



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Eruvin, Daf כ – Daf כ

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
v'l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf כ--20-----

- **Abaye** asked **Rabbah**, if a chatzer opens into the area around a well enclosed by boards, may one transfer items between the chatzer and the enclosed area? **Rabbah** said it is mutar (no eiruv need be made, because the enclosed area is not considered to be owned by another individual). **Abaye** asked, what if there are 2 chatzeiros that open into the enclosed area, is it still permitted? **Rabbah** answered it is assur, as we see that **R' Huna** prohibited transferring in this case, even if there is access between the two chatzeiros besides via the enclosed area around the well, because people outside will not realize there is additional access between the 2 chatzeiros, and they will think that transfer between the chatzeiros via the enclosed area is allowed because a "shituf" was made between the chatzeiros and the enclosed area. The problem with that is that a "shituf" was only instituted for a mavui (which must have 3 walls, and must be longer than it is wide, both of which the enclosed area is not). As a gezeirah to prevent that from happening, it is assur to transfer between these areas. **Rava** says there is no gezeirah, and therefore if there is access between the chatzeiros directly, transfer between the chatzeiros and the enclosed area would be allowed.
 - **Q: Abaye** brought a Braisa that clearly says that when there is direct access between the chatzeiros, transferring between them and the enclosed area is permitted. This is problematic for **R' Huna**!? **A: R' Huna** would say that the case of the Braisa is where there is access directly between the chatzeiros that is easily visible to the people in the reshus harabim. In that case there is no reason for the gezeirah.
- **Q: Abaye** asked **Rabbah**, if the water in the well dried up on Shabbos, does it become assur to carry in the enclosed area? **A: Rabbah** answered, the boards are considered "walls" only because we are lenient to allow access to water. If the water is gone, the leniency doesn't apply and it is assur to carry in the enclosed area.
 - **Q: Ravin** asked, what if the water dries up on Shabbos and then water returns to the well on Shabbos (e.g. it rained). Is carrying in the enclosed area allowed? **A: Abaye** answered, if the water dries up, **Rabbah** taught that it is assur. If the water returns, it is like the walls were put in place on Shabbos, and the halacha is that walls put in place on Shabbos are considered to be full walls.
 - **Q: A Braisa** says that **R' Nachman** said, walls put in place on Shabbos only create a reshus hayachid l'chumra (one who transfers into it will be chayuv, but one may not carry inside the enclosed area created by these walls)!? **A: R' Nachman** said his halacha with regard to walls that were put in place b'mezid. Here, the rain fell, which "created" the walls on their own.
- **R' Elazar** says, one who transfers from a reshus harabim into the area around a well enclosed by boards is chayuv.
 - **Q: This is obvious!** If it wasn't a reshus hayachid D'Oraisa, the **Rabanan** would not allow one to carry there!? **A: He** meant that if one encloses an area of the reshus harabim, not around a well, with boards, it still has a din as a reshus hayachid.
 - **Q: That is also obvious!** If it didn't, the **Rabanan** couldn't be lenient and allow this arrangement around a well?! **A: He** meant that it is considered a reshus hayachid even though throngs of people walk through this area.

MUTAR L'HAKRIV L'BE'AIR...

- **Q: A Mishna** says that a person may not stand in one reshus and drink from a cup in another reshus unless he brings his head and most of his body into the reshus where the cup is. What is the halacha with regard to giving an animal to drink? Does its head and most of its body need to be in the reshus hayachid with you or not? It is clear that if you are holding the pail with the water for the animal to drink, but not holding onto the animal itself (to prevent it from turning its head into the reshus harabim) that the head and most of the animal needs to be in the reshus with you. But, if you are holding onto the animal, must the head and most of the body be in the reshus? **A: The Mishna** says that the area around the well must be large enough to fit the animal's head and

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

most of its body. Presumably the Mishna is discussing where the person is holding onto the animal and it still requires the head and most of the body to be within the reshus!

