



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

Eirubin Daf Chuf Daled

- The Braisa said that if most of the enclosed area was planted with trees, it retains its residential status and one may carry there.
 - **R' Yehuda in the name of Avimi** said, the trees must be arranged in rows. **R' Nachman** said they need not be arranged in rows.
- **R' Nachman in the name of Shmuel** said, if a karfaf larger than a beis sasayim was enclosed for non-residential purposes, and later on a dwelling was built next to it, what must be done to give the karfaf the status of being “enclosed for residential purposes”? He must make an opening larger than 10 amos wide (which makes the walls ineffective) and then rebuild that wall so that the opening is only 10 amos wide.
 - **Q:** What if he knocks down an amah sized piece of the wall and rebuilds it, then does this to another amah-sized piece, and another, etc., until he has done so to more than 10 amos of the wall? Is that good enough? **A:** A Mishna said that a keili with a hole the size of a pomegranate loses its keili status and tumah status. **Chizkiya** asked, what if smaller holes were punctured and repaired consecutively, adding up to the size of a pomegranate? **R' Yochanan** answered that it would be the same as a sandal whose strap broke and was repaired and then whose second strap broke and was repaired. The halacha is that it loses its stringent tumah status because it is considered to be a new sandal. Same would be with the keili. Based on that, the same should be true in the case of the wall.
- **R' Kahana** said, one may not carry in a backyard (with no direct access from the house) larger than a beis sasayim.
 - **R' Nachman** said, if the house was opened up to the backyard before it was enclosed, then carrying in the backyard becomes mutar.
 - **Q:** That is obvious!? **A:** We are discussing a case where a granary was located in the backyard. We would think that the entrance was made for access to the granary, and not to create a residential backyard. **R' Nachman** teaches that it is considered enclosed for residential purposes and therefore mutar to carry in.
- A karfaf larger than a beis sasayim that was enclosed for residential purposes, which then became full of water, the **Rabanan** thought to say that it is like the case where most was planted with things other than trees and it is therefore assur to carry there. **R' Abba the brother of Rav the son of R' Mesharshiya** said, we say in the name of **Rava** that water is like planted trees and it is therefore mutar to carry there.
 - **Ameimar** says, this is true only if the water is fit for drinking.
 - **R' Ashi** says, this is true only if the water is 10 tefachim deep in an area of a beis sasayim or less.
 - The Gemara says that this is not true, just like we find that a pile of fruit – no matter how high and how large the area it covers – does not change the status of a karfaf.
- There was a backyard in Pumbedra that was larger than a beis sasayim and was not enclosed for residential purposes. On one end of this yard a mavui opened up into it, whose other side opened to the reshus harabim. The other end of the yard opened to a path that was used to access vineyards (through entrances on the side of this path), and the other end of this path opened to the river which had a 10 tefachim drop (which was a legal wall). It was assur to carry in the karfaf, and therefore assur to carry in the mavui and in the path (because they were open in their entirety to the backyard). The backyard then got a residential use and the question became how to “re-enclose” it for residential purposes.

- **Abaye** said we can't just put a wall by the river, because the river is already considered a wall and it would therefore not be considered "re-enclosing" it. We can't place a tzuras hapesach at the entrance of the path to the yard, because camels would frequently pass there and would certainly knock it down. What can be done is placing a lechi at the entrance of the path to the yard. Since the lechi would act to permit carrying in the path, it also would be considered a new wall for the yard and would thus "re-enclose" it.
 - **Rava** said, we cannot permit the lechi to enclose the path because people may not recognize the river as a wall and will think that a lechi can be used even for a path that is only enclosed on 2 sides. Rather, we should place a lechi at the opening of the mavui that leads into the reshus harabim. Since the lechi would act to permit carrying in the mavui (because it had a proper adjustment on its opening to the reshus harabim), it would also be considered a new wall for the yard and would thus "re-enclose" it.
 - The result is that carrying in the mavui is now mutar, carrying in the back lot is now mutar, but carrying in the path remains assur (because it is fully open on one end). With regard to carrying between the yard and the mavui, there is a machlokes between **R' Acha** and **Ravina**: one says it would be mutar (the yard has a residential use, but no actual residents and therefore an eiruv between the 2 areas is not necessary) and one says it is assur (the yard may get residents which would require an eiruv to be made, and we therefore make it assur now as well).