



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Shabbos, Daf ב – Daf ט

**Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
v'l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shrager A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda**

-----Daf ב---2-----

MESECHTA SHABBOS

PEREK YITZI'OS HASHABBOS -- PEREK RISHON

MISHNA

- The cases of prohibited transferring from reshus to reshus on Shabbos include 2 isurei D'Oraisa and 2 isurei D'Rabanan ("2 which are 4") for the ba'al habayis (the one standing inside in reshus hayachid) and 2 isurei D'Oraisa and 2 isurei D'Rabanan ("2 which are 4") for the "pauper" (the one standing outside in reshus harabim). These cases are as follows:
 - If the pauper stands outside in the reshus harabim and takes something from the reshus harabim (R"HR) and puts it into the hand of the ba'al habayis who is standing in the reshus hayachid (R"HY), or if the pauper takes something from the hand of the ba'al habayis in the R"HY and brings it back out into the R"HR, (in each case, the pauper has made an "akira" in one reshus and a "hanacha" in the other reshus) the pauper is chayuv D'Oraisa (in each case) and the ba'al habayis is fully patur (having done nothing wrong).
 - If the ba'al habayis (B"HB) takes something from the R"HY and puts it into the hand of the pauper in the R"HR, or if the B"HB takes something from the hand of the pauper in R"HR and brings it into the R"HY (in each case the B"HB has made an "akira" in one reshus and a "hanacha" in the other reshus), the B"HB is chayuv D'Oraisa (in each case) and the pauper is patur (having done nothing wrong).
 - If the pauper sticks his hand into the R"HY and the B"HB takes something from it, or if the B"HB places something into the pauper's outstretched hand and the pauper brings it into the R"HR (in each case, an "akira" was done by one and a "hanacha" was done by the other), they are both patur from a D'Oraisa, but are each chayuv on a D'Rabanan in each of these 2 cases.
 - If the B"HB sticks his hand into the R"HR and the pauper takes something from it, or if the pauper places something into the B"HB's outstretched hand and the B"HB brings it into the R"HY (in each case, an "akira" was done by one and a "hanacha" was done by the other), they are both patur from a D'Oraisa, but are each chayuv on a D'Rabanan in each of these 2 cases.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna in Mesechta Shavuos, among other things, lists the prohibitions of "taking out" from reshus to reshus and says they are "2 which are 4". Why doesn't it list like our Mishna does, which said that they are "2 which are 4" for the one standing inside (the B"HB) and "2 which are 4" for the one standing outside (the pauper)? **A:** In Shavuos, where the main discussion is not about Shabbos, we only mention the Avos Melachos (which are the melachos that were done in the Mishkan, and therefore encompasses taking from the R"HY to the R"HR), but our Mishna, which is discussing Shabbos in depth, discusses the Avos and the Toldos (bringing from R"HR to R"HY as well).
 - **Q:** Avos are chiyuvei D'Oraisa, and there are only 2 cases of chiyuvei D'Oraisa involving transferring from R"HY to R"HR. If so, according to what we just answered, why does the Mishna in Shavuos say there are "2 which are 4"? We can't say that the Mishna there means there are 2 D'Oraisa and 2 D'Rabanan, because the Mishna there, based on the other lists it mentions, is only discussing things that are D'Oraisa!? **A:** **R' Papa** says, in Shavuos we only list things that are D'Oraisa, and although it says "taking out", it means taking out and taking in (R"HY to R"HR and R"HR to R"HY), so there are a total of 4. Our Mishna discusses the cases that are D'Oraisa and the ones that are D'Rabanan.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The Mishna says “yetzi’os”, which means taking things *out*, not bringing things *in*!? **A: R’ Ashi** explains, anytime there is an “akira” on something, it is called a “hotza’ah”, even if it is being brought *into* the R”HY. **Rava** says that when the Mishna says “yetzi’os” it refers to “domains”, of which there are only two.

-----Daf 1-3-----

- **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 Briasa 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

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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.

