



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Eiruv Daf Chuf Beis

- A pasuk says that “Hashem pays back the ones who hate Him to His face”. **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** explains, it is as if Hashem is saying that He carries around this “debt” as a burden that He wants to throw off and get rid of (He “reluctantly” pays back the wicked for any good they have done).
 - The pasuk continues, “He does not delay paying those that hate Him”. **R' Illa** says, He doesn't delay paying the wicked, but He does delay rewarding the tzadikim (until Olam Habbah).
 - Like **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** says, “Asher anochi mitzvavicha hayom la'asosam” – this world is for doing and the next world is for receiving reward.
 - **R' Chagai or R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini** says, the pasuk says Hashem is “Erech Apayim” (which is written in the plural form) to say that Hashem is patient in giving reward to tzadikim and in giving punishment to the resha'im.

R' YEHUDA OMER AHD BEIS SASAYIM...

- **Q:** Does **R' Yehuda** limit the size of the entire enclosed area (the well plus the area within the boards) to an area of beis sasayim, or does he only limit the well to a beis sasayim, but the additional 2 amos of enclosed area all around (to allow for the head and most of the body of the animal) can be above and beyond the beis sasayim? We must limit the area to a beis sasayim so that one does not learn from there to permit an area larger than a beis sasayim in an enclosed field. The question is, do we say that people look at the measurement of the well, so as long as it is not larger than a beis sasayim it is ok, or do we say that people look at the entire enclosed area, and therefore the entire area cannot be larger than a beis sasayim? **A:** A Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** says the area cannot be larger than a beis sasayim. **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says a well that is a beis sasayim x beis sasayim (which is the same thing as saying an area of a beis sasayim) is mutar and we may still add the necessary 2 amos around that. If **R' Yehuda** means that the well itself may be a beis sasayim, then he is saying the same thing as **R' Shimon ben Elazar**! It must be that he says the well plus the area around must not be larger than a beis sasayim.
 - **Q:** It could be that **R' Yehuda** also says that the well itself can be as large as a beis sasayim, and he still argues with **R' Shimon**, because **R' Shimon** requires the area to be square, and **R' Yehuda** would allow a rectangle as well, as long as the area does not exceed a beis sasayim.
- **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says, an enclosed area with no roof that is used for residential purposes (a chatzer, a backyard, etc.) is permitted to carry in even if it is larger than a beis sasayim. On the other hand, an enclosed area with a roof that is primarily used for the sake of the area outside of it (e.g. a watchman's hut) is only mutar to carry in if it is the size of a beis sasayim or less.

MISHNA

- **R' Yehuda** says, if the path of the reshus harabim runs through the area enclosed by the boards, the path must be diverted around the boards (to allow carrying within the boards). The **Chachomim** say the path does not need to be diverted.

GEMARA

- **R' Yochanan and R' Elazar** both say, the **Chachomim** here are teaching the strength of these walls (they are not effected by traffic running through it).
 - **Q:** This would seem to say that **R' Yochanan** agrees with the **Chachomim**. However, **Rabbah bar bar Channa in the of R' Yochanan** said that if the doors of the city of Yerushalayim would not be closed at night, it would be considered to be a reshus harabim (because of the path that runs through it)!? **A:** **R' Yochanan** explains the halacha of the **Chachomim**, but he himself does not agree to it.

