

Laws of Eruvin Chapter 5 (Auto Translated)

English

Auto Translated

Shiur Overview

Summary of Rambam Laws of Eruvin Chapter 5 – Shitufei Mevo'ot and Shituf Medinah

Introduction to the Chapter

We have already completed **eruv chatzerot** (carrying from house to courtyard). Now we will learn **shitufei mevo'ot** (carrying from courtyards to the alleyway) and also the matter of an entire **medinah** (city).

Innovation: Three Levels, Two Names

Technically there are only **two names**: eruv chatzerot and shitufei mevo'ot. What one does for a medinah has **no special name**, although it has certain unique laws. Seemingly all three levels are **the same thing on a different level**, but there are distinctions.

Innovation: Shituf Mevo'ot is More Lenient than Eruv Chatzerot

Already learned in **Chapter 1**: eruv chatzerot requires specifically **bread (pat)**, but shitufei mevo'ot is sufficient with **any type of food**. One would have thought that a larger grouping (more people) should be stricter, but on the contrary, **it is easier**. Perhaps the reason is because with many residents it would have been difficult to have enough bread.

Principle: One Needs Both – Eruv Chatzerot and Shitufei Mevo'ot

Even when there is a shituf mevo'ot, each courtyard must **also** make eruv chatzerot. Initially one needs bread in each courtyard.

Law 1 – Partners in One Food Item for Business Purposes

The Rambam: People of an alleyway who are partners with each other in one food item for business purposes, such as they purchased wine in partnership, oil, honey and the like – they do not need another partnership, and may rely on the business partnership. Provided that the type in which they are partners is one type, and in one vessel. If one requested from his fellow wine or oil before Shabbat and he did not give it to him – the partnership is nullified, for he has revealed his intention that they are not like partners who are not particular with each other.

Plain Meaning

If the people of the alleyway are already partners in a food (like wine, oil, honey) for business/commerce purposes, they **do not need to make an extra shituf** – they can rely on the partnership that already exists. But it must be **one type** and **in one vessel**, and if one requested to take from the shared food before Shabbat and was **not allowed** – the partnership is **nullified for Shabbat purposes**.

Innovations and Explanations

1) Comparison with "somchin al shulchan echad" by courtyards – but with an important distinction:

By eruv chatzerot we learned that people who eat **at one table** do not need **any eruv at all** – they are considered **one household**. By shitufei mevo'ot however the principle is **different**: we don't say they are "one house" that doesn't need any eruv at all. We say that **the partnership itself counts as the eruv/shituf**. That is, one does need a shituf, but the already-existing partnership **is** the shituf. The distinction is significant: by courtyards – "one household" is exempt from eruv; by alleyways – the partnership **serves as** the shituf.

2) Why it only works by alleyways:

Perhaps because an alleyway is easier – one doesn't need as strong an eruv as bread, so a partnership in food is sufficient. For a courtyard it perhaps wouldn't suffice because there one specifically needs bread.

3) "Sechorah" – broader than business:

Simply "sechorah" means a business partnership (they resell wine/oil/honey). But the Rambam also brings a broader case: even when people buy together for their own use (like a "co-op" – each can take from the shared supply), this is **a fortiori** sufficient – this is already very similar to "somchin al shulchan echad."

4) Two conditions – one type and one vessel:

- **One type** – all partners must be partners in **the same type** of food. Not that one buys wine and another oil.

- **One vessel** – the food must be in **one vessel/place**. Even if they are partners in the same type, but it's in separate vessels, it is **divided** and doesn't count as a partnership. The reason: there must be a **recognizable partnership** – everyone belongs to one thing in one place.

5) Example – not all partners with all:

In an alleyway with three courtyards: A is a partner with B in wine, A is a partner with C in oil – in total A is a partner with both, but **not all are partners with all in the same thing**. In such a case it does **not** count – because it is **in two vessels** (separate partnerships), they do need to make a partnership for Shabbat.

6) Two types of partnership – makpidin vs. einam makpidin:

- **Partners who are not particular with each other** – each can take for their own use without precise accounting (like brothers in a business who don't count every piece of pepper). This counts as shituf.

- **Partners who are particular with each other** – one may take, but must precisely record and account. This does **not** count as shituf for Shabbat.

The level of partnership required for shitufei mevo'ot is **"partners who are not particular"** – a partnership where one trusts enough to let take without particularity. A mere

monetary partnership (makpidin) doesn't help, because it's not a partnership in the food itself.

7) "Bikesh velo natno" – revealing of intention:

When one requested to take from the shared food before Shabbat and was not allowed, this reveals intention that they are "makpidin" – and therefore the partnership is nullified for Shabbat.

Law 2 – One of the Alleyway Residents Who Doesn't Want to Participate

The Rambam: One of the alleyway residents who was accustomed to participate with them and did not want to – the alleyway residents enter his house and take from him a shituf against his will. And if he was not accustomed – they compel him to participate with them.

Plain Meaning

Two levels: (a) For a regular participant who doesn't want to one week – one goes in and takes from him against his will. (b) For one who doesn't want to at all – one compels him through beit din.

Innovations and Explanations

1) Compelling based on middat Sedom:

The foundation of this law is "zeh neheneh vezeh lo chaser" – the bit of food taken from him is minimal, and he has benefit that he may carry in the alleyway. Even if he says he doesn't want to carry this Shabbat, it is middat Sedom to prevent others.

2) Two levels of compulsion (Maggid Mishneh):

For a regular participant – one doesn't need to compel him, one simply goes in and takes. For one who doesn't want to at all – one must compel him through beit din "until he says I want to," because one cannot yet enter his house without his consent.

3) Question – why not be mezakeh:

It is asked – why does one need compulsion, let's simply be mezakeh to him? The **Ra'avad** says that "kofin oto" means through zechiiah – one is mezakeh to him without his consent. But the Rambam's language "kofin" looks like more than just zechiiah.

4) Why only by alleyway and not courtyard?

Such a law doesn't appear by courtyard. A possible answer: by courtyard one needs bread, which is harder to take against his will; by alleyway it works with wine/oil and the like.

Law 3 – Being Mezakeh from a Storehouse

The Rambam: One of the alleyway residents who has a storehouse of wine, oil and grain, may be mezakeh from it a bit to all the alleyway residents to participate in it, and makes an eruv for them with it, even though he did not separate it and designate it.

Plain Meaning

One who has a large storehouse of wine/oil/grain can be mezakeh a bit for all the alleyway residents, and thereby make a shituf – even without having separated it into a special vessel.

Innovations and Explanations

1) Innovation of "without separating":

The main innovation is that one doesn't need to separate the food into a special vessel – it can remain in the storehouse, "it is mixed in the storehouse." This is a leniency specifically when one has a lot.

2) Why don't we speak of zechiiah as the normal method right away?

In the reality of Chazal's times not everyone had extra bread/food to be mezakeh for everyone. The normal method is that each gives a bit. Only when it happens that one has a storehouse, can he be mezakeh. This explains why the Rambam brings the law of zechiiah with a storehouse only here.

3) The "cost" of eruv:

From all the laws we see that eruv/shituf costs something – it's not free. One can obligate people to give a bit, but one cannot demand that one person should pay for everyone alone, unless he has a storehouse.

[Digression: matzot/eruv today] Today matzot are very cheap, therefore it seems easy to be mezakeh with an extra matzah. But in Chazal's times one didn't have "extra matzot flying around" – one had to buy. This explains why the laws speak more of established methods like each gives a bit.

Law: Courtyard Open to Two Alleyways

The Rambam: A courtyard that has two openings and is open to two alleyways – participates with only one of them. They are prohibited in the second alleyway. Therefore, if one was mezakeh a shituf for all the alleyway residents and participated on their behalf – he must inform the people of this courtyard, for they only participate with their knowledge.

Plain Meaning

A courtyard that has two doors open to two different alleyways, can only participate with one of them. It remains prohibited regarding the second alleyway. Therefore, when one is mezakeh a shituf mevo'ot for all the alleyway residents, he must inform the owner of the courtyard that is connected to two alleyways, because one cannot participate without his knowledge.

Innovations and Explanations

1) The distinction between courtyards and alleyways:

By two courtyards that are connected – there is no concept of a "choice" because a courtyard naturally belongs to both. But by two alleyways there is a choice – the courtyard owner can want to belong to one alleyway and not the other. This is the foundation of why one must inform.

2) Question – why must one inform at all?

According to our law one can indeed participate with both alleyways! He can first make with one, and then add the second. If so, what is the deficiency? It's a benefit for him!

3) The answer – why it's not a benefit:

The courtyard owner who is open to two alleyways has a legitimate reason not to want this shituf. Because if he participates with both alleyways, the people from both alleyways can enter his courtyard – one brings food from his alleyway, the other from his alleyway, and both make a "big

party" in his courtyard. He doesn't want this – he doesn't want to be the meeting point where two alleyways meet.

