

לא נצרכה אלא לקרן זוית –

It was not necessary to mention כרמלית, 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 s' אליעזר's view (that כרה"ר דמי),¹ there is seemingly a מחלוקת what he maintains by צדי רה"ר היכא דאיכא חיפופי; where רב פפא maintains כרה"ר דמי. כרמלית דמי (seemingly) maintains ר"א בריה דר"א and

replies to an anticipated question:

לא בעי למימר דאצטריך לצדי רשות הרבים –

in order to mention וְהַכְרַמְלִית **did not want to say that it was necessary** ר' יוחנן inform us **that** צדי רה"ר² is also a כרמלית –

responds:

משום דלרבי אליעזר כרשות הרבים דמי ואפילו אית בהו חיפופי –

because according to רבי אליעזר the צדי רה"ר have the status of a רה"ר, and not of a כרמלית and even when there are stakes³ by the צדי רה"ר (which separate it from the proper), nevertheless ר"א still maintains⁴ 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 ר' יוחנן prefers to maintain the ברייתא is according to everyone including ר"א.

This approach seems to indicate that ר' יוחנן sides with רב פפא, who maintains that according to רב אחא רה"ר דמי even where חיפופי. However, there is the opinion of ר' אבהו, who seemingly maintains that ר"א differentiates in צדי רה"ר whether there are no

¹ See previously א,ו.

² Concerning צדי רה"ר we already learnt (דף ו,א) that there is a מחלוקת between the רבנן who maintain that it is a כרמלית and רבי אליעזר who maintains דמי כרה"ר. Our תוספות responds to the following question; instead of including a קרן זוית, where we have no precedent that it is a כרמלית, it would be more appropriate for ר"י to include צדי רה"ר, where we already know that the רבנן consider it a כרמלית. [Alternately, there is a greater חידוש that כרמלית צדי רה"ר is a קרן זוית; see 'Thinking it over' # 1.]

³ Therefore we cannot even say that the ברייתא wishes to include חיפופי ליה היכא דאית, because even then, there is an opinion that it is דמי כרה"ר.

⁴ See א,ו ד"ה היכא where תוספות asserts that רב פפא maintains according to ר"א that דמי כרה"ר, even when there are חיפופי.

ר"א; so (then it is a כרמלית), even according to 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 יוחנן interpret the ברייתא that it comes to include דאיכא חיפופי, where צדי רה"ר היכא דאיכא חיפופי, where כרמלית לכו"ע it is a ר"א בריה דר"א according to ר"א.

answers: תוספות

או שמא מספקא ליה אי מודה להו רבי אליעזר אם לאו –

or perhaps we can say that ר' יוחנן, who is making this statement, **is uncertain whether or not ר"א agrees**⁵ 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' היכא that according to רב פפא either ר' יוחנן agrees with רב פפא, 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 ר' יוחנן what is the status of a לרה"ר? ⁶קרן זוית הסמוכה לרה"ר
2. Why does תוספות give two answers, instead of one?

⁵ We may say that ר"א 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 maintain with certainty that everyone maintains ר"א לאו כרה"ר דמי צדרי רה"ר, because היכא דאיכא חיפופי, because ר' יוחנן on ו,א forgoes the option of saying "אשכחן כהאי גוונא" in the case of רה"ר, he chooses rather the case of המעביר חפץ, and it may be for this reason because ודו"ק ליה, מספקא ליה.

⁶ See תוספות ז,ב ד"ה התם.