- It could be that the Mishna is discussing where he is NOT holding onto the animal, and that is why most of the animal needs to be in the reshus.
- **Q:** If he is not holding onto the animal, it would not be mutar!? A Braisa says that one may not give an animal to drink around a well, but must pour the water into a trough or something for the animal to drink. That is talking where the animal is not being held, and we see it is assur!? **A: Abaye** explained that Braisa as not talking about a typical case. It is discussing a case where a trough in a reshus hayachid sticks into the enclosed area around the well. The Braisa is saying that he must pour the water into the trough and not carry the pail of water over the trough to the animal, because we are afraid that he may put the pail down in the reshus harabim and then lift it to carry to the animal, thereby transferring into a reshus hayachid. However, in a typical case, it may be permitted to give an animal to drink without holding onto the animal as long as most of it is in the reshus with you.
 - Another version of the original question was whether it even helps to have most of the animal's body in the reshus, or is that something that only helps by people? When holding the animal, having most of the body is clearly enough, the question would be when not holding the animal. The Gemara tries to bring an answer from our Mishna that says most of the animal must be within the reshus, and presumably we are discussing where he is holding the animal. The Gemara says that is not a proof, because the Mishna may be discussing where he is not holding the animal. The Gemara then asks the question from the Braisa quoted above and gives the same answer.
- **Q:** A Braisa says that one may force-feed a camel when its head and most of its body are within the reshus hayachid. To force-feed one must hold the animal, yet we see that most of the body must still be in the reshus!? **A: R' Acha bar R' Huna in the name of R' Sheishes** says, a camel is different because of its long neck. It may be that another animal which is being held does not need most of its body to be in the reshus.