- **Q: R' Yehuda** and the **Chachomim** seem to contradict themselves. Elsewhere **R' Yehuda** says, if there are 2 houses on opposite sides of the reshus harabim, the houses can act like walls, and one only needs to place a lechi on each end of one of the houses and he may carry in between. The **Chachomim** say that he may not carry in this situation. In that case the reshus harabim is running right through and **R' Yehuda** says it is not a problem and the **Chachomim** say it is a problem!? **A: R' Yehuda** allows it over there because there are 2 full walls (here there are only 4 corner-boards). The **Chachomim** allow it over here because there are at least 4 partial walls. In that other case there are only 2 walls.
- **R' Yitzchak bar Yosef in the name of R' Yochanan** said, no place in Eretz Yisrael can ever be a reshus harabim D'Oraisa.
 - **R' Dimi** repeated this statement of **R' Yochanan**. **Abaye** asked, what is **R' Yochanan's** reason for paskening like that? If it is because Eretz Yisrael is bordered by rocky mountains on one side and steep cliffs on the other side (which act as 2 walls and therefore is not a reshus harabim D'Oraisa), Bavel is also "walled" on 2 sides by the Tigris and Euphrates rivers!? In fact, the entire world is surrounded by the oceans (and should therefore not be considered a reshus harabim D'Oraisa)! **Abaye** said, maybe it is because the roads in Eretz Yisrael are very hilly and not easy for people to travel on, and therefore not considered to be a reshus harabim. **R' Dimi** said, you are exactly right. That is exactly how **R' Yochanan** explained his statement.
 - We find that **Ravin and R' Avahu** each say in the name of **R' Yochanan** that the roads of Eretz Yisrael are not considered to be a reshus harabim because they are so hilly and therefore not like the way the Yidden travelled in the Desert (where the "Anan" flattened the paths for them).
- **Q: Ravva** asked **Rava**, if the path gets to a height of 10 tefachim within 4 amos, but the public travels on this path, does it have a din of a reshus harabim? According to the **Rabanan** who say that if the public travels through the area enclosed by the corner-boards it is not a problem (even though it is easy for the public to travel), surely this won't make it into a reshus harabim (the mound is considered to be a wall and the public cannot negate the din of a wall). The question is according to **R' Yehuda**, who says that the public's use of the area enclosed by the corner-boards is problematic. Does he hold that way there because it is easy for them to use or does he even hold that way in the case of the mound where it is not easy for them to use? **A: Rava** said it does get the status of a reshus harabim.
 - **Q:** He asked, even if the public must climb up with help of a rope? **A:** He said, even then.
 - **Q:** He asked, even if it as steep as the area to Beis Maron? **A:** He said, even then.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that a chatzer which the public enters on one side and exits on the other side is considered to be a reshus harabim for tumah purposes and a reshus hayachid for Shabbos purposes. This can't be going according to the **Rabanan**, because they say that even easy access by the public does not make an area enclosed by corner-boards into a reshus harabim, so access through a chatzer, which is definitely more difficult, would obviously not make the chatzer into a reshus harabim, and there would be no reason to state so in the Braisa. The Braisa must be following **R' Yehuda**, and we see that **R' Yehuda** says that where access is difficult for the public, it does not make the area into a reshus harabim, not like **Rava** said!? **A:** The Braisa may be following the **Rabanan**, and the Braisa is necessary to teach that regarding tumah it is considered to be a reshus harabim.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that a mavui that opens on one side to the reshus harabim and on the other side into a pit, the mavui is considered to be a reshus harabim for tumah purposes and a reshus hayachid for Shabbos purposes. This can't be said according to the **Rabanan**, because they say that even easy access by the public does not make an area enclosed by corner-boards into a reshus harabim, so access through a mavui that opens into a pit, which is definitely more difficult would obviously not make the mavui into a reshus harabim, and there would be no reason to state so in the Mishna! It must be following **R' Yehuda**, and we see that **R' Yehuda** says that where access is difficult for the public, it does not make the area into a reshus harabim, not like **Rava** said!? **A:** The Mishna may be following the **Rabanan**, and the Mishna is necessary to teach that regarding tumah it is considered to be a reshus harabim.

- **Q:** A Mishna says, the paths of Beis Gilgul, which are very steep, are considered a reshus hayachid for Shabbos purposes and a reshus harabim for tumah purposes. This can't be said according to the **Rabanan**, because they say that even easy access by the public does not make an area enclosed by corner-boards into a reshus harabim, so access through the paths of Beis Gilgul, which are very steep and definitely more difficult would obviously not make it into a reshus harabim, and there would be no reason to state so in the Mishna! It must be following **R' Yehuda**, and we see that **R' Yehuda** says that where access is difficult for the public, it does not make the area into a reshus harabim, not like **Rava** said!? **A: Rava** answered, this area is a true reshus hayachid (owned by a private individual), which cannot be effected by the public walking through it. It is only public property areas that are enclosed that can be effected when the public walks through it.