

TosfosInEnglish.com

However there is a slight difficulty; for shortly (on the 'ב' עמוד), concluded מרימר the exact opposite;⁶ that by rolling since it is not destined to rest, it is not considered at rest -

אבל האי' כיון דסופו לנוח⁸ כמונח דמי -

However here (when it is in the air) since it is destined to land it is considered at rest.

In summation; רבא agrees with ר"י that we require a משהו ע"ג הנחה if something is in the air, however if it is rolling ע"ג קרקע then ר"י agrees to קלוטה. The גמרא here however seems to indicate that we require a משהו ע"ג הנחה by קרקע, more than when it is in the air.

תוספות reverses himself:

וחזר רבינו יצחק לפרש דודאי רבי יהודה סבר כרבי עקיבא דקלוטה כמו שהונחה⁹ -

And the ר"י reversed his position and explained that ר"י certainly agrees with (באור or ע"ג קרקע) whether קלוטה כמי שהונחה דמיא ר"ע that we say

היכא דבעי שתנוח שם כי ההוא דפירקין¹⁰ -

Where he wants that it should rest there, like that case in our פרק -

אבל בההוא דפרק בתרא דעירובין (דף צ"ב) היה קורא בספר¹¹ דלא בעי שתפול -

However regarding that case in the last פרק of עירובין where 'he was reading a ספר', in which case he does not want it to fall -

שם בעי רבי יהודה הנחה על גבי משהו -

There ר"י requires a משהו ע"ג הנחה.

ורבא קאמר דרבנן דרבי עקיבא¹² לית להו קלוטה כמו שהונחה דמיא בשום מקום -

⁶ נח ע"ג משהו (תוך ד"א only if it was משהו) even if it finally landed חייב (even if it finally landed משהו) explained our משנה ר' יוחנן (ד"א). Regarding the case of רה"ר דרך לרה"י where the חכמים do not rule קלוטה, this applies, according to רבא even if it was ג' תוך, unless it landed משהו ע"ג. Seemingly the teaching of רבא is the same as ר"י. This is what רבינא asked מרימר.

⁷ Perhaps this האי' is referring to the case in עירובין מס' היה קורא על האסקופה (see footnote # 3); where it is dangling in the air over the רה"ר and it is considered לנוח סופו. רצ"ע. See 'Thinking it over'.

⁸ מרימר answered that ר"י was discussing something which is rolling (on the ground, according to תוספות), and it is considered לנוח סופו therefore in order to be חייב, it must rest (momentarily) משהו ע"ג, however when something is in the air it is considered לנוח סופו, so therefore (if not for רבא), we may have thought that it does not require a הנחה ע"ג, therefore רבא teaches us that even in the case of אוריר we require a הנחה. We see from this answer that there is more reason to require a משהו ע"ג הנחה when it is קרקע ע"ג than when it is באוריר, which is the opposite of what תוספות just taught us that ע"ג קרקע we do not require that it come to a rest. [רש"י learns this answer of מרימר different than תוספות, in which case there would seemingly be no question.]

⁹ The הגהות הב"ה amends this to read, היכא שהונחה דמיא (instead of היכא שהונחה הב"ה).

¹⁰ This is referring to the גמרא on צ"ב, where he threw it ד"א ברה"ר ועבר ד"א ברה"ר in which case ר"י is מחייב שתיים; since he intended that it land ברה"ר he is חייב for הוצאה and מעביר ד"א ברה"ר (see footnote # 4).

¹¹ See footnote # 3.

¹² This is the רבנן of our משנה on צ"א (and elsewhere).

