2.1.3

4a (פשט העני) → 5a (אימא לא קמ"ל)

Note: our סוגיא is driven by a premise – that "transfer" requires three components: עקירה ("uprooting" – i.e. lifting the object from its place of rest), transfer (over the boundary of the domains) and הנחה ("putting it to rest"- i.e. laying it down at its final destination). The assumption about that premise is that both עקירה and הנחה must be from/on a place that is substantial – i.e. minimum of 4x4 טפחים

I. Inquiry into liability for "יד" in משנה – his hand is (by definition) less than 4x4 טפחים – why is he חייב?
   a. *דבה*: our משנה follows ר"ע (שבת יא:א), who rules that if he throws an item from רה"י לרה"י over רה"ר, he is חייב
      i. *Reason*: he holds קלוטה כמי שהונחה – i.e. traveling over airspace creates a virtual "stop"
         1. *Therefore*: he doesn't require הנחה on a מקום ד' טפחים
      ii. *Challenge*: רבה himself was unsure how to read the משנה
         1. *Possibility one*: dispute is in case the item never goes over י' טפחים, and their dispute is about קלוטה
         2. *Possibility two*: dispute is in case the item is over י"ט – whether we infer liability of זורק from מושיט
            a. *In which case*: all agree to קלוטה כמי שהונחה → liability if thrown under י' טפחים
      iii. *Answer*: after רבה asked the question, he came to the conclusion that the dispute is below קלוטה – י"ט
      iv. *Rejection*: this only proves that הנחה doesn't require ד"ט; עקירה may still require ד"ט
   b. *ד' יוסף*: our משנה follows רבי
      i. *Question*: which statement of רבי is the basis?
         1. *If*: the ברייתא where רבי, *contra* חכמים, rules that if he thew an item and it landed on a beam of any size, he is חייב
            a. *Rejection*: that is understood per אביי, that it refers to a tree that is planted in רה"י but its branch extends into רה"ר; רבי holds that the branch is defined by the trunk('s location) → חייב as it is considered having gone into רה"ר (רבנן see branch as independent)
         2. *Rather*: רבי - ברייתא rules that if he threw an object from רה"ר to רה"ר through רה"י, he is חייב (חכמים exempt)
            a. *And*: per שמואל, רבי finds 2 liabilities – for הכנסה (to רה"י) and הוצאה (to 2nd רה"ר)
            b. *Therefore*: רבי does not require עקירה, nor הנחה, from/on a significant resting spot (4x4)
            c. *Block*: רב and שמואל agreed that רבי only ruled this way if the רה"י is covered (and he threw under the cover; e.g. through a tent), based on construct that a house is considered "filled"
               i. *And*: should one suggest that our משנה is also referring to a covered רשות, that is only a valid suggestion for רה"י; a covered רה"ר is inherently exempt, as it isn't similar to the camp in the desert (דגלי מדבר), which is the model for all הוצאה
   c. *ד' זירא*: our משנה follows אחרים, who rule that if someone threw an object to another, if he stood still and caught it, the thrower is חייב; but if he moved to catch it, the thrower (and receiver) is פטור (שנים שעשאוה פטורים)
      i. *And*: in analyzing it, we noted that the receiver, if standing still, caught it in his hand → no need for 4x4
         1. *Rejection*: this only proves הנחה, not עקירה (the thrower may have lifted it off a table e.g.)
         2. *Additionally*: even regarding הנחה, perhaps he caught it in the folds of his tunic
   d. *ד' אבא*: our משנה should be understood to refer to a טרסקל (like a picnic basket with a tapered bottom) in his hand
      i. *Challenge*: that will not be a valid explanation for רה"ר, as a טרסקל in רה"ר is its own רה"י, per ר' יוסי בר יהודה
      ii. *Defense*: perhaps ר' יוסי בר יהודה would agree that it is not a separate (היחיד) רשות is it is lower than י' טפחים
      iii. *Challenge (ד' אבהו)*: משנה doesn't mention טרסקל, just "his hand"
   e. *ד' אבהו*: he must have reached below ג' טפחים (considered לבוד – like the ground) to get it, or was in pit or was a midget
      i. *Challenge (דבא)*: why wouldn't the תנא mention it if our case was so odd?
   f. *דבא*: a person's hand is considered to be ד' על ד' (support from ר' יוחנן, per רבין's report)
      i. *Parallel*: ר' יוחנן ruled that if a person threw an object into another's hand, the thrower is חייב
         1. *Question*: what is he teaching – ר' יוחנן already ruled that ידו של אדם חשובה לו כד' על ד'
         2. *Answer*: we might have only applied his ruling to a case where the person grants significance to his hand (by using it pick up/put down), but here, it may not have קמ"ל – חשיבות כד' על ד'