4) Great principle in zachin leadam:

From here we learn that "zachin leadam shelo befanav" only works when it's truly a benefit. When the person has a real reason not to want it, it's no longer a benefit, and one cannot be mezakeh without his knowledge.

5) Precision in the Rambam's language regarding compulsion:

This fits with the Rambam's previous language about compulsion. The Rambam conveyed that one can only compel when the person has no real reason – he's just in a "bad mood" (shoteh mitesha middot). But when he has a legitimate claim (like here, that he doesn't want both alleyways to pass through his courtyard), one cannot compel.

Law: A Woman Makes Eruv for Her Husband

The Rambam: A woman makes eruv for her husband without his knowledge, provided that no Jew neighbor prohibits. But if there were Jews upon them, one makes eruv and one does not – it is prohibited to make eruv without his knowledge.

Plain Meaning

A wife can make eruv for her husband without his knowledge, but only when it's a simple benefit. When there is a neighbor who prohibits (who doesn't want to participate), she may not make without the husband's knowledge.

Innovations and Explanations

1) The foundation of ishah merevet:

This is not because the wife has special ownership instead of the husband. It goes back to the same principle of zachin leadam – she can be mezakeh for him, but only when it's truly a benefit for him.

2) What does "oser" mean:

It is discussed what the situation means when the husband can "prohibit." One interpretation is that this speaks of the person who belongs to two alleyways – when he has a legitimate right to prohibit neighbors, then the wife can also make for him (because it's a benefit).

3) Opinion of the Ran:

The **Ran** has a different interpretation: "keshe'oser" means that they have no other way – then there is more "shelemah da'ata" (he truly wants it), because they need him for the eruv.

4) Opinion of the Ra'avad:

When he has no (when he has no other way) one can indeed make eruv **without his knowledge**, because then they need him. But **when he has** one must ask if he wants. The Ra'avad brings a proof from **the incident of Zina** in the Gemara.

5) Innovation in the concept of "benefit":

What we call **benefit** means only that **usually people want** – but it's not an absolute benefit, it depends on what the person himself wants. The distinction between **buying** (where one makes him obligated) and **being mezakeh** (where one gives him a benefit) is brought up – buying is not zechiiah, it's a separate thing.

6) A wife may give a davar mu'at:

It is mentioned that a wife may give a davar mu'at (for example a bat dagah) – this relates to **laws of ketubbot**.

Law: Shituf Mevo'ot – Consumed That Type / Two Types
The Rambam: If they participated, one from this courtyard and one from two alleyways – if they participated with one type, even if that type was consumed, that other partner may be mezakeh to them. If they participated with two types and the food became scarce – he adds and is mezakeh to them and doesn't need to inform. But if it was consumed – he needs to inform them.

Plain Meaning

When the shituf was with **one type** and it was consumed, one can make a new shituf without informing, because we already know that all agreed to that type. By **two types**: if there is still a bit (became scarce) – he adds without informing, because he is strengthening the existing eruv. But if **consumed** (completely gone) – he needs to inform, because perhaps they won't agree to a new type.

Innovations and Explanations

1) Dispute between Rambam and Ra'avad whether one can participate with two types:

The **Maggid Mishneh** points out that the dispute already stems from **Chapter 1 Law 11**, where the Rambam says **all items combine for the measure of shituf**. The Ra'avad disagrees and says that only by **eruv chatzerot/eruv techumin** can one combine two types, but by **shituf mevo'ot** one cannot.

2) What does "two types" mean according to the Ra'avad?

The **Ran** asks: **this interpretation is confusing, for they can only participate with one type** – how can there even be two types? The answer according to the Ra'avad: **two types** means that one **switches** the type (one previously had one type, now makes with another type), not that one has both types together.

3) Why by two types and consumed one needs to inform:

Because there are already "choices" – we don't know which type people want, and perhaps he will make a third type that no one wants. By one type it's clear what everyone wants.

Law: Courtyard Open to Two Alleyways – Law of Regular Use of One Opening

The Rambam: A courtyard open to two alleyways – if they made eruv with both separately (but not all three together), they should not make eruv with them – they prohibit both, because both alleyways have traffic (regel) through the courtyard.

When the courtyard regularly uses one opening – the one it regularly uses prohibits, and the one it doesn't regularly use doesn't prohibit. We view the courtyard as belonging only to the alleyway where it is regular.

Plain Meaning

"Prohibits" means: it also prohibits the other courtyards in that alleyway from carrying, because the courtyard also belongs to the second alleyway which has no eruv.

Innovations and Explanations

1) If the alleyway residents where it's not regular made eruv:

Even if the courtyard made eruv only with the alleyway **where it's not regular – the other alleyway is permitted by itself and doesn't need to make eruv with it.** Because the courtyard had **revealing of intention** that it wants to be part of the other alleyway, it doesn't prohibit the alleyway where it is regular.

2) We push it to the alleyway where it's not regular:

When the courtyard made **no** eruv at all, and the alleyway where it's regular made eruv **by themselves** (without the courtyard), and now the residents of the alleyway where it's not regular want to make eruv – **we push it to the alleyway where it's not regular.** We assume it belongs to the other alleyway, **in order that** the alleyway where it's regular (which already has a good eruv) should be able to carry without disturbance.

The reasoning: although the courtyard truly belongs less to the alleyway where it's not regular, but **since** both (the courtyard and the alleyway where it's not regular) are "not mixed" – we push it there, in order not to ruin the alleyway that is already in order. It's a **leniency** based on practical reasoning.

Law: Courtyard with Opening to Alleyway and Opening to Karmelit/Reshut Hayachid

The Rambam: A courtyard that has an opening to an alleyway, and the other opening goes out to a karmelit (karpef) – since it is prohibited to carry from the courtyard to that karpef, it relies only on the alleyway opening, and therefore prohibits the alleyway residents until it participates with them. But if the karpef is beit sa'atayim mukaf (reshut hayachid) – it doesn't prohibit the alleyway residents, for it relies on the opening of the reshut hayachid.

Plain Meaning

When a courtyard has two doors – one to the alleyway and one to a karmelit – we view it as having only one door (to the alleyway), because it may not carry to the karmelit. Therefore it belongs to the alleyway and must participate. But when the second opening goes to a reshut hayachid, it has a better option – it has a way to its private place where it doesn't need any eruv at all. We view it as belonging to the other side, and the alleyway can make an eruv without it.

Innovation

The principle is that we look where the person can practically go – when the second opening is a karmelit, it is "forced" to the alleyway and must participate. When the second opening is a reshut hayachid, it has a better option and we don't count it as part of the alleyway.

Law: One of the Alleyway Residents Who Went to Another City

The Rambam: One of the alleyway residents who went to another city – doesn't prohibit them.

Plain Meaning

When one of the alleyway residents left for Shabbat, he doesn't prohibit, and one doesn't need to participate with him.

Innovation

The Rambam doesn't bring all the details from before (by courtyard) about nearby place and measurements. Also it's noted that "alleyway residents" means even one person – which is interesting, and perhaps it's easier by alleyway than by courtyard.

Law: One of the Alleyway Residents Who Built a Partition

The Rambam: Who built a partition four tefachim wide at his opening – doesn't prohibit them, for he has separated himself from them and divided his domain.

Plain Meaning

When one builds a partition (4 tefachim wide) at his opening, he has separated himself from the alleyway. His domain is a separate domain, and he doesn't prohibit the others.

Innovation

By courtyard the law of partition appeared regarding water (aliyah), but here it appears specifically regarding alleyway. The alleyway counts him as not existing.

Law: Nullification of Domain in Alleyway

The Rambam: Alleyway residents who participated, some of them, and some forgot and didn't participate – they nullify their domain to those who participated. The law of nullification of domain is like the law of courtyard residents.

Plain Meaning

When part of the alleyway residents participated and part forgot, those who forgot can nullify their domain. All laws of nullification of domain by courtyard also apply here.

Law: Every Person with His Household Members Like One Person

The Rambam: And they already said that every person with his household members who rely on his table are considered like one person.

Plain Meaning

Each household is viewed as one unit – not each individual separately needs to be part of the eruv/shituf.

Innovation

The law applies both for eruv chatzerot and for shitufei mevo'ot. Even when more than one family lives in one house, if they rely on one table, we count them as one.

Law: One Courtyard Forgot and Didn't Make Eruv – But There is Shituf Mevo'ot

The Rambam: An alleyway where all its courtyards made eruv, each courtyard by itself, and afterwards they all participated in the alleyway, one courtyard forgot and didn't make eruv with its courtyard members – nothing is lost, for they all participated, and they rely on the shituf. For they only need eruv chatzerot with the shituf so that the children won't forget.