-----Daf נב--21-----

- **R' Yitzchak bar Adda** said, the leniency of the boards around the well in the reshus harabim was only allowed to accommodate the people travelling to Yerushalayim for Yom Tov (the olei regalim).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says the leniency was allowed only for the animals?! **A:** This means for the animals of the olei regalim.
 - The Braisa continues and says, a person who wants to drink from the well, must actually climb into the well and drink there.
 - **Q: R' Yitzchak in the name of R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** says that boards may only be used to enclose a well of fresh spring water (which is higher quality water). If it is only done for the benefit of the animals, why does it need to be high quality water? **A:** Since this water caused the boards to be viewed as “walls”, we require the water to be higher quality, fit for people.
 - The Braisa said, the leniency of the boards was only instituted to benefit the animals. However, if the well is too wide for a person to climb in and out, he may use the leniency of the boards as well. A person may not fill the pail and give the animal to drink directly. Rather, the person must pour the water drawn for the animals into a trough.
 - **Q: R' Anan** asked, if so, what leniency is offered by the boards? **A:** That he may draw the water and spill it out!
 - **Q: R' Anan** means, if it must be spilled out, why does the animal's head and most of its body need to be in the reshus? **A: Abaye** said, typically, with most of the body in the reshus the person may give the animal to drink directly. The Braisa is talking about a case where the trough which is a reshus hayachid sticks into the area around the well...(see last Daf for full explanation).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yirmiya bar Abba in the name of Rav** says, the halacha that if a hut is present within 70 and 2/3 amos of a city, the city's techum is counted from that hut, does not apply to huts in cities of Bavel. Also, the halacha that we are meikel and may enclose an area around a well with boards, is only allowed in Eretz Yisrael and Bavel (based on Rashi). Bavel has floods that destroy these huts and therefore they cannot be relied upon to extend a city's limits. With regard to enclosing the area with boards, in Eretz Yisrael and Bavel where people travel to yeshivos to learn, we allow this kula. Elsewhere, we do not.
 - **Another version** said that the halacha of the huts and of enclosing the area with boards, both do not apply in Bavel or any other place outside of Eretz Yisrael. The halacha of huts doesn't apply in Bavel because they are frequently washed away and it doesn't apply elsewhere because there are thieves that steal the huts. The halacha of enclosing the well area with boards doesn't apply elsewhere because people are not traveling to go learn and it doesn't apply in Bavel because water is easily accessible, and we don't have to allow this kula to provide access to water.
 - **Mari the son of R' Huna the son of R' Yirmiya bar Abba** would travel more than 2,000 amos from the city on Shabbos to daven at the shul set up at the place where it was known that Daniel davened. **R' Chisda** asked him, what are you basing your extending the city limits on? It can't be the huts, because your grandfather said in the name of **Rav** that huts in Bavel may not be relied upon. He answered that he relied on the ruins of other cities within the 70 and 2/3 amos of his city.
 - **R' Chisda** said, **Mari bar Mar** darshened, Dovid Hamelech, Iyuv, and Yechezkel each stated that all of the Torah is tremendously vast, without stating how large. Zecharya ben Ido gave a measurement. He said he saw in a vision a folded scroll which was 20 amos (amah refers to the distance between "the elbow and the fingertip" of Hashem) long and 10 amos wide. This means, when unfolded it was 20x20 amos. He continued and said that it was written on both sides. Both sides taken together therefore give an area of 40x20 amos. Based on the measurement of the Heavens given in the pasuk, and the measurement of the Torah, it comes out that the size of the world is 1/3,200 of the size of the Torah.
 - **R' Chisda** said, **Mari bar Mar** darshened, Yirmiyah says there were two pots of figs before the Heichal – one had very good figs and one had bad figs. In this vision, the good figs represented the tzadikim and the bad figs represented the wicked people. Still, the pasuk says that the bad figs gave off a good smell, to teach that even the wicked have a chance to change.
- **Rava** darshened: "haduda'im nasnu rey'ach" – refers to the men of Klal Yisrael who have not even tasted sin. "V'ahl pisacheinu kol migadim" – refers to the Jewish women who tell their husbands of their "openings" (when they are a niddah), or it refers to the women who close their openings for their husbands (they stay away from all z'nus). "Chadashim gahm yishanim, dodi tzafanti lach" – Klal Yisrael says to Hashem, we have instituted many more gezeiros than you have put on us, and we keep all of them.
 - **R' Chisda** asked about the meaning of this last pasuk and was told it refers to the easier mitzvos and the more difficult mitzvos. **R' Chisda** asked, but they were given at one time, they are not "old and new"? Rather the "old" must refer to the D'Oraisas and the "new" refers to the D'Rabanans.
- **Rava** darshened a pasuk to mean one must be more careful with a D'Rabanan than a D'Oraisa, because not keeping any D'Rabanan carries a death penalty with it.
 - **R' Acha bar Ulla** darshened a pasuk to mean, one who makes fun of the words of the **Chachomim** is punished in boiling excrement.
 - **Rava** says that pasuk means, whoever studies Torah tastes meat (it never gets tasteless).
- A Braisa says, **R' Akiva** was once put into jail and subsisted on the water brought to him daily by **R' Yehoshua Hagarsi**. One day the prison guard spilled out half the water he was bringing. He told **R' Akiva** what happened. **R' Akiva** said he will use whatever water there remained to wash his hands before eating his bread rather than for drinking. He said, I rather die of thirst than transgress the words of the **Chachomim**. When the story was told, the **Chachomim** said, if this is how **R' Akiva** acted in his old age, one can only imagine how he was in his younger years, and if this is how he acted when in prison, one can only imagine how he acted when not in prison.
- **Rava** darshened the pasuk in Shir Hashirim that begins with "lecha dodi neitzei hasadeh..." to mean – Klal Yisrael says to Hashem, do not judge us like the liars and cheaters or the cities. Come look in the fields at the people

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

who study Torah in poverty. You have given wealth to the goyim who deny You. Your true praise comes from those who learn Torah.

- **R' Hamnunah** explains the pasuk which says that Shlomo Hamelech said 3,000 meshalim and sang 1,005 songs. This means that Shlomo gave 3,000 meshalim for every part of the Torah and 1,005 reasons for every D'Rabanan.
 - **Rava** explained a pasuk to mean that Shlomo taught all of Torah with all the symbols and meanings.
 - **Ulla in the name of R' Elazar** says, Shlomo instituted laws to help guard the Torah.
- **R' Chisda in the name of Mar Ukva** explains “kevutzosav taltalim” to mean that each line and crown on each letter of the Torah teaches mounds of halachos. “Shechoros ka'oreiv” – the one who gets up early and stays up late to learn is the one who can figure out these halachos. **Rabbah** says it is the one who “blackens” himself from learning Torah that can figure out these halachos. **Rava** says it is one who is merciless to his children like a raven (he learns without concerning himself to support his family) who can figure out these halachos.

