

כרמלית It was not necessary to mention – לא נצרכה אלא לקרן זוית, only to include a nook

Overview

ר' יוחנן says that the word "והכרמלית", that is mentioned in the ברייתא comes to include (that) a קרן זוית (is a כרמלית). question is; why does not ר' יוחנן say instead that it comes to include צדי רה"ר.

Concerning צדי רה"ר we already learnt (דף ו,א) that there is a מחלוקת between the רבנן who maintain that it is כרמלית and רבי אליעזר who maintains כרה"ר דמי.

Concerning צדי רה"ר's view there is seemingly a מחלוקת what he holds by ר"א maintains ר"א בריה דר"א and כרה"ר דמי maintains רב פפא; היכא דאיכא חיפופי כרמלית דמי.

ר' יוחנן – לא בעי למימר did not want to say

that it was necessary to mention והכרמלית in order to inform us that צדי רה"ר¹ is also a כרמלית

because according to צדי רבי אליעזר, משום דלרבי אליעזר כרשות הרבים דמי כרה"ר, have the status of a רה"ר, and not of a כרמלית

and even when there are stakes² by the ר"א, צדי רה"ר, ר"א still maintains³ that it is a רה"ר, therefore ר' יוחנן does not want to say that the ברייתא includes צדי רה"ר as a כרמלית, because we like to maintain the ברייתא, like everyone including ר"א.

This approach seems to indicate that ר' יוחנן sides with רב פפא, who maintains that according to ר' אליעזר, however there is the opinion of ר' אבהו, צדי רה"ר דמי ואפילו דאיכא חיפופי according to ר' אבהו, who seemingly maintains on דף ו,א that ר"א differentiates in צדי רה"ר whether there are no חיפופי, then it is a רה"ר, or whether there are חיפופי, then it is a כרמלית, even according to ר"א; so why did not ר' יוחנן interpret the ברייתא that it comes to include צדי רה"ר as a כרמלית, where according to ר"א בריה דר"א it is a כרמלית לכו"ע.

answers: תוספות

or perhaps we can say that ר' יוחנן, who is making this statement, is uncertain – או שמא מספקא ליה

¹ Instead of including a קרן זוית, where we have no precedent that it is a כרמלית, as opposed to צדי רה"ר, where we know that the רבנן consider it a כרמלית.

² Therefore we cannot even say that the ברייתא wishes to include חיפופי ליה היכא דאית ליה חיפופי, because even there, there is an opinion that it is דמי כרה"ר.

³ See היכא תוס' ו,א ד"ה היכא where maintains that according to ר"א, רב פפא holds דמי כרה"ר even when there are חיפופי.

whether or not ר"א agrees⁴ to the רבנן in a case where איכא חיפופי, that it is a כרמלית, therefore he chose not to mention it, not to get involved in something he was not sure of.

Summary

ר"א, צדי רה"ר כרה"ר דמי ואפי' רב פפא either agrees with ר' יוחנן or he is unsure what is the view of ר"א in this case. Therefore he chose not to discuss it.

Thinking it over

1. According to רבי אליעזר what is the status of a לרה"ר?
2. Why does תוספות give two answers, instead of one?

⁴ We may say that he is uncertain whether רב פפא or ר"א בריה דר"א is correct. Alternatively we may say that he is even uncertain if ר"א בריה דר"א, said his statement in a definitive manner, or he was merely questioning the assumption of רב פפא.

See פני אברהם, that ר' יוחנן seemingly cannot hold with certainty that everyone maintains ר"ר לאו כרה"ר צדרי רה"ר, because דמי היכא דאיכא חיפופי, because דמי היכא דאיכא חיפופי on ר' יוחנן, he forgoes the option of saying "אשכחן כהאי גוונא" in the case of ר"ר צדי רה"ר, he chooses rather the case of המעביר חפץ, and it may be for this reason because לכה"פ מספקא ליה, "ודו"ק.