

2.11.4

99a (משנה ב2) → 100a (זרק ונח על גבי חייב)

- I. **מסנה ב2**: lip of cistern or rock that are 10 high – fully considered רה"י (→ חייב for taking from or putting on)
- Rhetorical analysis*: use of הבור (instead of just בור) teaches that חוליית and depth of בור join to make י"ט
 - Support*: ברייתא prohibits - sans מחיצה - filling or drinking from בור which is י' deep – and חוליית is part of that שעור
- II. Series of questions and מ"מ related to requirement of מחיצה being 10 high and 4 wide
- Question* (asked of רבא): if there is a pillar י"ט high in רה"ר and he threw it ד"א and it landed atop – חייב?
 - Lemma1*: both עקירה and הנחה took place באיסור (under י"ט – in רה"ר)
 - Lemma2*: it traveled through פטור מקום (above 10)
 - Answer* (רבא, similarly רב יוסף and רב אבוי): as per our משנה, liable
 - Counter* (מרדכי) – who asked: perhaps our משנה is a case of a needle
 - Block*: even a needle still has some width → is somewhat over י"ט
 - Answer*: perhaps it landed in crevice on rock or grooves atop pillar, which puts it squarely under 10
 - Query* (ר' יוחנן): if a wall is י"ט high but less than ד"ט wide, and it is adjacent to a כרמלית but they made it רה"י
 - Question*: is wall itself judged to be רה"י (→ if someone throws atop wall, he is liable)
 - Answer* (עולא): certainly is considered רה"י ק"ו – if it operates as a מחיצה for others (adjacent רשות)
 - Support*: attributed to רב and ר' יוחנן has same ruling with same reasoning
 - Query* (ר' יוחנן): if he had a בור 9 deep and took dirt out and built it up as a lip → 10 deep, is he liable
 - Question*: height came simultaneously with הוצאה
 - Following*: if we accept that מחיצה which comes with הוצאה is insufficient,
 - Then*: what if he had a בור 10 deep and filled it in to 9 – מחיצה was there and is now gone – חייב?
 - Challenge*: why doesn't he answer this from his own ruling?
 - Context*: (ahead ג משנה) if he threw ד"א at a wall, above י"ט exempt; below י"ט – liable
 - And*: in our discussion, we pointed out that he should be exempt, as it never came to rest
 - ד' יוחנן* answered that the context is a fat fig (sticky – sticks to wall)
 - However*: that means that he threw it less than ד"א (volume of fig is considered)
 - Answer*: in that case, he isn't מבטל the fig, so distance isn't altered; in our case, he was מבטל
 - Query* (רבא): if he threw a shelf (רה"ר in ד"א) and it landed on pegs (now 10x4), what is the הלכה?
 - Clarification*: what is he asking? If simultaneous מחיצה+הוצאה is liable? Same as יוחנן ר' question
 - Rather*: there was something atop the shelf; do we consider the item landing with shelf (פטור)
 - Or*: since it's likely that הפג bounced around before settling, as if מחיצה was made first (חייב) – תיקו
 - רבא**: water is at rest on water, a nut on water is not at rest
 - רבא's query*: if a nut is in a כלי and the כלי is floating on water – is nut "at rest"?
 - Lemma1*: reference nut, which is at rest in כלי, OR
 - Lemma2*: reference כלי, which is not at rest (floating on water)? – תיקו
 - Related*: oil atop wine is dispute ריב"ג/חכמים (in re: contact of טב"י w/oil and impact on wine) – טבול יום ב:ה-
 - אבוי**: if a בור is 10 deep and 8 wide and he threw a mat in – חייב
 - But*: if the mat divided the בור (exactly in half, such that neither half is ד"ט) – פטור
 - Note*: for אבוי, certainly the חוליה (יוחנן) would cancel the מחיצה
 - And*: for יוחנן ר', who wasn't sure about the חוליה, the mat would not divide the מחיצה
 - אבוי**: if a בור in רה"ר is 10x4 and filled with water and he threw something in – חייב
 - but*: if it is filled with fruit – פטור
 - reason*: water doesn't "cancel" the רשות ("מחיצה"); fruit does cancel it
 - support*: ברייתא – if he threw from רה"ר ים (or vice-versa) exempt (i.e. ים treated like כרמלית)
 - ד"ש*: if spot in sea has 10x4, he is liable
- III. **מסנה ג**: if he threw an item ד"א in רה"ר at a wall; above י"ט – like throwing in air (exempt)
- Below*: 10 טפחים, like throwing on the ground (which is liable)
 - Challenge*: item never came to rest
 - Answer* (ר' יוחנן): referent is a fat (sticky) fig which is נח
 - ד' חייב*: if he threw at wall and it came to rest in hole, dispute ר"מ/חכמים if we imagine hole as big enough
 - Support*: ברייתא records that this case is a dispute – ר"מ rules חייב (due to "חוקקין להשלים"); רבנן exempt
- IV. **רב**'s ruling: a תל המתלקט (hill that has a grade such that) it rises י"ט within ד"א – considered רה"י
- Therefore*: if a מבו is topographically related to רה"ר in that manner, needs no לחי or קורה to permit carrying
 - And therefore* (רחב"ג): if there is such a תל in רה"ר and he threw on to it – חייב (רה"י → רה"ר)