-----Daf כב---22-----

- A pasuk says that “Hashem pays back the ones who hate Him to His face”. **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** explains, it is as if Hashem is saying that He carries around this “debt” as a burden that He wants to throw off and get rid of (He “reluctantly” pays back the wicked for any good they have done).
 - The pasuk continues, “He does not delay paying those that hate Him”. **R' Illa** says, He doesn't delay paying the wicked, but He does delay rewarding the tzadikim (until Olam Habbah).
 - Like **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** says, “Asher anochi mitzvavicha hayom la'asosam” – this world is for doing and the next world is for receiving reward.
 - **R' Chagai or R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini** says, the pasuk says Hashem is “Erech Apayim” (which is written in the plural form) to say that Hashem is patient in giving reward to tzadikim and in giving punishment to the resha'im.

R' YEHUDA OMER AHD BEIS SASAYIM...

- **Q:** Does **R' Yehuda** limit the size of the entire enclosed area (the well plus the area within the boards) to an area of beis sasayim, or does he only limit the well to a beis sasayim, but the additional 2 amos of enclosed area all around (to allow for the head and most of the body of the animal) can be above and beyond the beis sasayim? We must limit the area to a beis sasayim so that one does not learn from there to permit an area larger than a beis sasayim in an enclosed field. The question is, do we say that people look at the measurement of the well, so as long as it is not larger than a beis sasayim it is ok, or do we say that people look at the entire enclosed area, and therefore the entire area cannot be larger than a beis sasayim? **A:** A Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** says the area cannot be larger than a beis sasayim. **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says a well that is a beis sasayim x beis sasayim (which is the same thing as saying an area of a beis sasayim) is mutar and we may still add the necessary 2 amos around that. If **R' Yehuda** means that the well itself may be a beis sasayim, then he is saying the same thing as **R' Shimon ben Elazar**! It must be that he says the well plus the area around must not be larger than a beis sasayim.
 - **Q:** It could be that **R' Yehuda** also says that the well itself can be as large as a beis sasayim, and he still argues with **R' Shimon**, because **R' Shimon** requires the area to be square, and **R' Yehuda** would allow a rectangle as well, as long as the area does not exceed a beis sasayim.
- **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says, an enclosed area with no roof that is used for residential purposes (a chatzer, a backyard, etc.) is permitted to carry in even if it is larger than a beis sasayim. On the other hand, an enclosed area with a roof that is primarily used for the sake of the area outside of it (e.g. a watchman's hut) is only mutar to carry in if it is the size of a beis sasayim or less.

MISHNA

- **R' Yehuda** says, if the path of the reshus harabim runs through the area enclosed by the boards, the path must be diverted around the boards (to allow carrying within the boards). The **Chachomim** say the path does not need to be diverted.