Plain Meaning

When all courtyards participated in the alleyway, and one forgot to make eruv chatzerot – it doesn't matter. The main

permission comes from shituf mevo'ot. Eruv chatzerot is only an extra decree so children should see that one makes eruv.

Innovations and Explanations

1) The purpose of eruv chatzerot when one already has shituf:

The entire purpose of eruv chatzerot when one already has shituf mevo'ot is **so the children won't forget** – the children should see that one places bread, so they won't err that one may carry everywhere. But the main permission is the shituf.

2) Conversely – forgot shituf mevo'ot:

If one forgot **shituf mevo'ot** (but did make eruv chatzerot) – it is **prohibited in the alleyway**. But the members of each courtyard are permitted to carry in their courtyard, because the alleyway to the courtyards is only like a courtyard to houses.

Law: They Participated in the Alleyway and All Forgot to Make Eruv in Courtyards

The Rambam: They participated in the alleyway and all forgot to make eruv in courtyards – if they are not particular about loaves (they let others eat from their bread), they rely on the shituf on the first Shabbat. And when did they say this? Only in pressing circumstances.

Plain Meaning

When **all** forgot eruv chatzerot, one can rely on the fact that people are not particular about their bread (like a type of partnership in bread), but only the first Shabbat, and only in pressing circumstances.

Innovations and Explanations

1) The mechanism:

Because people let others eat from their bread, there is as if a partnership in bread – which can serve as a type of eruv chatzerot.

2) Two limitations:

(a) Only **first Shabbat** – because if one forgets twice in a row, something is wrong, one must start remembering; (b) Only **in pressing circumstances** – it's not initially.

3) Connection to "not particular about loaves":

Eruv chatzerot is with **bread specifically**, while shituf mevo'ot can be with other foods. Therefore the "not particular about loaves" is relevant specifically for eruv chatzerot which needs bread.

4) Why so strict?

One doesn't really need eruv chatzerot when one has shituf mevo'ot, the whole thing is only rabbinic? The answer: just as the rabbis decreed, they made it serious, and only once do they allow making this after the fact.

Law: Alleyway Where They Didn't Participate

The Rambam: An alleyway where they didn't participate, even if all courtyards did make eruv in – they only carry in it four amot like a karmelit.

Plain Meaning

Without shituf mevo'ot, even with eruv chatzerot, in the alleyway one may only carry four amot – like a karmelit.

Law: Alleyway Where They Didn't Participate – Distinction Between Houses and Courtyards Open to It
The Rambam: An alleyway where they didn't make shituf mevo'ot, but all courtyards did make eruv chatzerot – the alleyway becomes as if only houses are open to it without courtyards, therefore they don't carry in it at all. But if the courtyard residents didn't make eruv – they carry in it vessels that rested in it, like a courtyard where they didn't make eruv.

Plain Meaning

When all courtyards have an eruv, they become like houses (because each courtyard becomes one domain), and then to the alleyway only "houses" are open – which makes the alleyway like an alleyway that doesn't have houses and courtyards open to it, and one may not carry anything. But when the courtyards didn't make eruv, they remain courtyards, and the alleyway has a law like a courtyard where they didn't make eruv – one may carry vessels that rested in it.

Innovations and Explanations

1) The foundation of the Rambam's distinction:

The Rambam starts from the principle that an alleyway must have **houses and courtyards open to it** in order to be permitted with lechi and korah. When all courtyards have an eruv, they become like houses, and then the alleyway lacks the condition of "courtyards open to it" – it is not permitted with lechi and korah, and it gets a law of karmelit, where one may not carry anything (not even vessels that rested in it).

2) Two levels of rabbinic prohibition:

(a) **Karmelit** – a stricter rabbinic prohibition, where one may not carry even vessels that rested in it (only through wearing); (b) **Alleyway without shituf** – a lighter rabbinic prohibition, where only the eruv/shituf is lacking, and there one may use vessels that rested in it. When the alleyway is considered a karmelit (because it's not permitted with lechi and korah), the prohibition is stricter.

3) Question on the Rambam:

Why should an alleyway open to houses be worse than a courtyard open to houses? A courtyard with houses is a normal courtyard! The answer: An **alleyway** has a special law – it needs houses **and courtyards**, and without courtyards it's not considered an alleyway at all, but like another area (karmelit).

4) The Ra'avad's disagreement:

The Ra'avad doesn't agree with the Rambam's distinction, but the Rambam says it's a "simple principle."

Law: Non-Jew or Sadducee in an Alleyway

The Rambam: A non-Jew or Sadducee who prohibits in a courtyard – his law among alleyway residents is like his law among courtyard residents. One must rent (sechirat) from the non-Jew, and by a Sadducee one needs nullification of domain. An alleyway of a non-Jew and one Jew – they don't need to participate.

Innovations and Explanations

1) "One Jew" doesn't mean literally one Jew:

Just as we learned by courtyard, "one" means one family/household – when rabbis are seated at one table, it's

the law of one. One Jewish family with one non-Jew – the non-Jew's dwelling is like an animal, and one doesn't need any eruv.

2) Eruv doesn't help for a non-Jew:

Even if all Jews together have an eruv, they don't become "one" regarding the non-Jew, because the non-Jew doesn't want them to become one domain with him. Only an actual family (not through eruv) is considered an individual.

Law: Non-Jew Who Has an Opening to a Valley

The Rambam: A non-Jew who lives in an alleyway, if he has in his courtyard another opening to a valley – he doesn't prohibit the alleyway residents, even if it's a small opening of four by four, and even if he takes out camels and wagons through the alleyway opening – he doesn't prohibit them, for his intention is only on his opening designated for him that goes out to the valley.

Important Innovation – Distinction Between Non-Jew and Jew

By a **Jew** we look if the opening to the valley is permitted for carrying on Shabbat – this determines which domain he belongs to. But by a **non-Jew** there are no Shabbat restrictions – he may carry wherever he wants. Therefore we look by a non-Jew at a psychological reasoning: which door is "**designated for him**" – his own private door. Even if the door to the alleyway is much more convenient and larger (he leads through camels and wagons!), but the small door to the valley is only his – we say that **there** is his main place, because he feels that this is his own thing.

However: if the opening leads to a **karmelit/simta** (not a valley), then **he doesn't rely on it** – the non-Jew doesn't rely on such a door that leads to a crowded place, and he uses the alleyway opening, **and prohibits them until they rent from him.**

Law: Alleyway Where One Side is Non-Jews and One Side is Jews – Eruv Through Windows

The Rambam: When one side of the alleyway is inhabited by non-Jews and one side by Jews, and there were windows open from courtyard to courtyard of Jews, and they all made eruv through windows – even though they became like one household and are permitted to take out to each other through windows – they are prohibited to use the alleyway through their openings until they rent from the non-Jews, for many are not prohibited like an individual in a place with a non-Jew.

Plain Meaning

One would have thought that when all Jewish courtyards made eruv through windows and became like one domain, they should be considered like "an individual" against the non-Jew (and then one wouldn't need rental). But no – an eruv doesn't make them truly one family.

Innovation

Only an **actual family** (not connected through eruv) is considered an individual. Therefore one still needs to rent from the non-Jew. The eruv through windows only helps for

carrying between themselves through the windows, but not for the alleyway itself.

Law: Shituf Medinah – How to Participate in a City

The Rambam: A city that is surrounded by doors (reshut hayachid from Torah law) needs a shituf. Each courtyard makes eruv by itself – even in the entire city, each courtyard must make an eruv, so that the law of eruv chatzerot won't be forgotten. And additionally – all city residents participate as they participate in an alleyway.

Plain Meaning

A medinah (city with doors) also needs a shituf, similar to an alleyway. Each courtyard also makes eruv chatzerot so one won't forget.

Law: City Owned by an

Law: City Owned by an Individual vs. Owned by Many; Law of Two Openings

The Rambam: If the city was owned by an individual, even if it became owned by many – they all participate with one shituf. And likewise if it was owned by many but has one opening – they all participate with one shituf. But if it was owned by many and has two openings through which they enter through one and exit through the other, even if it became owned by an individual – they don't make eruv for the entire city, rather they leave from it one place, even one house and one courtyard, and the rest participate.

Plain Meaning

A city that belongs to one individual, even if it later became a place of many – one may make one shituf medinah. Also a city of many with only one opening – one shituf is enough. But a city of many with two openings where one enters through one and exits through the other – one must leave a "shiur" (at least one house and courtyard) that is not part of the eruv.

Innovations and Explanations

1) The reason for shiur – for recognition (hekeira):

The shiur is necessary so that people should know that there is an eruv. In a city with two openings, where many pass through it, it looks like a reshut harabim. People don't see the shituf mevo'ot directly. Through the fact that one house remains outside the eruv – and one may not carry there – it becomes a recognition that there is an eruv, and one shouldn't come to think that one may also carry in reshut harabim.

