeps the hand outstretched and drops the contents from his hand, he will not be oiver a D'Oraisa, because the akira was done before Shabbos. However, when it was done on Shabbos, if we make a penalty that he must keep it outstretched, that may lead to him being oiver a D'Oraisa (if he drops the contents from his hand), so we shouldn't make a penalty in that case?! From the fact that we just said that we make a penalty even if it may lead to a chiyuv D'Oraisa, we can answer **Rav Bivi's** question. He asked, if one mistakenly put bread on an oven wall, can he remove it (which entails an issur D'Rabanan) before he is chayuv an issur D'Oraisa (of baking the bread)? From our case we would answer that he cannot remove it, just as we don't let him move his hand although it may lead to an issur D'Oraisa! **A1:** It is true – we can answer **R' Bivi's** question based on our Gemara. **A2:** It could be that **R' Bivi** can't be answered from our case, because our case may only make a penalty when he did it b'meizid, but if done b'shogeg, it may be that we don't penalize him. **A3:** Even if both cases are talking about a shogeg, the Braisos may be arguing about whether we are goizer the case of shogeg for the case of a meizid. **A4:** It could be that the Braisos are not arguing. The Braisa that prohibits is discussing where he wants to bring his hand back into another chatzer (where part of his intention is being accomplished – he is removing the stuff from his chatzer – and therefore we prohibit him), and the Braisa that permits it is discussing where he wants to bring his hand back into the same chatzer.