GEMARA

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yochanan and R' Elazar** both say, the **Chachomim** here are teaching the strength of these walls (they are not effected by traffic running through it).
 - **Q:** This would seem to say that **R' Yochanan** agrees with the **Chachomim**. However, **Rabbah bar bar Channa in the of R' Yochanan** said that if the doors of the city of Yerushalayim would not be closed at night, it would be considered to be a reshus harabim (because of the path that runs through it)!? **A: R' Yochanan** explains the halacha of the **Chachomim**, but he himself does not agree to it.
- **Q: R' Yehuda** and the **Chachomim** seem to contradict themselves. Elsewhere **R' Yehuda** says, if there are 2 houses on opposites sides of the reshus harabim, the houses can act like walls, and one only needs to place a lechi on each end of one of the houses and he may carry in between. The **Chachomim** say that he may not carry in this situation. In that case the reshus harabim is running right through and **R' Yehuda** says it is not a problem and the **Chachomim** say it is a problem!? **A: R' Yehuda** allows it over there because there are 2 full walls (here there are only 4 corner-boards). The **Chachomim** allow it over here because there are at least 4 partial walls. In that other case there are only 2 walls.
- **R' Yitzchak bar Yosef in the name of R' Yochanan** said, no place in Eretz Yisrael can ever be a reshus harabim D'Oraisa.
 - **R' Dimi** repeated this statement of **R' Yochanan**. **Abaye** asked, what is **R' Yochanan's** reason for paskening like that? If it is because Eretz Yisrael is bordered by rocky mountains on one side and steep cliffs on the other side (which act as 2 walls and therefore is not a reshus harabim D'Oraisa), Bavel is also “walled” on 2 sides by the Tigris and Euphrates rivers!? In fact, the entire world is surrounded by the oceans (and should therefore not be considered a reshus harabim D'Oraisa)! **Abaye** said, maybe it is because the roads in Eretz Yisrael are very hilly and not easy for people to travel on, and therefore not considered to be a reshus harabim. **R' Dimi** said, you are exactly right. That is exactly how **R' Yochanan** explained his statement.
 - We find that **Ravin and R' Avahu** each say in the name of **R' Yochanan** that the roads of Eretz Yisrael are not considered to be a reshus harabim because they are so hilly and therefore not like the way the Yidden travelled in the Desert (where the “Anan” flattened the paths for them).
- **Q: Rachva** asked **Rava**, if the path gets to a height of 10 tefachim within 4 amos, but the public travels on this path, does it have a din of a reshus harabim? According to the **Rabanan** who say that if the public travels through the area enclosed by the corner-boards it is not a problem (even though it is easy for the public to travel), surely this won't make it into a reshus harabim (the mound is considered to be a wall and the public cannot negate the din of a wall). The question is according to **R' Yehuda**, who says that the public's use of the area enclosed by the corner-boards is problematic. Does he hold that way there because it is easy for them to use or does he even hold that way in the case of the mound where it is not easy for them to use? **A: Rava** said it does get the status of a reshus harabim.
 - **Q:** He asked, even if the public must climb up with help of a rope? **A:** He said, even then.
 - **Q:** He asked, even if it as steep as the area to Beis Maron? **A:** He said, even then.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that a chatzer which the public enters on one side and exits on the other side is considered to be a reshus harabim for tumah purposes and a reshus hayachid for Shabbos purposes. This can't be going according to the **Rabanan**, because they say that even easy access by the public does not make an area enclosed by corner-boards into a reshus harabim, so access through a chatzer, which is definitely more difficult, would obviously not make the chatzer into a reshus harabim, and there would be no reason to state so in the Braisa. The Braisa must be following **R' Yehuda**, and we see that **R' Yehuda** says that where access is difficult for the public, it does not make the area into a reshus harabim, not like **Rava** said!? **A:** The Braisa may be following the **Rabanan**, and the Braisa is necessary to teach that regarding tumah it is considered to be a reshus harabim.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that a mavui that opens on one side to the reshus harabim and on the other side into a pit, the mavui is considered to be a reshus harabim for tumah purposes and a reshus hayachid for Shabbos purposes. This can't be said according to the **Rabanan**, because they say that even easy access by the public does not make an area enclosed by corner-boards into a reshus harabim, so access through a mavui that opens into a pit, which is definitely more difficult would obviously not make the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

mavui into a reshus harabim, and there would be no reason to state so in the Mishna! It must be following **R' Yehuda**, and we see that **R' Yehuda** says that where access is difficult for the public, it does not make the area into a reshus harabim, not like **Rava** said!? **A:** The Mishna may be following the **Rabanan**, and the Mishna is necessary to teach that regarding tumah it is considered to be a reshus harabim.

- **Q:** A Mishna says, the paths of Beis Gilgul, which are very steep, are considered a reshus hayachid for Shabbos purposes and a reshus harabim for tumah purposes. This can't be said according to the **Rabanan**, because they say that even easy access by the public does not make an area enclosed by corner-boards into a reshus harabim, so access through the paths of Beis Gilgul, which are very steep and definitely more difficult would obviously not make it into a reshus harabim, and there would be no reason to state so in the Mishna! It must be following **R' Yehuda**, and we see that **R' Yehuda** says that where access is difficult for the public, it does not make the area into a reshus harabim, not like **Rava** said!? **A: Rava** answered, this area is a true reshus hayachid (owned by a private individual), which cannot be effected by the public walking through it. It is only public property areas that are enclosed that can be effected when the public walks through it.