2) The concern:

Without the shiur a person would see that one carries in the city and would think that one may also carry in a reshut harabim, because the city with two openings looks like reshut harabim (many pass through it).

3) Why by one opening one doesn't need shiur:

When there is only one opening, it doesn't look like reshut harabim, because one cannot enter from one side and exit from another. Therefore there is no concern.

4) The shiur's law:

The people who remain in the shiur can make their own shituf among themselves (if the remaining ones were many), but they cannot be part of the large city-eruv.

[Digression: whether we practice shiur today] Later authorities say that in practice there is no city where one can make an eruv in this manner, and people don't know at all about eruv chatzerot.

Law: Law of a Ladder in the Wall

The Rambam: A city of many that has one opening and a ladder in one place – they make eruv for the entire city and don't need shiur.

Plain Meaning

A ladder at the wall is not considered like an opening, therefore it remains like a city with one opening, and one doesn't need any shiur.

Innovation

The distinction is noted between a ladder in the wall (which is not considered an opening) and a tel hamitlakek eser (which is considered an opening), but the distinction is not elaborated.

Law: Which Houses Can Be Used for Shiur

The Rambam: Houses that are left – even if there is one adjacent to the city but its back is to the city and its front is outward – can be used for shiur.

Plain Meaning

Even a house whose door is not to the city's side, but outward, can be used as shiur.

Innovation

This proves that the essence of shiur is not that there should be a practical separation, but only a recognition – that people should know that there is an eruv. Even a house that one couldn't use the eruv (because its opening is not open to the city), is sufficient for shiur.

Law: Being Mezakeh Shituf for City Residents

The Rambam: One who is mezakeh a shituf for the city residents – there is no need to inform them.

Plain Meaning

When one is mezakeh a shituf for all city residents, one doesn't need to inform them, because it's a benefit for them.

Innovation

This fits with the principle "zachin leadam shelo befanav" – because the shituf is a benefit (one may carry), one doesn't need their consent.

Law: One Who Forgot and Didn't Participate / Went to Another City

The Rambam: The law of one who forgot and didn't participate from the city residents, or one who went to dwell in another city – they have one law.

Plain Meaning

All laws that we learned previously (nullification of domain, compulsion, etc.) also apply by shitufei mevo'ot in a city.

Law: One Doesn't Make Eruv for Half a City

The Rambam: A city that has several alleyways, except for one alleyway – it prohibits all of them. Therefore one doesn't make eruv for half a city, but either all of them or alleyway by alleyway. Each alleyway should build a matzevah at its opening if they don't want to make eruv so they won't prohibit the other alleyways.

Plain Meaning

One cannot make an eruv for half a city. Either all alleyways make together, or each alleyway makes for itself. If one alleyway doesn't want to participate, it prohibits the entire city. The solution is that the alleyway that doesn't want should build a matzevah (a stone/barrier) at its opening, so it will separate itself and not prohibit the others.

Innovations and Explanations

1) Practical law for a city rabbi:

When the city rabbi wants to make an eruv, there are only two options: either nothing (each alleyway by itself), or everything together. Half a city doesn't work.

2) The matzevah as a solution:

The alleyway that doesn't want to participate has a solution – it builds a matzevah (a stone or barrier) at its opening, which separates it from the rest of the city. Through this it doesn't become part of the city and doesn't prohibit.

3) What does "matzevah" mean:

Matzevah simply means a stone that one sets up (language of netzavah), like by our forefather Yaakov: "the stone which I set as a matzevah." The original meaning of "matzevah" is simply a stone that one sets up – a "recognition," a sign. Not a matzevah in the sense of a gravestone. It's a physical barrier/marker that shows that the alleyway is separated.

Conclusion of Laws of Eruv Chatzerot

With this we complete **Chapter 5** and thereby **Laws of Eruv Chatzerot** in general (including shitufei mevo'ot and shituf medinah). The last three chapters (Chapters 6-8) are already **Laws of Eruv Techumin**.

| Full Transcript

Rambam Hilchos Eruvin Chapter 5 – Shitufei Mevo'os: Partners in Food for Business Purposes

Introduction: From Eruv Chatzeros to Shitufei Mevo'os

A gut yohr, we are learning the holy Rambam Hilchos Eruvin Chapter 5.

We are learning here the topic of... we have already finished the topic of eruv chatzeros, and we learned three types of things: from the smaller, when people live together in a

courtyard and one may not carry from the house to the courtyard, and then the larger one of courtyards where one may not carry to the mavoi either except with a shituf, and then an entire city where in order to be permitted to carry in the city, which is four amos in reshus harabim, there must also be a pas so that the bnei ha'ir should be together.

We have already learned about eruv chatzeros, now we are going to learn about the next two, how the mevo'os are joined together. Technically, there is somewhat of a distinction, we

need to see, but technically there are only two names. It's called eruv chatzeros, meaning one makes it in a courtyard, and shitufei mevo'os means one makes it in a mavoi. What one makes in a city doesn't have some extra name. There are indeed certain extra halachos. And we need to understand better, because seemingly all three things, or all two things, are exactly the same thing, just on a different level. The same thing.

Distinction Between Eruv Chatzeros and Shituf Mevo'os

Nevertheless, there are certain distinctions. That is, one clear distinction we already learned in Chapter 1, that an eruv chatzeros requires pas, but yes, conversely, shituf mevo'os is sufficient with any type of food. This is a kula. It's interesting, that is, shituf mevo'os, it includes more people, but it's easier, it becomes more lenient. It could be that it was very difficult, because one needs to have so much pas, one needs to have for each person a kezayis up to how many residents, up to a certain amount of residents. Up to eighteen. Eighteen makes it easier. Three two meals. Yes, I understand, I'm just saying that it's interesting, that you would have thought it should be harder, it's easier to make a shituf mevo'os.

And here we are going to learn many more halachos, that is, first certain halachos how we can have an eruv even without an eruv, which is similar to what we learned before, if one lives together, we will see about this. It's here because a courtyard specifically requires pas, so these things are less applicable. Or it doesn't speak of pas, it's certain, it doesn't work for eruv chatzeros, only for shitufei mevo'os. But the thing is that there are many other halachos which are, all the halachos that were learned before, almost every halacha that exists in eruv chatzeros one needs to see how it is in shitufei mevo'os. It's almost, one takes as a general rule that all halachos are exactly the same, how one can combine two mevo'os, or one courtyard with, all kinds of such things are stated, seemingly similar but not exactly the same, so one must learn internally the halachos of shitufei mevo'os.

And one learns here also that one must have both, that even when there is a mavoi the courtyard must also make separately, even if the mavoi makes the courtyard must make separately. One has already learned once about this, right? One has already learned that one must when making an eruv initially, one must bring pas to each courtyard lechatchila, we will see here in this chapter from now, lechatchila one must have pas, one must have eruv chatzeros always. But okay, let's begin to learn, we'll see.

Halacha 1: People of a Mavoi Who Made an Eruv with Them as Partners in One Food Item for Business Purposes

The Language of the Rambam

The Rambam says, **People of a mavoi who made an eruv with them as partners in one food item for business purposes. Such as if they purchased wine in partnership and oil and honey and the like – they don't need another shituf, and they can rely on the partnership of business.**

Simple Meaning: Partnership in Food Exempts from Additional Shituf

We learned earlier a halacha in eruv chatzeros that the formal act of being meshtatef on food or on pas is only important when one is not actually one family, but a person who lives with his children doesn't need to. But we saw a chiddush of a

halacha, that it's not only a person with his family, but also truly close friends who are somech al shulchan echad, they actually eat together, they are close friends, people who eat al shulchan echad don't need any eruv chatzeros because they are actually one.

He says, regarding a mavoi comes out a very similar halacha. A mavoi needs to be meshtatef with eating together, but if they are already meshutafim with food by nature, they share food, and the next halacha will explain which way why should bnei mavoi be meshutafim in food, but if they are meshutafim in food, this is enough for the partnership, one doesn't need to make an extra formal pas? I'm not sure if this means one doesn't need to.

Chiddush: The Halacha by Mavoi is Different from by Courtyard

This is what the Gemara says is a bit very interesting and very different, because in a courtyard, that is the way that it's called a bayis echad, doesn't need any eruv. That is, one makes an eruv so that one should be able to, if one goes to the next, they can send out one. Here the halacha looks like... yes, but it becomes... they are somchin alav le'inyan eruv. I don't know if it's similar. It sounds like it could be that it is yes similar, but it sounds like it's a different geder. It's different. This is the eruv. That is, it's yes, one needs an eruv. One doesn't say that they are one house, where one house doesn't need any eruv. But it's already enough, one can be yotzei the eruv with this. And it could be one can actually be yotzei because a mavoi is easier, one doesn't need such a strong eruv like a pas, like a courtyard. So this is enough eruv for a mavoi. Perhaps for a courtyard it wouldn't have been enough because it's not pas.