-----Daf 7---4-----

- **R' Bivi bar Abaye** asked (quoted earlier in the Gemara), if one forgot and put bread to bake on the oven wall on Shabbos, may he remove it before it bakes to save him from a chiyuv Chatas (a D'Oraisa), although that would make him be oiver an issur D'Rabanan?
 - **Q: R' Acha bar Abaye** asked **Ravina**, what case are we talking about? If he was a shogeg and didn't realize until after the bread was baked, then he can't remove it before it gets baked, because he is unaware of it?! If he is discussing where he remembered after he placed it in the oven but before it was baked, he wouldn't be chayuv a Chatas even if it fully baked, because a Mishna teaches that one is not chayuv a Chatas unless he is unaware of the issur at the beginning and at the end, and here he is aware of the issur at the end?! If **R' Bivi** is discussing a case where the person did this on purpose, then he should ask whether it is permitted to remove the bread to save him from a chiyuv Skila, not a Chatas?!
A: R' Shila said, he is discussing a case of shogeg, and the question was whether we allow someone else, who sees that the bread is baking, to pull it out of the oven to save the shogeg person from becoming chayuv to bring a Chatas.
 - **Q: R' Sheishes** asked, we would not tell someone to be oiver an aveirah D'Rabanan to save another person from a Chatas!
 - **R' Ashi** said, **R' Bivi** is discussing someone who put the bread in b'meizid, and **R' Bivi** actually asked whether he can be saved from Skila by removing the bread and being oiver a D'Rabanan.

PUSHAT HE'ANI ES YADO

- **Q:** Why is the ani chayuv for placing something into the hand of the B"HB? An akira and a hanach must be from/onto a place that is at least 4x4 tefachim and a hand is not 4x4 tefachim?! **A: Rabba** said, our Mishna follows **R' Akiva** who says that passing through the airspace is as if something has landed (when one throws something through the R"HR it is as if it has landed in R"HR), and so placing into the hand of the B"HB is like placing it into the R"HY.
 - Although we find that **Rabba** was unsure if this was what **R' Akiva** held, we can say that later on he was certain.
 - **Q:** From **R' Akiva** we only see that a hanacha does not need to be on an area of 4x4 tefachim, but our Mishna clearly suggests that an akira does not need to be from an area of 4x4 tefachim place either?! **A:** **R' Yosef** said, our Mishna follows the view of **Rebbi**, who says that an akira and the hanacha do not need to be on/from a place which is 4x4 tefachim.
 - **Q:** Where do we find that **Rebbi** said this? It can't be from where **Rebbi** said that if someone throws something that lands onto a tree branch that is protruding into the R"HR that he is chayuv although the branch is not 4x4, because **Rebbi** says that the branch is considered to be a place of 4x4 based on the fact that it is part of the tree which is surely 4x4 tefachim! It also can't be from where **Rebbi** says that if one throws an object from one R"HR to another R"HR and there is a R"HY in the middle, he is chayuv two Chataos (it is considered to be a hanacha in the R"HY and then an immediate akira), because **Rav** and **Shmuel** explain that **Rebbi** only holds that

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

way where the R”HY is a roofed structure (we view such a structure as if it is filled up in its entirety and therefore something that passes through is viewed as if it landed there), but in a R”HR which would lose its status if it was roofed, he would not hold that way. So we cannot say that **Rebbi** is the Tanna of our Mishna who holds that we don’t need 4x4 even in a R”HR!? If so, who is the Tanna of our Mishna!?

-----Daf 7---5-----

- 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.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **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.

-----Daf 1---6-----

- 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).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- 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’meyzid 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’rabanan, 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’meyzid 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.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Daf 7