-----Daf לז---23-----

MISHNA

- **R' Akiva** says, the kula of corner-boards may be used to enclose the area around a public well (fed by an underground spring and less likely to dry up), a private well, and a public watering hole (a collection of rain water, which is more likely to dry up). However, the area around a private watering hole must be enclosed by true walls. **R' Yehuda ben Bava** says, enclosing with corner-boards only works for the area around a public well (it is not likely to dry up, and if it does someone will likely remind the others to stop all carrying). All others need to be enclosed by at least walls of ropes that are 10 tefachim high.

GEMARA

- **R' Yosef in the name of R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, the halacha follows **R' Yehuda ben Bava**. **R' Yosef in the name of R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** also said that corner-boards only help to enclose an area that surrounds a spring-fed well.
 - Although these statements seem redundant, both are necessary. If he would just that say he paskens like **R' Yehuda ben Bava** in the Mishna, we would say that he permits corner-boards even around public watering holes. The reason he says spring-fed wells is to contrast **R' Akiva** who says that private spring-fed wells may be enclosed with the corner-boards. If he would just have said his second statement we would think that he allows public and private spring-fed wells to be enclosed with corner-boards.

MISHNA

- **R' Yehuda ben Bava** also said, one may carry in a garden or karfaf (area enclosed for non-residential purposes) which is 70+ amos by 70+ amos, and which is enclosed by a fence 10 tefachim high, as long as it has a watchman's hut or a dwelling structure, or is near the city. **R' Yehuda** says, one may carry in a karfaf of that size even if there is only a water source within the karfaf. **R' Akiva** says one may even carry in a karfaf that doesn't have the water source in it, as long as it is not larger than 70+ amos by 70+ amos.
- **R' Eliezer** says, one may not carry in a karfaf whose length exceeds its width by even one amah. **R' Yosef** says, even if the length is double the width, one may carry in it.
- **R' Illai** said that he heard from **R' Elazar** three things: 1) one may carry in an enclosed karfaf even if it is the size of a beis kor (much larger than a beis sasayim); 2) if one member of a chatzer forgot to join the eiruv and therefore was mevatel his reshus to the others of the chatzer (which would allow them to carry in the chatzer), the others in the chatzer may carry in and out of that person's house, but he may not; 3) one may be yotzeh the mitzvah of maror with "arkablin". **R' Illai** said he searched for someone who heard these from **R' Elazar** as well and could find noone.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why does the Mishna say **R' Yehuda ben Bava** *also* said? It can't be just because he said a chumra in the last Mishna and is now following it with another chumra, because **R' Yehuda** did that in the last couple of Mishnayot and it doesn't say "also"!? **A:** **R' Yehuda ben Bava** is not interrupted by the **Rabanan's** shita, whereas **R' Yehuda's** 2 chumros were.
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Eliezer** said 2 chumros in Mesechta Succah and the Mishna says "also" even though the **Rabanan** interrupt with their shita!? **A:** They interrupted him to discuss his shita. **R' Yehuda** was interrupted about something else.

R' AKIVA OMER AFILU EIN BAH ECHAD MIKOL EILU MITALTILIN B'SOCHA

- **Q:** The **Rabanan** already said that for purposes of carrying, a karfaf not enclosed for dwelling purposes is limited to a beis sasayim in size, and has no size limit if enclosed for dwelling purposes. If so, **R' Akiva** is saying the same thing!? **A:** The difference is that the **Rabanan** allow a full 5,000 square amos, and **R' Akiva** only allows slightly less than that (70+ amos x 70+ amos).
- **Q:** How do we know that a square, the area of the chatzer of the Mishkan, is the maximum size for a karfaf? **A:** **R' Yehuda** says, the pasuk discussing the chatzer of the Mishkan says the length is 100 amos and the width is "50 by 50". The Torah is telling us to take 50 amos and set it around the original 50, thereby making a square with an area of 5,000 square amos. This square is then to be used for some halacha. The halacha must be the size of a karfaf.
 - The simple meaning of the pasuk is saying to set up the Mishkan so that there are 50 empty amos in front of it and 20 empty amos on each other side.

R' ELIEZER OMER IHM HU YSA ARKAH...