Aha, interesting. I looked at it more like it's the mavoi version of somech al shulchan echad. But there are distinctions, and there is a distinction lehalacha, one needs to think. Okay, very good.

Explanation: Partnership for Business Purposes

People of a mavoi who made an eruv with them as partners in one food item for business purposes. They had a business, they had a partnership, a clever partnership, that instead of each time one person lacks salt or sugar he should have to run to the grocery, they agreed that they share. Certain things one shares, not because they are like one family that eats dinner together, but as he says "for business purposes", it was more practical for them to purchase together the certain thing. Such as if they purchased wine in partnership and oil and honey and the like.** They purchased together wine or oil or honey, they didn't have to purchase extra, and each one took turns going to take from there. One didn't say each one pays in a set amount, rather each one can take from there.

So the story you're telling now is more than business. In simple terms business means that they have a store for some reason back then, where they sell. It's not a store, they sell further the wine honey and oil. But as we see further, usually partners who share food together, it doesn't bother them if one takes a bit from the other, but it's not lechatchila made for that. As we saw, if he doesn't allow, he brings from below that if it's such a case that you said that one purchases together, then certainly, then it's truly an inyan of somchin al shulchan echad. But business means even, certainly there is even, they purchased the merchandise, but there is between them such a

kind of deal that one can calculate, one can, if one wants to take for himself, he can calculate, but they figured, one doesn't even need to calculate, because this means partnership, not one is makpid al zeh. So he's going to say. You know, one trusts them that he won't take in the whole world, it's a partnership, it's placed before you until you take it.

Well good, **they don't need another shituf, and to rely one can rely on the partnership of business**, on the partnership of business that they are already partners.

Right, it's very interesting, he puts in the same language of partnership, that is, a partner for this, with mev'o's it's not exactly an eruv, they don't become one, but they become partners. They are already partners, they are partners in the same sack of flour, whatever it is they sell there, wine and oil and honey. Yes.

Condition: One Type and in One Vessel

He says however, this is only when the rules, **and this is when the type that they are partners in is one type**, they are partners in one type, that is, not that one purchases one thing and one purchases the other thing, and each one can take from the other person's thing. Yes yes. Or it's the same, **and in one vessel**, it lies in one place. Not that even if one can take from the other, but it lies in different vessels, then they are divided, even if they have some certain type of partnership. It must be truly a partnership that is recognizable, the same type and the same vessel, and all belong in this.

But if these were partners in this in wine and these in another in oil, ah, that is, in the mavoi live eight people, let's say. If all eight are partners and all eight can eat the same wine for example, it's good. But if four are partners together among themselves in wine, and four are partners together among themselves in oil, again, that is, I, let's say there are three people here, which makes life easier, three courtyards, just because I want to translate. We have different businesses, we purchase together wine and oil, but I don't have business with everyone, not all courtyards, all people have partnership with everyone. I have a partnership with Yankel we purchase together wine, with Berel we purchase together oil. In total, I am a partner with both, but not all are partners with all in the same thing.

So in total wine, we are yes all partners in wine, but because **in two vessels**, they yes need to make a partnership le'inyan Shabbos. They need to make an extra... a remarkable thing in honor of Shabbos.

Halacha 2: If He Requested from His Fellow and He Didn't Give Him – The Partnership is Nullified

The Language of the Rambam

Now we are going to see a way how one can build the partnership. One thought that they are partners, but it turns out they are partners but something is missing. What does it mean they are partners? Means that money they paid together, when one makes a profit from this they will need to calculate, but something is missing. I'll take a case, **if he requested from his fellow wine and oil before Shabbos**, he is a partner in the wine or the oil, but when it came to action, on paper and pen they are good partners, but when it came to action he wanted to take, **and he didn't give him, the partnership is nullified**, even they remain still partners in the business, but le'inyan Shabbos the partnership is nullified.

For he revealed his intention that they are not like partners who are not makpid on each other, because with the fact that one didn't let him take he was megaleh daas that they are not full partners who are not makpid on each other.

Chiddush: Two Types of Partnership

I mean that they are full partners halachically, that is in the business there is a partnership. But there is a level of partnership that is called partners who are makpid on each other, and there is another level, or another type - not necessarily a level - another type of partnership that is called partners who are not makpid on each other.

Makpid means simply that he trusts him, he may take a bit for his own use and so on, as it is indeed each one takes, it's equal, there's a distinction. But if they tell him, "You want to take? Write down exactly how much you took, and we'll calculate exactly", this is called partners who are makpid on each other. That is, they may take, but they need to calculate exactly how many bottles of wine he took from the store, or whatever. This is called partners who are not makpid on each other.

Practical Difference Regarding Shabbos

Regarding Shabbos this doesn't mean a partnership that should mean that they all have one food. I'm not sure, yes, so it is, that makpidim on each other means you can take but you must write down, or it could be makpidim on each other means you can't take, you just go in to buy and you don't use anything from it. So I remember, I once... This could be, it could be that it's not necessarily so the halacha, I'm just saying that "not makpidim" certainly means that certainly they may not take the whole thing, but it means that they trust that one takes each one according to his portion, according to the portion of the partnership, and one doesn't calculate. "Makpidim" means that one doesn't calculate every... a normal person has a partnership with his brother about I don't know what, he sells pepper, he doesn't count with him how many pieces of pepper the other used for his need, it's still part of the business. This is called makpid on each other. So I remember from other places that this is called makpidim on each other.

But the point is, it seems that le'inyan Shabbos it must be not makpidim, because it must be one pas. It's not a money partnership, a money partnership doesn't help le'inyan Shabbos, one must have...

Two Possible Explanations

If so, it can mean both things. It can mean makpidim on each other as you say, or it can mean that they are indeed partners, but they don't take from there any food, they are not partners that also in their daily life they take from there. They have together a store, people have together a store, they don't eat one from the other. This doesn't mean a partnership le'inyan Shabbos. But I tell you, there is a store where one allows a bit... but not too much, a bit each one may take, he wants to be. If he doesn't allow, then it's over. Yes.

Halacha 2 – Bnei Mavoi Where One Doesn't Want to Participate

We go further. About bnei mavoi... halacha, halacha, it has nothing to do with the previous one. One goes. It's interesting what this comes in here just another halacha. Such a halacha about, what happens when there is a group of people in a mavoi, and one of them, usually he is a part of this, of the eruv, of the shituf mev'o's, he also throws in a bit of his food. But

this week he is somewhat in a bad mood, "I'm however not accustomed to contribute to my mavoi, and he didn't participate", he doesn't want to participate.

So since he has already been megaleh daas that he is a part of this, and usually he is a part of this, the halacha is that **the bnei mavoi enter into his house, and take from him a shituf against his will**, they can enter into his house, and take from him a shituf against his will, they can take from him a piece of food to become a shituf against his will.

Simple Meaning: We Force Him Based on Midas Sedom

What is the simple meaning? One takes from him his food, he doesn't want. One takes his food. Because it's a kind of forcing him, because one knows that usually he wants. So it seems. He says that there is such an inyan of forcing based on midas Sedom. It doesn't concern him the little bit of food that one takes from him, and he will have benefit that he will be permitted to carry with them. But he, this week, anyway doesn't hold by going out of his house, he is so bad. It's midas Sedom, which is "this one benefits and this one benefits", or "this one benefits and this one doesn't lose", you won't lose. This Shabbos he doesn't want to carry, so this Shabbos he doesn't give the little bit to the shared plate. So it's such a midas Sedom, and on midas Sedom one can obligate.

Two Levels of Coercion

Yes, Rav divided it somewhat, I didn't understand what he says exactly. There isn't such a halacha for example in a courtyard. Why is there this law specifically by mavoi? I don't know. Let's see further. Perhaps it's also there, by the way, I don't know. Perhaps further for a courtyard it must be pas, it doesn't go like this.

And there is also one who doesn't want, one wants to participate at all in the mavoi, one of the mavoi who never wants to be meshtatef, one can't enter into his house and take from him, but **we force him to participate with them**, yes, one can put pressure on him, one can force him to participate with them.

Translation

It seems, so says the Maggid Mishneh perhaps, it seems that there are two levels. There's one who is accustomed, we don't need to compel him, we go into his house and we take out a loaf, whatever, less than a loaf, because he's a partner. One who says "I don't want at all," not that he's accustomed, he doesn't want at all, we compel him. What does it mean we compel him? Perhaps beit din compels him? What does it mean a different level of compelling? The simple meaning is that we can't yet go into his house, we must first compel him. This one says kofin oto bebeit din ad sheyomar rotzeh ani, because we need him to agree.

Question: Why not be mezakeh?