- **Q:** The Braisa lists examples of a karmelis and lists “karmelis” as one of the examples. All the examples are of a karmelis, so what is meant by the mention of “karmelis” as an example? **A: R' Dimi in the name of R' Yochanan** said this comes to include an indented area of the R”HY which is adjacent to the R”HR and therefore accessible for the public to use. Since this is inconvenient for them to use, it does not get the status of the R”HR and rather gets the status of a karmelis.
 - **R' Dimi in the name of R' Yochanan** also said, the area in the R”HR where there are pillars where shop owners hang their wares is also a karmelis because it is inconvenient for the public to use.
 - **R' Zeira in the name of R' Yehuda** said, the area where there are blocks that the shop owners would sit on is a karmelis, because the public find it difficult to use.
 - If one holds that the place of the pillars are a karmelis, for sure the area of the blocks (which are even more difficult for the public to use) is a karmelis. But, if one says that the area with the blocks is a karmelis, it may very well be that the area of the pillars is still a R”HR.
- **Rabbah bar Shila in the name of R' Chisda** said, if one throws something 4 amos in R”HR and it sticks to the side of a brick, the thrower is chayuv, because that is considered to have landed in the R”HR. However, if the thrown object landed on top of the brick, if the brick is between 3-10 tefachim high (since it is less than 4x4 tefachim in size) it is a makom pitur and the thrower is patur. If the object landed on thorns, even if less than 3 tefachim off the ground it is a makom pitur, because no one would step on them (and they are therefore not considered to be part of the R”HR). **Chiya bar Rav** said, on thorns people would step, but on excrement they would not. **R' Ashi** said, people would even step on excrement, and therefore, to be a makom pitur the area must be 3 tefachim off the ground.
- **R' Dimi in the name of R' Yochanan** said, to be a karmelis a place must be 4x4 tefachim and **R' Sheishes** adds that it must be less than 10 tefachim off the ground. (Therefore, if a house is 4x4, but less than 10 tefachim tall on the inside, it has the status of a karmelis. If, on the outside, the roof is more than 10 tefachim off the ground, the roof will have the status of a R”HY. One can carry on the roof, but not inside the house. Also, the airspace above 10 tefachim in a karmelis is given the status of a makom pitur).
 - A karmelis has the kulos of a R”HY, so that if it is less than 4x4 it is a makom pitur, not a karmelis, and the kulos of a R”HR, meaning that above 10 tefachim it is a makom pitur.
- **Abaye** said, in the case (quoted above) of the house that one can carry on the roof, but not on the inside (because the roof is less than 10 tefachim high on the inside), if one were to dig an area the size of 4x4 in that house so that the area has a height of 10 tefachim, the entire inside would get the status of a R”HY. Even the other areas in the house that were not dug out have the status of “chorei R”HY” (holes or crevices in the wall of a R”HY) which all agree are considered to be a R”HY.
 - With regard to chorei R”HR, **Abaye** says it has the status of the R”HR and **Rava** says it is not a R”HR, but is looked at on its own merit and characteristics to see what reshus it qualifies as.
 - **Q: Rava** asked **Abaye**, according to you, the indented area of the R”HY should have the status of the “chorei RH”R” and therefore should be treated as a R”HR, not a karmelis!? **A: Abaye** explained, the indented area of the R”HY is not easily used and is therefore not considered to be R”HR, but the “chorei” are easily used and therefore get the status of the R”HR.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that if one throws an object 4 amos in the R”HR and it lands on a wall within 10 tefachim of the ground, he is chayuv. The Mishna was explained by **R' Yochanan** to mean that the case was that a sticky fig was thrown and stuck to the wall (otherwise, whatever was thrown should have bounced back and not ended up a distance of 4 amos in the R”HR). Now, according to **Abaye** who says that chorei R”HR is like the R”HR, why do we need to answer that we are dealing with a fig? Why can't we be talking about anything and say that it went into a chorei R”HR and that's why he is chayuv!? **A:** Either we can answer that any hard object would bounce out of the chorei R”HR, and therefore we must be talking about a sticky object. Or, we can say that the Mishna is talking about a wall that has no holes (which makes sense based on

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

the first part of the Mishna that says, if the object lands higher than 10 tefachim it is as if it is thrown in the air and never lands. But, if we are talking about a wall with chorim, then the chorim above 10 tefachim should be a R”HY, why does it say it is “in the air”? It must be that the Mishna is discussing a wall that doesn’t have holes).

- **R’ Chisda** said, if one sticks a pole, even 100 amos high, in the R”HY and throws something that lands on top of the pole, it is considered to have landed in R”HY, because the reshus of R”HY goes up until the Heavens. Clearly he holds that we don’t need a place of 4x4 for the hanacha.
 - **Q:** Maybe we should say that **R’ Chisda** follows **Rebbi** who says that if someone throws an object in R”HR and it lands on something small sticking out into the R”HR it is considered to have landed on that spot, although the object landed on something which is less than 4x4 tefachim?
A: Abaye said, **Rebbi** is talking about a case where a tree from R”HY has a branch sticking out into the R”HR. **Rebbi** holds that since the trunk of the tree is 4x4, every branch gets a din of 4x4 as well, and that’s why it is considered to have landed on something which is 4x4. However, in **R’ Chisda’s** case, **Rebbi** may disagree with **R’ Chisda**.