- **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Eliezer** says if the length is even one amah more than *twice* the width, one may not carry in the enclosure. In our Mishna he said that if the length is even one amah more than the width it is a problem!? **A:** **R' Bibi bar Abaye** said, in our Mishna he means an amah more than twice the width as well.
 - **Q:** If so, he is saying the same thing as **R' Yose**!? **A:** **R' Yose** says a square is preferred, and **R' Eliezer** has no preference for a square.

R' YOSE OMER...

- **R' Yosef in the name of R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said that we pasken like **R' Yose** (that a rectangular shape is good as well) and **R' Bibi in the name of R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said that we pasken like **R' Akiva** (that a karfaf enclosed for non-residential purposes is permitted as well).
 - These are not contradictory. **Shmuel** paskened like the lenient parts of **R' Yose** and **R' Akiva**.
- If a karfaf larger than a beis sasayim was enclosed for dwelling purposes, and then the majority of the area was planted with something other than trees, it becomes a "garden" and is assur to carry in. If trees are planted in the majority, it retains its residential status (as a chatzer) and remains mutar to carry in.
 - **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** said, it is only a problem when the majority that is planted (with something other than trees) is itself larger than a beis sasayim. In that case, that area itself is assur, and the rest of the enclosed area is like a chatzer that is open in its entirety to that area and therefore becomes assur as well. However, if the planted area is at most a beis sasayim, it is mutar to carry throughout the entire enclosure.
 - **Q:** He must be following **R' Shimon** who allows transfer between a chatzer and a karfaf (which the unplanted area and the planted area, respectfully, are considered to be). However, even according to **R' Shimon**, since the majority is planted, it should be mevatel the area that is not planted and the entire area should become assur to carry in!? **A:** **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** must have said that if the *minority* of the karfaf is planted, it is mutar to carry only if the planted area is itself less than a beis sasayim. However, if it is a beis sasayim, it becomes assur to carry in the entire area. This follows the **Rabanan** who do not allow transfer between a chatzer and a karfaf. **A2:** **R' Yirmiya MiDifti** says that **R' Huna** meant, if it is the minority that is planted it is mutar to carry as long as the planted area itself is only a beis sasayim. However, if it is more than a beis sasayim, it is assur to carry in. This would follow **R' Shimon** who allows transferring between a chatzer and a karfaf.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 7D---24-----

- 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 Pum Nahara 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 reshush 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 reshush

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

harabim. Since the lechi would act to permit carrying in the mavui (because it had a proper adjustment on its opening to the reshut 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).

-----Daf דב--25-----

- If one wishes to decrease the size of a karfaf that was not enclosed for residential purposes to less than a beis sasayim, planting trees in the area greater than the beis sasayim will not help (it is still considered part of the karfaf). If he places a pillar which is 10 tefachim high and 4 tefachim wide in it, that area is considered to reduce the area of the karfaf. If the pillar is less than 3 tefachim wide it does not reduce the area of the karfaf. If the pillar is between 3 and 4 tefachim wide, **Rabbah** says it does decrease the area of the karfaf (it is greater than the amount allowed for lavud) and **Rava** says it does not (less than 4 tefachim is not a significant area and therefore remains part of the karfaf).
 - This same concept would apply where one erects a wall in the karfaf to re-enclose it for dwelling purposes. If the wall is placed 4 tefachim away from the karfaf wall, it is considered a new enclosure. If it is less than 3 tefachim, it is not. Between 3 and 4 is a machlokes between **Rabbah** and **Rava**.
 - **R’ Simi** says the machlokes in both cases is only where there is less than 3 tefachim. However, if there is 3 tefachim, all would agree that since it can’t be considered lavud, it creates a separate area and a new wall.
- If one reduces the size of a karfaf by adding a thick layer of mud onto the inside of the karfaf wall, if the mud is thick enough to stand on its own without being attached to the wall, it is considered to reduce the size of the karfaf. If the mud cannot stand on its own, **Rabbah** says it still reduces the karfaf, because right now it is standing (although attached to the wall), and **Rava** says it does not reduce the karfaf, because it is considered to be insignificant.
- If a karfaf which is not enclosed for residential purposes, is larger than a beis sasayim, and has a mound 10 tefachim high as one of its walls and one re-encloses the karfaf for residential purposes by erecting a wall 4 tefachim away from the mound, it is good. If it is less than 3 tefachim from the mound, or if it is placed on top of the mound, there is a machlokes between **R’ Chisda** and **R’ Hamnuna**. One says it is good and one says it is not.
 - We can prove that **R’ Chisda** is the one who allows it. We find that if one erects a wall on top of an existing wall, **R’ Chisda** says it is effective for purposes of Shabbos (to re-enclose a karfaf), but ineffective in acquiring the property of a ger (who has no inheritors, in which case the halacha is that the first person to make an act of “kinyan” to the property would acquire it). **R’ Sheishes** says it is even ineffective for Shabbos purposes.
 - **R’ Chisda** said, **R’ Sheishes** would agree with me that a wall erected atop a mound would be effective, because people use the area on top of the mound and the wall is considered a wall for them.
 - **Q: Rabbah bar bar Chana** asked, according to **R’ Hamnuna** and **R’ Sheishes** who say that a wall built atop an existing wall is ineffective, what happens if the original wall sunk into the ground and only the new wall now exists, can it be effective as being re-enclosed? **A:** If he was asking about the case of acquiring the property of a ger, it would not be effective, because we find that **Yirmiya Bira’ah in the name of R’ Yehuda** said that an improvement to the property of the ger (which could act as a kinyan) which happens by itself is not a good kinyan, and these walls “happened by themselves” because they can only be effective by the sinking of the original walls. If he was asking about these walls re-enclosing