It's interesting, because there is an easier way of being mezakeh for both. He's talking the whole time not about being mezakeh. Why doesn't one say mezakeh? But why indeed? He says perhaps the Ra'avad. The Ra'avad says... what does the Ra'avad say? There needs to be nachat ruach demevatel. He says, kofin oto, through the fact that one is mezakeh, as if we don't reckon with him, he doesn't want the mavoi to be his, an eruv, because it's against the eruv. Kofin oto, we are indeed mezakeh to him, and it doesn't look like it's a benefit for him. No, but it doesn't look that way. The language "kofin oto" looks like... You can say that being mezakeh one certainly can, but

we need to take from him, so just like that he's not mityaesh from the question.

Yes, not clear. Don't know. It's not relevant for all the people who fight with the eruv, but anyway... Yes.

Halacha 3 – Being Mezakeh from a Storehouse

Further, here it says yes, the zekhiya. Now we're going to learn that one can be mezakeh. Section 3, yes? **"One of the residents of the mavoi who has a storehouse of wine and oil and grain, he may be mezakeh from it a little to all the residents of the mavoi to partner with him, and he makes an eruv for them with it."** If one has a lot of a certain thing, he can be mezakeh a little for each of the residents of the mavoi, they should become partners with him, and with this he makes an eruv.

Innovation: Even though they didn't separate and designate

He says the innovation here, **"even though they didn't separate and designate."** This is certain that one can, we've already said the law of being mezakeh, that indeed one takes on a plate and is mezakeh for the people. Here is the innovation, that even if he didn't actually put it in a special [vessel], actually separate it, it remains further in his storehouse, but he gave permission that each one can... the storehouse belongs to everyone, not the whole storehouse, a portion of the storehouse, "a little to all the residents of the mavoi." Enough, but this is without a measure. Even if the measure was what is me'arev bo otzar, harei zeh me'arev bo otzar, it means a partner.

Interesting. So further, soon we'll see that one can be mezakeh, more halachot about being mezakeh.

Question: What is the power of zekhiya?

But you ask a good question, what is the power of the fact that one can be mezakeh? Perhaps he doesn't want to be zocheh. But then there is... Yes, but the thing itself, one can even drag money from him. Let's say, there isn't here one who has extra food and he wants to give away for everyone. Can one go drag from him, because it's... Meaning, it's still called, "there are matters, there are matters." Because the little bit that he needs to give, is not a davar merubeh, it doesn't mean, it's not a measure that should mean theft or pasal da'atei. And he's going to have benefit from it that he'll be able to carry in the mavoi.

Innovation: Why speak specifically of a storehouse?

On the other hand, you see here clearly that the law of zekhiya is because of convenience, when it happens that one has a lot. It's not one lives in... We learned that then one says that we don't need to be mafrish in a vessel, it's enough that it remains in "harei hu me'arvo ba'otzar." Why we put it actually in a vessel and are mezakeh, it's obvious that we can, or as it was already said earlier. No difference. But I say why does the deed stand here? Because he wants to say here the innovation that even when it's me'orav ba'otzar it means as if he had separated everything as shituf.

There's another thing, even beshelo hifrish, this is another halacha. Usually there's a question, you're right, there's a question in the Gemara whether one may be mezakeh with a storehouse. But I would have thought something else. As we saw earlier the halacha of zekhiya, it simply stood that one can be mezakeh. In eruv chatzerot you mean to say. True. And we don't yet know that all halachot are the same. It never says

that all halachot are the same. Perhaps each thing one needs to see extra.

Innovation: Eruv costs something

It could be that, I just thought, that perhaps we are accustomed that here you have leftover food, it costs you nothing to put a partner. But it seems from all these halachot that something costs it. Certainly, you're right, it's little, one can perhaps buy, I don't know. But it's not simple that everywhere you can be mezakeh. Here he says one can be mezakeh, there's one wealthy person who can afford for everyone. The storehouse is indeed a thing that he can afford, because it's going to be used, every Shabbat one needs to reckon, it's still there. But what we do, usually one takes a... okay, it's very cheap, but perhaps today mitzvot are cheap, whatever. It seems from all these halachot that one assumes that it costs something. One can't ask, there's a certain claim, one needs to ask. Certainly, one can obligate people to give a little. If everyone gives a little it's affordable. But to say that simply one should give for everyone, from where does he have extra challah for everyone? Do you understand what I'm saying?

Innovation: Why doesn't one speak immediately of zekhiya?

More than this he catches the case of "oleh oleh ad she'ya'aleh lesham." And I also say, I also try to answer why one doesn't go straight to zekhiya. If one can be mezakeh, it's a matter, make a zekhiya, don't make yourself crazy, do so many halachot of whom, with claims, how is it with claims. It seems that it's not accepted, because zekhiya also needs bread, and who has extra bread for the eruv? Do you understand what I'm saying? A normal way, one asks a little from each one, it works out. I say, in halacha one can indeed, and this is why the halacha doesn't speak of this, rather we speak of fixing, because we see it as much easier to give and take an extra matzah and be mezakeh to that one. But we don't speak in such a reality. We speak in a reality when if we want each one to give a little like this, one indeed needs to buy. Eh, I thought that as if there are no mitzvot in the world and extra mitzvot don't fly around. This will be a good word I think.

Halacha 4: A Courtyard Open to Two Mavo'ot

Speaker 1:

One says in halacha one can indeed, and this is why the halacha doesn't speak of this, rather we speak of fixing, because we see it as much easier to give and take extra matzah and be mezakeh to that one, but we don't speak here in such a reality, we speak in a reality when if we want each one to give a little like this, one indeed needs to buy. I thought, here, that as if there are no mitzvot in the world today, extra mitzvot don't fly around. It will be good for you, I wait.

Okay, until here is essentially the halacha of... umm... okay, I don't know, how can one follow afterwards, now one can learn that many details in the zekhiya vet. Ari, as now earlier we learned this, what happens when two courtyards are connected, and the person wants perhaps to be only part with one, and I don't come with the other. But that will be a person never what disturbs.

Now we'll see that there's a way of zekhiya, that this is not normal. I'll be right that one just learned two courtyards that can become together. But now we speak of two mavo'ot, and the question it is on lekher movi. I say that it's set out like earlier, the halacha of chatzi, and now one says the same

similar halacha in mavo'i. Now one says that it happens from such a kind of situation in mavo'i, that a person wants to be a part of one or the other.

Speaker 2:

No, but they haven't learned the halacha yet, not until now have we only learned halachot of how one can settle. We had earlier a 3 we had when he asks the two shitot of using one with the other...

Speaker 1:

Yes yes, all kinds of matters of how it becomes together, how one can make together. But here now becomes a thing that becomes a question about the zocheh. Because the question is which mavo'i your courtyard wants to be part of. You want at all to partner with this one, or at all with that one. One can perhaps with both together, but it happens that one doesn't make with both together. One makes only with one, and since we've seen how one makes everything together.

Speaker 2:

So I don't remember that a house in a courtyard is not hager. Because a house in a courtyard, outside, have the defanen what we learned. So um rat to, yes. But then it's not relevant to choose.

Speaker 1:

Only by a courtyard between two mavo'ot is it relevant that one should be able to give him a choice. Either this or that, I need to know which you want.

Language of the Rambam: A courtyard that has two openings to two mavo'ot

Speaker 1:

Okay, **chatzer sheyesh lah shnei petachim uftachim ulshtei mevo'ot**, a courtyard that has two doors and they are open to two other mavo'ot, **if he says mishtateif im echad mehen bilvad**. If the person was only mishtateif with one of the two mavo'ot — not the person, the courtyard, right? The courtyard was only mishtateif with one of the two mavo'ot, **ne'esru bemavo'i hasheni**. The courtyard may only carry to the one mavo'i to whom they made shituf, and they become forbidden on the mavo'i hasheni, **ve'echad mehen motzi umachnis bah**.

The words "ne'esru" is not now became forbidden with the making, it remains forbidden, right? Your being mishtateif with one doesn't help regarding the other. He doesn't say that with what you were megaleh da'at that you are mevatel your reshut from your courtyard to the mavo'ot. No, it's the same. But with each mavo'i you need extra to make a deal.

Speaker 2:

Yes, or one can make one big, but yes, he means apparently this to say.

Zekhiya in shituf for residents of mavo'i — needs to inform

Speaker 1:

But **lefikach**, yes, **lefikach**, it comes out thus, **zikhah echad beshituf lechol bnei mavo'i veshutaf aleihem**, one was mezakeh, he says here, what happens when the shituf mavo'ot happened in the manner of zekhiya? One was mezakeh from his food for all residents of mavo'i ushutaf aleihem, right? **Tzarich lehodi'a le'anshei chatzer zo**, the courtyard that is in the mavo'i, but they are also connected to another mavo'i, he needs to be modi'a that he's making for them a shituf

mavo'ot, **she'ein mishtaftfin ela mida'atan.** Why? **She'ein zeh chesaron lahem.**

For all other people, since he is mezakeh for all other people we've already learned that we don't need to inform them, so it says as if adam shelo befanav. It's enough that he is mezakeh for them. But the person who lives between the two mavo'ot...

