



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

Shabbos Daf Vuv

- A Braisa says, if someone transfers objects from a store (R"HY) to the R"HR by way of the area with the benches (which has the status of a karmelis), he is chayuv. **Ben Azzai** says he is patur.
 - **Ben Azzai** holds walking is like standing still ("mehalech k'omed dami") and therefore it is as if he carried from R"HY to a karmelis and then from a karmelis to a R"HR, and therefore he is patur. The **Rabanan** (the **T"K**) hold that since he is walking, he has not stopped and therefore has transferred from a R"HY to a R"HR.
 - **Q:** Where do we find that the Torah is mechayuv someone for transferring from R"HY to a R"HR through an intervening karmelis? **A: R' Safra in the name of R' Ami in the name of R' Yochanan** said, when someone carries *more* than 4 amos in R"HR he is patur, yet the moment he puts down the object he is chayuv. We see that carrying through an exempt area can still make one chayuv.
 - **Q:** That case is different because wherever he puts it down it is a makom chiyuv (he would have then carried 4 amos), but in the Braisa it is a true makom petur and if he would place the items in the area of the benches he would actually be patur!? **A:** Rather, we learn it from the case of one who carries exactly 4 amos in R"HR – the first 4 amos are a makom petur, because if he stops there he will be patur, yet if he completes the 4 amos he is chayuv.
 - **Q:** That is only a makom petur for him, but for other people it is a makom chiyuv. The Braisa is talking about a true makom petur!? **A:** Rather, we learn it from the case of one who carries from a R"HY to the RH"R through the "tzidei reshus harabim" (the sides of the R"HR) which is not considered the R"HR and he is still chayuv. And, even according to **R' Eliezer**, who says the tzidei reshus harabim has the status of the R"HR, that is only where there are no obstructions there. In the Braisa's case there are obstructions (benches), so the case of tzidei R"HR is a good source for the **Rabanan's** halacha even according to him.
 - **R' Yochanan** said, **Ben Azzai** agrees that if someone throws an object from R"HY to R"HR through the area with the benches, he is chayuv.
- A Braisa says there are 4 "reshuyos" (domains) in regard to Hilchos Shabbos:
 - Reshus Hayachid – a ditch which is 10 tefachim deep and 4 tefachim sq., or an area of 4 tefachim sq. that is 10 tefachim high (e.g. the top of a wide wall).
 - Reshus Harabim – a major thoroughfare, a city square, or streets that are open on both ends leading to the main roads.
 - Transfer from RH"Y to R"HR and visa-versa, if done b'shogeg will require the person to bring a korbon, and if done b'meizid he gets kares or skila. Same is for transfer of 4 amos within the R"HR.
 - Karmelis – this is a D'Rabanan created reshus, e.g. a sea, open fields, areas in front of stores with the benches, and a "karmelis".
 - Transfers of 4 amos within this reshus, or from this to RH"R or RH"Y or visa-versa, are only assur D'rabanen, so no korbon, kares or skila, but it is assur.
 - For a jointly owned courtyard, or a street that is not a thoroughfare, one can make an eiruv chatzeiros and carry there.

- Makom Petur – transfer within and to/from this reshus to another reshus is mutar l'chatchila (e.g. above 10 tefachim in the R"HR, and other examples to be given in the Gemara).
 - When standing on the threshold between RH"R and R"HY, one can transfer from there to the RH"R (and visa-versa) and from there to the R"HY (and visa-versa), but one should not take something from the R"HR and then place it into the R"HY (or visa-versa), but if he did, he is patur. **Acheirem** say that if the door to the house is open, the threshold has a din of R"HY. If it is closed, it has a din of R"HR. If the threshold is 10 tefachim high and 4 sq. tefachim, it is its own reshus.
- When describing the R"HY, the Braisa said "This is a complete R"HY" ("zu hi R"HY gemurah"). What is "this is" and "complete" coming to exclude?
 - "This is" excludes **R' Yehuda's** ruling in a Braisa. **R' Yehuda** says, if one has a house on each side of the R"HR, he can put 2 "lechies" or 2 "korahs" and may carry in the R"HR between the 2 houses. Our Braisa holds like the **Rabanan**, who argue and say that it still has a din of the R"HR and one may not carry from the house into that area.
 - "Complete" teaches, that one would think the **Rabanan** agree with **R' Yehuda** that D'Oraisa it is a R"HY between the houses and one who throws from the R"HR into that area would be chayuv. The Braisa is teaching us that he is not chayuv.
- When describing the R"HR, the Braisa said "This is a complete R"HR" ("zu hi R"HR gemurah"). What is "this is" and "complete" coming to exclude?
 - "This is" excludes another din of **R' Yehuda** in a Mishna. **R' Yehuda** says, when enclosing the area around a well with 4 corner posts for the "olei regel", if the well is in the path of where the public walks, the path must be diverted in order to allow one to carry there. Our Braisa holds like the **Rabanan** who argue and say that the path need not be diverted.
 - "Complete" is not necessary in this case. It is said only because it is said in the case of R"HY.
- **Q:** Another Braisa mentions a desert as an example of a R"HR. Why doesn't our Braisa mention this example? **A: Abaye** said, the Braisa that considers a desert to be a R"HR is taking about the times that the Yidden were in the desert. Other than at that time, a desert is not a R"HR.
- **Q:** The Braisa said that if one transfers from R"HR to R"HY or visa-versa, if it was done b'shogeg the person must bring a chatas, and if it was done b'meizid he gets kares or skila. Why do we need to mention the punishments? They are obvious?! **A:** The chiddush is, that **Rav** found that **R' Chiya** had said in the name of **Issi ben Yehuda** that there is one melacha of Shabbos that one would not be chayuv skila on. The Braisa is telling us, that transferring from reshus to reshus is not that one melacha and one *would* be chayuv skila for this melacha.
- **Q:** The Braisa said that an open field is a karmelis. A Mishna says that an open field is a R"HY for Hilchos Shabbos!? **A1: Ulla** said, the Mishna means it is *not* a R"HR, but may very well be a karmelis. It did not mean to say that it is a definite R"HY. **A2: R' Ashi** said, that Mishna is discussing a huge field with walls around it with no one living in the field. D'Oraisa that is a R"HY, which is why the Mishna characterizes it as such. However, D'Rabanan it is a karmelis.