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

a karfaf for residential purposes, it will be effective, because it would be considered a wall that was created on Shabbos and a Braisa teaches that a wall created on Shabbos has the full din of a “wall”.

- **Q: R’ Nachman** said that a wall created on Shabbos is only considered a wall D’Oraisa, l’chumra!? **A:** He says that regarding a wall that was *intentionally* created on Shabbos. The wall in our question was “created” on its own.
- We find the **R’ Nachman** paskened in an actual case that erecting a wall upon an existing wall was ineffective to acquire the property of a ger.
- If a karfaf is 3 beis se’ah and not enclosed for residential purposes, and one of the 3 beis se’ah is roofed, **Rabbah** says the areas combine and it is a karfaf of 3 beis se’ah, which one may not carry in. **R’ Zeira** says the areas do not combine (because we say the “edge of the roof comes down and closes off the area” by acting as a wall, thereby separating it from the unroofed area) and one may therefore carry in both areas.
 - **Q:** If there is a roofed structure in an open field, **Rav** says one may carry in it (“the edge of the roof comes down and seals off the area”) and **Shmuel** says one may not carry there. Can we say that **Rabbah** and **R’ Zeira** are arguing in the same machlokes? **A: Rabbah** and **R’ Zeira** agree that regarding a straight roof we say “the edge of the roof comes down and seals off the area”. They are arguing in a case where the karfaf is roofed with a slanted roof.
 - **R’ Zeira** said that he agrees that it is assur to carry in a karfaf that is open in its entirety to a chatzer, because the area of the chatzer “joins” the area of the karfaf and makes the karfaf larger than a beis sasayim.
 - **Q: R’ Yosef** asked, the karfaf alone is not larger than a beis sasayim, and therefore mutar to carry in. The chatzer is mutar to carry in as well. It was even mutar to carry between the karfaf and the chatzer before the wall broke down. If so, why would it become assur once the wall broke down? The chatzer, which is a residential enclosure, cannot be said to combine to the karfaf to make it exceed the beis sasayim limit!? **A: Abaye** says, you are obviously asking according to **R’ Shimon** who allows transfer between a chatzer and a karfaf, but even according to him, **R’ Zeira** is discussing a case where the karfaf was exactly a beis sasayim, and now that the wall has fallen, the empty space where the wall once stood “joins” the karfaf and makes the karfaf into an area larger than a beis sasayim.
- There was an orchard larger than a beis sasayim which used a palace wall as one of the walls to enclose it (and that was the wall that it enclosed it for residential purposes). The palace wall abutting the orchard collapsed, leaving no wall enclosing it for residential purposes. **R’ Bibi** thought to say that an inner wall of the palace can be relied upon for this purpose. **R’ Pappi** said, those walls were made for inside, not for outside and they therefore cannot be relied upon.

-----Daf 10---26-----

- 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

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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!!!