Speaker 2:

No, it seems here that the person who lives between the two mavo'ot can only go either with this mavoi or with that mavoi, he can't belong to both.

Speaker 1:

The halacha says, it's a big problem, the Rambam says that since... the Rambam says that if one makes with one one can't with the other, therefore he needs to inform, Shabbat brings a nice proof from shnat taf, lo zo af zo.

The holy Rav asks immediately a question, I don't understand, what is the obligation? What does it disturb? He can both. That means, it doesn't disturb, one can do one, after one has made one one can still add the second. It doesn't disturb at all. True? With this you don't take away anything from him. Essentially, with this you only make him one, he belongs in talisa in one mavoi. If he wants afterwards to be mishtateif with the other mavoi, he can be mishtateif with the other mavoi. So why indeed?

Speaker 2:

Yes, good, it doesn't occur to anyone.

Speaker 1:

That means, the Rav brings it thus, he stands perhaps in the commentators in the Gemara, one needs to look in the Gemara what he brings. But the Rav asks a question, what obligation does he have? It's anyway permitted in both. That means, perhaps there's a shita that says one can't be permitted with both, but our halacha is clear that one can be permitted with both. So what kind of obligation is it? It's indeed difficult.

The commentators on the Rambam want to say answers, that as if essentially the same thing can be in the courtyard. I don't understand why. But perhaps he specifically doesn't want, this is the point. Perhaps he specifically doesn't want the eruv. There's such a thing, a person specifically doesn't want the eruv.

Discussion: Why is it not a benefit — both mavo'ot will meet in his courtyard

Speaker 2:

I can hear, because if it becomes a shituf in the mavoi, and all the people of the mavoi may pass through his courtyard to the next mavoi. He's indeed the middle that is connected to two mavo'ot.

Speaker 1:

Ah, so as if, I understand what you're saying. Because I was difficult for myself, because if you say simply that you have a new thing that one can say "I don't want," then the previous halacha doesn't fit that one can be kofeh. It's not such a thing that one doesn't want. And also, the Rambam doesn't say that he doesn't want in that one. The Rambam says, perhaps he wants the eruv and not in that one. Do you understand? He wants the eruv, only he wants it should be open to both. And then now becomes the whole... now he's in, because the people from the two mavo'ot will be able to meet in the middle place, in the courtyard of the person.

Speaker 2:

Right, I hear. You're saying that perhaps specifically because he's open to two, then becomes a bigger problem, because he doesn't want to be two, and now he has no choice, now he must make two, because he can't... I mean, if he'll make with one, will already automatically...

Speaker 1:

So we see here also that one can't be kofeh when the other has something of an argument. It was so implied, because the language was thus, when the other is a madman, usually he's a shoteh of the nine measures, he's in a bad mood. If he has however a legitimate reason, as we see here, in such a case one can't, it's not a certain benefit. As you say, it's not one benefit lahem. Why shouldn't he be able to make only with that one if he wants? If he wants only with the other, he'll make with the other, and you force him up also to be with you. Then both...

Speaker 2:

One doesn't force, because what let's say that one thinks, if that one the mavoi on the north side has a deal with me, because he gave me things, okay? Now I with him are one partner mavoi. Afterwards I go to the other side, and I make with him a deal. The first one may now go all the way to the third? He has no law with the third.

Speaker 1:

No, he can't, but both should be able to go to the middle one. Both should be able to make a big party by the middle one, and he'll bring food from here and he'll bring food from here. And this is what he's afraid of.

Speaker 2:

Ah, yes yes.

Speaker 1:

Yes good.

Principle: Zachin for a person only when it's indeed a benefit

Speaker 1:

In such a case it's not a benefit.

Okay, so one needs to be medayek. One needs to be medayek, it needs to be only if it's indeed a benefit for him.

I'll tell you that with this fits the language of the Rambam earlier. There was a language that gave the implication that one is kofeh when he doesn't have a real reason not to. The language stood, usually he's a partner. I don't want to have him as a partner, I know that he's a bad mood, he doesn't answer. Then one can be kofeh him, because he doesn't have a true reason. Here we speak when he does have a true reason, then one can't be kofeh, it's not a benefit for him.

Speaker 2:

Legitimate, yes.

Halacha 5: A woman makes eruv for her husband

Speaker 1:

Okay. Further, we're going to learn an interesting halacha of who can...

Speaker 2:

It's a continuation of this.

Speaker 1:

It's a continuation of this, there was a similar halacha, the wife can make for the husband?

Speaker 2:

Yes, it's in... haven't we already seen?

Speaker 1:

He says this regarding mavoi. **Ishah shel ba'alah me'erebet shelo mida'ato**, even without his knowledge, **uvilvad shelo yehei yisrael shcheno**. What does it mean? On condition that he wants. Is that the meaning?

Speaker 2:

Ah, he's not one... yes yes.

Speaker 1:

What does it mean? **But if there were Jews among them, one made an eruv and one did not make an eruv, he is forbidden to make an eruv without his knowledge.** If there is a general rule... There is no previous halacha. He says "mearevet", "mearevet" means eruv chatzeiros. There was no previous halacha stated regarding a woman. Here it wasn't stated. It was stated regarding his wife shelo kegufo, I remembered, that one can acquire from her. She makes an eruv, her husband stands somehow, but both.

Speaker 2:

We didn't have it in the first chapter of Hilchos Eruvin, or the second? Ah, because this is further on in Hilchos Zechiya. I don't remember, but I remember regarding the non-Jew it was stated that one can ask from anyone. Ah, it was stated lizchot lahen al yedei shifchatam. Ah, ah, another thing. Not al yedei ishto, whatever. Ah, the al yedei ishto, I don't remember anymore. But this is the matter of anshei habayit. Here is a slightly different halacha.

Speaker 1:

Okay, this is the other one, in short it's a continuation of zachin le'adam. That means, one can... But here comes in ishto, not because she is mezakeh. It's different, right? She has a right. You know what this is? Basically there are two halachos. This is one, that the wife has the right to be mezakeh for the husband. But this goes back to the regular halacha, only when it's a zechus for him. Because the wife's making an eruv also has its aspect of zachin le'adam. Not that she has the right herself to be the baal habayis instead of the husband.

What Does "Oser" Mean?

Speaker 1:

Keitzad oser? What does oser mean? How should she reveal the matter? Not that he makes an eruv in one place, and she makes an eruv in another place. That is, regarding eruv chatzeiros or regarding eruv techumin. Okay.

Speaker 2:

Yes. I'm just saying, I didn't understand, and the Ran has a different explanation. Okay, not clear. Because you ask further, from where do we get the concept of buying here? The whole thing isn't clear. Now it's clear that a person can be oser. This is exactly that person from the previous halacha that we said they'll call him to beis din, they'll force him until he says yes.

Speaker 1:

But I think that the oser is speaking that we're only talking here about the person who belongs to two mevo'os. When he

indeed has the right to be oser on the neighbors, then the wife can also do it for him.

The Ran's Position — Keshe'osher

Speaker 2:

The Ran doesn't argue exactly that way, but something similar to that, right? That the halacha is speaking when there's another way. Keshe'osher means that they don't have another way. On the contrary, then keshe'osher they can indeed be more shelema da'ata, so says the Raavad, because then they need him.

Halacha 5 (Continued): Eruv Shelo Midato — The Raavad's Position

Speaker 1: Keshe'ein lo, keshe'oseh eruv means that he doesn't have another way. On the contrary, then keshe'ein lo one can indeed make an eruv shelo midato, so says the Raavad, because then they need him. If they don't need him, then they need to ask him if he wants. So argues the Raavad. One needs to look in the Gemara, the Raavad says there a story about uvda dezina, one needs to see what was there.

Speaker 2: Yes, it's not clear to me, because this is the important thing, whether one can force a person. He says it's a zechus, but no, it depends on what he wants. What we said earlier zechus only means that usually people want.

Innovation: Zechus Only Means What People Usually Want

Speaker 2: Yes, but there's a difference between buying and not buying. Buying is not with the zechiya, buying is that the other one must want, it's a second thing. Buying doesn't mean that one is mezakeh him, buying means that one tells him that he's obligated, but it doesn't make him an eruv. Or ah, once they took his bread, if he's angry, I don't know. It's not clear that the part isn't.

Speaker 1: Earlier we speak when he's angry, here we speak when we haven't yet dealt with him. Now only the wife says yes. This is perhaps so. Yes yes, agrees, works out. Making an eruv presumably means that she gives bread, right? She may give, yes.

Speaker 2: Okay, now one can learn earlier what is... Do you know what the halacha is that a woman may give a davar mu'at, for example a bas daga? Don't know? It has to do with Hilchos Kesubos. I think this is Hilchos Kesubos. Could be, I don't know.

