

מה שנהגית –

The גמרא challenged רב (who maintains that by מחזורת he pays מה שהזיקה) from our משנה, where it states that מפתח החנות he pays מה שנהנית, even though that in order to eat מפתח החנות she needs to be מחזורת; this seemingly disproves רב. Our תוספות explains why the גמרא did not offer an alternate resolution.

The אכלה מפתח החנות משלמת מה שנהנית **did not want to establish** the ruling of שנהנית in a case where **for instance the פתח ההנות protrudes into the רהבה** (which is a רה"ר), **so the animal can eat without חיזור**; in which case -

רב would admit that he is פטור. This would resolve the s'גמרא question. The reason the גמרא did not offer this answer is -

For it is unusual for a store to protrude that much into the רחוב.

All agree that (in the unusual case) where the חנות (פתח) protrudes into the רחבה, that he is משלם מה שנהנית.

What would the advantage if we would give this answer (that it was בולט לתוך)⁴, over the answer the גמרא actually gives (that it was בקרן זווית)?

² It would be פטור (from paying שהזיקה (מה) because it cannot be considered רשות הניק, since the animal (which is standing in the רחבה) can eat from it without חזזור. See previous ובמהחזרת תוס' ד"ה (TIE footnote #14).

⁴ This is assuming that it is the 777.