קלוטה And **ר"ע** stated that the **רבנן** who argue with **ר"ע** they do not agree with **ר"ע** **כמי שהונחה דמיא** anywhere -

אפילו רצונו שתנח שם אפילו תוך ג' -

Even if he wants it to land there and even if it is within three טפחים, nevertheless that is not sufficient, but we require a **הנחה ע"ג משהו** (not like **ר"י**) -

ולא סבירא ליה כברייתא דלעיל¹³ דקתני תוך ג' דברי הכל חייב -

And **ר"ע** does not agree with the **ברייתא** stated previously that within טפחים **ג' תפחים** all agree (even the **רבנן**) that he is **חייב** -

אלא סבר כברייתא דהכא דקתני אחזתו הרוח משהו¹⁴ -

But rather **ר"ע** agrees with the **ברייתא** mentioned here, which states that only if **הנחה ע"ג משהו** (but not if **הנחה ע"ג משהו**, where there was no **הנחה** [even באויר]) -

ומתניתין נמי משמע דאיירי בנח משהו כדאוקי רבי יוחנן -

And our **משנה** also indicates that we are discussing a case where it was **משהו** as **ר"י** established the **משנה**, for presumably the **סיפא** of our **משנה** where he is **חייב** is -

דומיא דרישא דקתני תוך ד' אמות פטור דאיירי בשנח דאי לאו הכי אמאי מיפטר -

Similar to the **רישא** which states that if he threw it **within ד"א** and it rolled outside **ד"א** he is **פטור**, and the **רישא** is in a case where it was **נח** within the **ד"א** for if it is not so (and it was not **ד"א** תוך ד"א), why is he **פטור**; he threw it more than **ד"א**, so since the **רישא** is in a case of **נח**, the **סיפא** must also be in a case of **נח** as **ר"י** stated. This therefore is the source of **ר"ע** that **ר"ע** **משהו** (in all cases whether באויר or **קרקע**).

responds to an apparent difficulty:

ורב חלקיה בר טוביה דאמר לעיל¹⁵ תוך שלשה דברי הכל חייב¹⁶ מוקי מתניתין בדלא נח -

And **רבנן** who stated previously that within three טפחים all agree that he is **חייב**, will establish our **משנה** that it was not **נח** and nevertheless he is **חייב** since it was **נח** -

ורישא דקתני פטור¹⁷ מיירי כגון שפסק כחו¹⁸ ומחמת הרוח נתגלגל חוץ לארבע:

And in the **רישא** where it state he is **פטור** (even though it was only **נח** לד"א),

¹³ צ"א.

¹⁴ See previously in this תוספות and footnote # 1. According to this, the source of **ר"ע** is not **ר"י** (see footnote # 3), but rather this **ברייתא** of **הרוח** (see קמא - יד דוד).

¹⁵ צ"א.

¹⁶ just proved that our **משנה** is in a case of **נח**; this would seemingly contradict **רבנן** who maintains that we do not require **נח**, but rather **נח** תוך ג' is considered **נח**.

¹⁷ If in the **סיפא** it was **נח** לא then presumably the **רישא** is also **נח**; if it is **נח** why is he **פטור**, since he threw it **ד"א**. See TIE footnote # 3 that we do not say **קלוטה** in the same **רשות** **והא**.

¹⁸ He did not throw it with sufficient force that it should travel **ד"א**, therefore he is **פטור**, since it was the wind that took it **ד"א**, not his throwing.

it is in a case where his force ceased ד"א תוך and it rolled outside the א"א because of the wind.

SUMMARY

requires a משהו ע"ג משהו ר' יהודה only if he does not intend that the object land in this רשות, otherwise we say קלוטה. However רבא (according to the רבנן) always requires a משהו ע"ג משהו.¹⁹

THINKING IT OVER

explains the גמרא on the עמוד ב' where it states in a case where it is באויר.²⁰ However רבא is saying his rule that משהו ע"ג משהו regarding the רבנן in a case where he threw it באמצע רה"י ורה"ר; in that case it is not סופו לנוח in the רה"ר, so how can the גמרא say דסופו לנוח?²¹

¹⁹ See קמא – יד דוד for a detailed explanation of this תוספות.

²⁰ See footnote # 7.

²¹ See ריטב"א ד"ה מתגלגל.