



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

### Eiruv Daf Chuf Vuv

- The Reish Galusa had set up an area of benches for relaxing under a particularly shady tree in his orchard (the orchard was larger than a beis sasayim which was not enclosed for residential purposes). He asked **R' Huna bar Chininah** to do what must be done to allow them to carry food to that area on Shabbos. **R' Huna** went and set up reeds within 3 tefachim to each other, from the Reish Galusa's residence until the sitting area. **Rava** (who held that it was mutar to carry there without this adjustment, because he held that when this sitting area was built, it was as if the entire karfaf was re-enclosed for residential purposes) went and removed all the reeds before Shabbos. **R' Pappa and R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** collected them and took them away so that no one would put them back into the ground. The next day (on Shabbos) **Ravina** asked **Rava**, a Braisa teaches that building a city within existing walls does not make it as if the walls were enclosed for purposes of the city, so this karfaf will also not be considered to be enclosed for residential purposes!? **R' Pappa** asked **Rava**, we find that **R' Assi** says, enclosures made to shade workers is not considered to be made for residential purposes. If so, the enclosure of this karfaf which was also only made for temporary concealment, is also not considered to be enclosed for residential purposes!? **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** asked **Rava**, we find that **R' Huna** said, walls erected for storage purposes is not considered to have been erected for residential purposes. If so, the walls of this karfaf which were erected to protect the garments that the people removed while sitting there, are not considered to be erected for residential purposes!? The Reish Galusa quoted a derogatory pasuk as referring to **R' Pappa and R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua**, for having dismantled the "fix" before Shabbos and not realizing the error of their ways until Shabbos, when it was too late to reestablish the "fix".

AMAR R' ILLAI, SHOMATI M'REBBI ELIEZER V'AFILU BEIS KUR

- **R' Illai in the name of R' Eliezer** says it can even be 30 se'ah (a beis kur). **Chananya** says it can even be up to 40 se'ah.
  - **R' Yochanan** explains, they both learn it from a pasuk that teaches that there is a comparison between a "city" and the "chatzer" of a royal palace. They argue whether a typical city (and through the comparison, a chatzer) is 30 se'ah or 40 se'ah.

V'CHEIN SHOMATI HEIMENU, ANSHEI CHATZER SHESHACHACH ECHAD MEIHEN V'LO EIRAV, BEISO ASSUR

- **Q:** The Mishna said that he may not transfer between his house and the chatzer but others may. Another Mishna says that others may also not!? **A: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua in the name of R' Sheishes** said, our Mishna follows **R' Eliezer** (who holds that when a person gives up his rights in a chatzer, he gives up his rights in his house as well) and the other Mishna follows the **Rabanan** (who hold that when one gives up his rights in a chatzer he does not mean to give up his rights in his house as well).
  - **Rava and R' Huna bar Chinina** explained that according to **R' Eliezer**, if there are 5 members of a chatzer, when one of them gives up his rights to the chatzer he need not give up his rights to each person. We can assume that just as he is liberal with giving up his rights vis-à-vis his house without specifically saying so, he is likewise liberal in giving up his rights to all members of the chatzer without specifically saying so. According to the **Rabanan**, he will have to give up his rights in the chatzer to each member of the chatzer.
  - **Q: R' Pappa** asked **Abaye**, according to **R' Eliezer**, if one specifically said he does not give up rights in his house, do we say he has not given up his rights, or do we say that one would not live in a house without rights to the chatzer, so even though he says so he has still given up his rights to his house? Also, according to the **Rabanan**, if one specifically gives up his rights to his house, do we say that he has given up his rights, or do we say

that no one would totally give up their rights and be a guest in his own house, and therefore we don't listen to what he has said? **A:** He answered, according to both, if he specifically says something, we listen to what he has said.

V'CHEIN SHOMATI MIMENU SHE'YOTZIN B'ARKABLIN B'PESACH

- **Reish Lakish** said that "arkablin" are bitter vines that grow around a palm tree.

**HADRAN ALACH PEREK OSIN PASSIN!!!**