



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

Eiruv Daf Tzaddik Daled

MISHNA

- If the wall of a chatzer collapsed, opening it to the reshus harabim, **R' Eliezer** says the chatzer gets the status of a reshus harabim, and therefore transferring between it and a reshus hayachid will make one chayuv. The **Chachomim** say that the chatzer gets the status of a karmelis, and transferring between it and another reshus is only assur D'Rabanan.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why does **R' Eliezer** hold that because the chatzer is open to reshus harabim it gets the status of a reshus harabim? **A:** The Mishna is referring to a case where the rabbim is now using the chatzer as a path, and **R' Eliezer** says elsewhere in a Braisa, that such usage gives something the status of a reshus harabim.
 - **Q:** **R' Eliezer** only said that halacha regarding a case where there was a path that belonged to the rabbim that became "lost", and they therefore take another path to use. That cannot be the case of the Mishna, because **R' Chanina** says that the machlokes in the Mishna is regarding the *entire* chatzer (not just a path near the actual reshus harabim)!? **A:** We must say that **R' Chanina** meant to say, the machlokes is regarding the area where the wall once stood. **A2:** The machlokes is regarding the area on the side of the reshus harabim that may be privately owned. **R' Eliezer** says that it has the status of a reshus harabim and the **Rabanan** say that it does not.
 - **Q:** Why do they argue in this case in particular? Why don't they argue about any other case of the sides of the reshus harabim? **A:** If they would argue in a typical case, where a wall may be abutting that area and protruding into that area (making its use more difficult), we would say that the **Rabanan** only argue in that case because its use is more difficult. They therefore argue in the Mishna, to show that they argue even in a case where the public's use is not difficult.
 - **Q:** **R' Eliezer** says his din in the Mishna regarding the *entire* area of the chatzer ("tocha")!? **A:** He says that because the **Rabanan** say that, but he is referring to the place where the wall once stood.
 - The **Rabanan** use that language because they say to **R' Eliezer**, you agree that the inside of the field has the status of a karmelis, so the place of the wall should be no different! **R' Eliezer** responds that the place of the wall gets the din of a reshus harabim because the rabbim currently walk there.

MISHNA

- A chatzer that became open to the reshus harabim on Shabbos, on two sides of the chatzer, or a house that became open on Shabbos, on 2 sides, or a mavoi whose korah or lechi was removed on Shabbos, **R' Yehuda** says, all remain mutar to carry on this Shabbos, but become assur to carry on any future Shabbos (unless the problem is fixed). **R' Yose** says, if it is not mutar on a future Shabbos, it is not mutar on this Shabbos either.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How large is this opening? If it is 10 amos or less, then it should be considered as an entrance on each side!? If the opening is more than 10 amos, even if only on one side it would be assur to carry in the chatzer!? **A:** **Rav** said, the Mishna is discussing an opening of 10 amos or less, but it is at the corner of the chatzer. This can't be considered an entrance, because people don't make entrances at corners.

- **Q:** Why is it that if the opening was on only one side of the house we would view the roof as creating a wall from its edge, but now that it is 2 sides we don't say that!? **A:** The **Yeshiva of Rav in the name of Rav** said, the opening was at a corner (so it can't be considered an entrance) and the roof is slanted (in which case we don't say that we view the edge of the roof as creating a wall).
- **Shmuel** says that the case of the chatzer in the Mishna is referring to openings larger than 10 amos.
 - **Q:** Even an opening of such size on one side of the chatzer would prohibit carrying, so why does the Mishna refer to a case where there are openings on two sides!? **A:** Since regarding a house we must say it was opened on 2 sides, we say so regarding a chatzer as well.
 - **Q:** Why by a house do we say that we view the edge of the roof as creating a wall when there is an opening on one side but not when there is an opening on 2 sides!? **Q2: Shmuel** himself does not even agree to the concept of viewing the roof as creating a wall?! **A: Shmuel** only doesn't say this concept when it must be applied to all 4 walls of a structure, but agrees to it when it is being used to create 3 walls or less. Also, **Shmuel** will say that the Mishna is referring to where the opening was at the corner of the house and that a 4 tefachim wide chunk of the roof broke off as well. Because it is so wide, to close these openings we would have to use the concept of the roof creating a wall at 4 places (at the 2 sides missing parallel to the length and at the 2 sides parallel to the width). According to **Shmuel**, we do not say this concept when we must say it for 4 walls.
- **Shmuel** doesn't agree to **Rav's** explanation of the Mishna, because the Mishna does not say that we are dealing with a slanted roof. **Rav** doesn't say like **Shmuel's** interpretation, because **Rav** does say the concept of the roof creating a wall even when it must be said for 4 walls.
 - We find this machlokes regarding a roofed structure without walls in an open field. **Rav** says one may carry anywhere under the roof because we view the roof as creating 4 walls, and **Shmuel** says one may only carry up to 4 amos in that area, because we don't say that concept when it must be applied to all 4 walls.
 - **Some say** that if the openings of this structure are less than 10 amos, all agree that carrying is allowed throughout. They only argue when the openings are more than 10 amos. **Others say** that when the openings are more than 10 amos all agree that carrying would not be permitted. The machlokes is where the openings are less than 10 amos.
 - Regarding a roofed structure with no walls, if one puts s'chach on boards placed within 3 tefachim to each other, it is a kosher succah. If there are no boards so placed, **Abaye** says it is a kosher succah (we say the concept that the roof (beams holding the s'chach) creates all 4 walls) and **Rava** says it is passul (we don't say this concept).
 - **Q:** Should we say that **Abaye** must hold like **Rav**, and **Rava** must hold like **Shmuel**? **A:** According to **Shmuel** the succah would clearly be passul in this case. According to **Rav**, it could be that he would agree with **Abaye**, because the roof creates all 4 walls. However, it could also be that he would agree with **Rava**, because these conceptual walls were "created" before it was decided to be used for a succah, and a succah which has conceptual walls is only kosher if the "walls" were "created" for the purpose of making a succah.