



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

Shabbos Daf Hey

- The Gemara continues its discussion as to who is the Tanna of our Mishna that seems to hold that neither an akira nor a hanacha needs to be done on a place of at least 4x4 tefachim.
 - **R' Zeira** says that our Mishna must follow **Acheirem** who seem to say in a Braisa that neither an akira nor a hanacha needs a place of 4x4 tefachim. In the Braisa they say, that if one throws an item 4 amos in the R"HR and someone else catches it, if the catcher didn't have to move to catch it, the thrower is chayuv even though the hanacha was in the catcher's hand, which is less than 4x4 tefachim.
 - **Q:** Maybe they only hold that way for a hanacha, but for an akira maybe they require an area of 4x4 tefachim?! Also, maybe **Acheirem** are discussing where the catcher spread out his coat and caught it in the coat which is a place of 4x4 tefachim?!
 - **R' Abba** says that our Mishna is talking about where the objects were lifted from a basket and placed into a basket, and thus there was a place of 4x4 tefachim. When the Mishna says it was placed into the "hand" it means the basket in the hand.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** says, a basket on a pole in the R"HR has a din of a R"HY. If so, according to him, in our Mishna when the B"HB puts something into the pauper's basket he should not be chayuv, because he is moving something from a R"HY to a R"HY?! **A:** **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** only holds that way when the basket is above 10 tefachim. Our Mishna is talking about where it is below 10 tefachim and it therefore has the status of the R"HR.
 - **R' Avahu** asked, the Mishna says "in his hand". It doesn't say anything about a basket. If it was placed into the hand, how do we have a place that is 4x4 tefachim?! He therefore says that the Mishna is talking about where the pauper had his hand within 3 tefachim of the ground. It therefore is considered to be on the ground (which is a place of 4x4 tefachim).
 - **Q:** The Mishna says that he is "standing", which seems to mean that the hand is not within 3 tefachim of the ground!? **A:** The Mishna can be talking about where he is bent over, or where he is standing in a ditch, or is discussing a person who is extremely short.
 - **Rava** says the Tanna would not teach a case which is limited to these circumstances. Rather, we must say that the hand of a person is chashuv and therefore has the status of a place that is 4x4 tefachim. **Ravin in the name of R Yochanan** said this as well.
 - **R' Yochanan** says, if one throws something (from reshus to reshus) and it lands in another's hand, he is chayuv. The chiddush of him saying this in this case (even though it could have been learned from his previous statement) is that although the thrower did not place it there, so one may say that he did not consider the hand a "makom chashuv" to thereby have it be considered like 4x4, it still gets the status of a place of 4x4 tefachim.
 - **Q:** **R' Yochanan** asked, if someone threw something and ran and caught it himself, is he chayuv or not? **R' Ada bar Ahava** explains the question to be – do we say that since he is the same person and has done the akira and hanacha and should be chayuv, or do we say that his running and catching it before it lands creates a second "ko'ach" which

makes the hanacha, and he is considered to be a different person than the one who did the akira and is therefore patu? **TEIKU**.

- **R' Yochanan** says, if someone standing in R"HR sticks his hand into the R"HY, catches rain and brings it into the R"HR, he is chayuv.
 - **Q: R' Zeira** asked, he has not done an akira on the water (just like the pauper doesn't do an akira when the B"HB puts something into his hand), so why is he chayuv? **A:** The case is that he hit the rain with one hand into the other as the rain came down, so that action is considered an akira.
 - **Q:** The akira of hitting rain as it falls was not done from a place that is 4x4 refachim?! **A: R' Chiya the son of R' Huna** said, the case is like **Rabbah** said elsewhere, that he took the water off a sloping wall, which is 4x4 tefachim.
 - **Q: Rabbah** said his ruling regarding a scroll that unraveled onto a sloping wall, because it comes to rest on it. Water does not come to rest on a sloping wall, so there is no akira and the person should therefore be patur!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, the case is that he took the rain from a ditch in the R"HY, which means that the rain had come to rest. The chiddush is, that although the water was floating on other water, it is considered to be at rest.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, if a nut is in a keili which is floating in water, is the nut "at rest" because it sits in the keili, or is it not because the keili is floating? **TEIKU**.
 - Oil on top of water is a machlokes whether the oil is one with the water and therefore "at rest" (**R' Yochanan ben Nuri**) or, because it doesn't mix, is considered to be floating on the water (the **Rabanan**).
- **R' Yochanan** says, if one made an akira to move something within a R"HY and then walked out to R"HR, he is not chayuv unless he stops walking and thereby makes a new akira with the intention to carry into R"HR.
 - **Abaye** says his "stopping" is only considered a new akira if he stops to rest, not to just fix the load on his back.