



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

Eiruv Daf Vuv

- **R' Chanin bar Rava in the name of Rav** said, a breach in the side wall of a mavui (when there is 4 tefachim of that side wall which is standing before the place of the breach) is not problematic unless the breach is more than 10 amos. A breach in the front wall of a mavui is problematic if it is even just 4 tefachim.
 - **Q:** Why should the front wall be treated any differently than the side wall (in both cases the breach should be considered another entranceway and the mavui should remain permitted to carry in)?! **A: R' Huna in the name of R' Yehoshua** said, **R' Chanin** is referring to a case where the corner wall is broken down (not the front wall), and this can't be considered an entranceway, because entranceways are not made in corners.
- **R' Huna** says that a breach of 4 tefachim on either wall makes the mavui assur to carry in.
 - **R' Huna** said to **R' Chanan bar Rava**, don't argue with me, because even **Rav** paskened like me when this question came before him in Damcharya. **R' Chanan** answered, **Rav** doesn't really hold like that. He paskened stringently in that case because the people of Damcharya were unlearned and he was trying to prevent them from coming close to desecrating Shabbos.
- **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said that **R' Huna's** view makes sense. We learned that in a case of a bent mavui (an "L" shaped mavui) where both ends open into the reshus harabim, there is a machlokes: **Rav** says that each leg of the "L" is treated as a mavui that is open on both sides to the reshus harabim. Therefore, he would need to put a "tzuras hapesach" on one end of each leg (or just in the middle, for both legs) and put a lechi or korah on the other end. **Shmuel** says each leg is considered to be a mavui that is closed, with only one end being open to the reshus harabim (and a simple lechi or korah at the opening to the reshus harabim will suffice). How large is the width of the mavui at the bend? If it is larger than 10 amos, **Shmuel** would not consider it a closed mavui. It must be that it is less than 10 amos, and still **Rav** considers it to be an open mavui. **Rav** must consider a breach of 4 tefachim as being "open"!
 - **R' Chanan** will say, that case is different because it becomes a public thoroughfare (since it is open on both sides to the reshus harabim) and that is why it is considered problematic if it is even 4 tefachim wide.
 - **Q:** This would mean that **R' Huna** disallows a breach of 4 tefachim even if it *not* a public thoroughfare. This is problematic, because **R' Ami and R' Assi** said earlier that a side wall breached up to 10 amos is not problematic for the mavui if there is a piece of wall 4 tefachim before the breach. According to the answer we just gave, **R' Huna** must be arguing on **R' Ami and R' Assi**?! **A:** In **R' Ami and R' Assi's** case the breached wall had a small piece near the ground still remaining, which prevented the breach from becoming a thoroughfare. In that case even **R' Huna** would agree that a breach up to 10 amos would not be problematic for the mavui.
- A Braisa says: How do we adjust a reshus harabim to permit carrying? The **T"K** says he must make a tzuras hapesach on one end and place a lechi or korah on the opposite end. **Chananya** says it is a machlokes between **B"S and B"H**. **B"S** say each end must be closed off by doors, which must actually be kept closed (except when one is walking through). **B"H** say one end must be closed off by doors and the other end needs either a lechi or a korah.
 - **Q:** We learn from a Braisa that a reshus harabim can only be adjusted with doors on both sides?! How can the previous Braisa say that **B"H** allow adjusting with a door on one end and a lechi or korah on the other end? **A: R' Yehuda** said, the previous Braisa is talking about adjusting a mavui that is open on both ends to the reshus harabim (not a reshus harabim itself).

- **Rav** paskens like the **T”K**, that a mavui opened at both ends to the reshus harabim needs to be adjusted with a tzuras hapesach on one end and a lechi or korah on the opposite end. **Shmuel** paskens like **Chananya** (according to **B”H**) that it requires doors on one end and a lechi or korah on the opposite end.
- **Q:** Do **B”H** require the doors to be closed (like **B”S**) or not? **A: R’ Yehuda and R’ Masna** both said in the name of **Shmuel** that the doors need not stay closed.
- They asked **R’ Anan** if the doors must remain closed. He said, go and see the gates of Neharda’ah, which are buried halfway in sand, in an open position, and **Shmuel** never required them to dig them out and close them.
 - **R’ Kahana** said, the gates were partially closed, and maybe that’s why **Shmuel** didn’t protest.
 - **R’ Nachman** required them to dig out the doors. It could be that he doesn’t require them to be closed, but that he does require them to have the *ability* to be closed.
- There was a “ches” shaped mavui in Neharda’ah whose 2 ends opened into the reshus harabim, and the **Rabanan** treated that mavui with the chumros of **Rav** and the chumros of **Shmuel**, and because of that, they required that doors be placed on the two bends (even though neither **Rav** or **Shmuel** would say that doors need to be put there) and a lechi or kora on each end opening to the reshus harabim.
 - The **Rabanan** followed the chumrah of **Rav** that the mavui is considered to be a mavui with 2 ends open to the reshus harabim. Although **Rav** paskened like the **T”K** that no doors are required in the case of an open mavui, the **Rabanan** followed chumrah of **Shmuel**, who (although in this case would hold that the mavui is considered to be a closed mavui) paskens like **Chananya** that in a case of a mavui open at both ends to the reshus harabim, doors are required.