Halacha 6: Shituf Mevo'os — With One Type or Two Types

Speaker 2: Let's see the next halacha. Now one can learn something, a detail from this, that is, here there is what one needs to be medayek, what he cannot do shelo midato, what was already an eruv, but one needs to make now a new one, because it's already finished, yes?

Shenisarvu echad mechatzer zo ve'echad mishni mevo'os. So it is, im bemin echad nishtatefu, if they were meshtatef with the same type of food, only one type of food, yes, **afilu kala oso hamin**, even if that food has already finished, what does it mean it finished? They ate it. The bnei hamavoy ate it. The shituf mevo'os that one makes, one eats it. It's not just a zecher be'alma. So **rashai oso shutaf acher umezakeh lahem**, he makes a new one, and he doesn't need to tell them, because there's an agreement from before that it's the same type, and we already know that the people agreed to become partners on this type.

But **im bishni minim**, what's the difference? **Im bishni minim nishtatefu, venistam ha'ochel**, there's no longer the shiur, and one wants to be mezakeh, to give so there should be the shiur, **mosif umezakeh lahem ve'eino tzarich lehodiya**. If there's only a little bit, there's still a little bit. Ah, the explanation is like this, it means like he's doing here perhaps a new thing, it means like he's strengthening the existing eruv. **Ve'im kala**, but if it finished, it's two types, and both types one needed to make a new one, I guess, yes? There's nothing at all. Yes, perhaps the people don't agree to a new one. Why? Because he's going to make a third type. Because once there are already choices, there's already which of the two types to make the next one. He can make exactly the same two types, what do I care?

Question: How Can One Be Meshtatef With Two Types?

Speaker 2: And in general this is difficult, didn't we learn earlier that one needs to have the same type. It's not clear. That's not how we learned earlier, it was stated regarding the partnership that it needs to be one type. The Ran already asks, **vezeh peirush shebushei she'einam yecholim lehishtatef ela bemin echad**, how can it be at all? Perhaps two types simply means that he changes the type. Perhaps that's what he means, but the Raavad doesn't hold that way. The Raavad says that one cannot be meshtatef with two types. And both the Raavad and the Rambam argue whether one can be meshtatef with two types, and this itself is part of their dispute.

Dispute Between Rambam and Raavad: Kol Hadevarim Mitztarfin Leshiur Hashituf

Speaker 2: Yes, he says in the Maggid Mishneh that the dispute is already there in Chapter 1, I remember, Halacha 11. He says that it's written there that in Chapter 1 Halacha 11 it says that the Rambam said that **kol hadevarim mitztarfin leshiur hashituf**. Very good. The Raavad said that this is not correct, but for eruv chatzeiros which is eruv techumin, one can, or shituf mevo'os, the Raavad argues that one cannot combine two types. It's indeed an explicit dispute between Rambam and Raavad in Chapter 1.

So according to the Rambam's explanation that one can make from two types, there can be such a halacha, whose explanation I still don't know. But according to the Raavad's explanation this cannot be, one must mean that what's written in the Gemara "two types" means that one changes the types in between. This can be.

Speaker 1: Right. This is the simple explanation in the Raavad's. The Raavad learned like the Rambam. It seems if it's two types, in short, if it's a change, it's not clear why two types means a change. That is, even if he makes the same two types, or it's never exactly the same.

Innovation: Why With Two Types the Type Matters

Speaker 2: Interesting. It's indeed so. In truth, in the way that one can do zechiya le'adam shelo befanav, there's no difference in the type. But then, when al zachin one cannot, because we're speaking here about the chatzer, one loses something as if. The person who belongs to the two mevo'os, which is not a certain zechus, because perhaps he wants to be with the other mavoy. And then it depends on the type. It's very, by the way. A chatzer always has more than one person. Yes.

Speaker 1: Okay. And the Tosafos in Shabbos 8 says... There was already an eruv between the chatzer with the other. So

further the same thing, that the chatzer is indeed not a clear thing that they want to be part of that mavoy, because perhaps they want specifically to be only from the other, so also, one says, one can be medayek that "**vetzarich lehodiyam**". Tzarich lehodiyam means to say that it will indeed only work if they agree.

Speaker 2: Right. I indeed knew that way. Right. What they want to do.

Halacha 7: Chatzer Shenishtatfa Im Shnei Mevo'os

Speaker 1: And further, the same chatzer, what happens like this? Instead of chatzer are mavoy are pesach zeh, and mavoy hasheni pesach ha'acher. If they indeed made both, both but not all three together, so the answer is, the answer of the Mishnah is, "**me'arvin shneihem imo**", but **bishtei mevo'os asur zeh al zeh**, but it doesn't become like one big mavoy. Unless they make one big partnership, but they made two, it's one from this way and one from that way. "**Lo ye'arvu imahem**", they didn't make any one eruv, it only remained an eruv with one of them not. They didn't make with any of them. Because they didn't do so, they are oser on both of them.

Speaker 2: Why? Because both have the risha regla, as they spoke in the previous case. Yes, it's like a chatzer where one didn't meshtatef. That is, no one may carry to the second mavoy, and not only that, he is oser al shneihem. What does it mean? As you say, that both of them may not carry to it.

Halacha 8: Chatzer Shehi Regila Befesach Echad

Speaker 1: What happens in such a case, when the person who is the chatzer, not the person, the chatzer that is shared by the two, that is connected to the two mevo'os, but with one of them they are more connected. There is a **chatzer shehi regila befesach echad**. He indeed has openings to two mevo'os, but to one mavoy he has an opening that he uses, which is a real door that is used a lot, and a pesach sheni eino regila bo. So "**zeh sheregila bo oser, veshe'eino regila bo eino oser**". He only is oser on the mavoy where he is indeed ragil, because we view it as if he belongs to that mavoy.

Speaker 2: So oser means that he also is oser that those chatzeiros by them may not enter into the mavoy, because as if you belong also to both of them. If you share an extra eruv it's perhaps extra, but if not they also may not carry, because they have narveh delosos, because the chatzer also belongs to that mavoy. And that mavoy has no eruv at all. And here there is a law that when it's regila bo, what does regila bo mean? That one conducts oneself to go in that direction. Usually people go that way, so only the way that they conduct themselves to go is oser. That is, if he would want to make an eruv, he can make even with the one that is eino regila bo, because with that he would show that it is indeed. But he didn't make, and it's eino regila bo, and with that he doesn't oser. It's such a kula.

Kula: Eruv Bnei Mavoy She'eino Regila Bo

Speaker 2: Eruv bnei mavoy she'eino regila bo, even if they made the eruv only with the other mavoy, still **hutrah mavoy ha'acher le'atzmo, ve'eino tzarich le'arev imo**. Why? Because now he has separated himself, he tells us, although we are ragil with you, but we are not an eruv. That is, even with the one he is ragil, but if he was megaleh daas that he wants to be part of the other mavoy, he doesn't oser him.

Halacha 9: Dochim Oso Etzel Mavoy She'eino Regila Bo

Speaker 2: Very good. **Ervu bnei hamavoy shehi regila bo le'atzman**, the mavoy where the bnei hachatzer are ragil made a mavoy for themselves without the bnei hachatzer, **vehi lo ervo imo**, and the chatzer in the middle didn't make an eruv not with the mavoy shehi regila bo and not with the mavoy ha'acher she'eino regila bo, nothing. And also the bnei hamavoy she'eino regila bo also didn't make among themselves any mavoy without him. **Ve'im ba'u le'arev bnei mavoy she'eino regila bo**, so now like this, if one will say that he belongs essentially to the mavoy that is ragil bo, he will be oser on them. So they made another kula, **dochim oso etzel mavoy she'eino regila bo**. We assume that he belongs to the other mavoy. Even though he truly belongs even less to the other mavoy, but since we don't want now to make kilkul for the mavoy that without him everything is in order, and the other one anyway has no eruv, we say no, he belongs to the other mavoy. Although it's not ragil, and there's no eruv, there's nothing, this is the reason. The only reason why we are docho him is so that the ragil that made its own eruv should be able to carry in its own eruv.

Innovation: The Logic of Dochim Oso

Speaker 1: It makes sense, because you see indeed that he is like that mavoy, he is from the type of people who is not a friendly person. Here there is a friendly mavoy, all people who belong to the friendly mavoy are one. He is from the other group.

Speaker 2: Okay. So this is the hoil. Hoil ule'arev, hoil ule'arev, hoil ule'arev. They are two not me'uravs. There is a bunch of anti-social people who don't want to be part of the edah, but they are part of them. It's more such an amur retzonenu, yes, whatever, you say that anti-social is also stupidity, but I mean to say, listen, there are two kinds of mavoy.

Halacha 10: Chatzer Sheyesh La Pesach Lemavoy Ufesach Lekarmelis O Lirshus Hayachid

Speaker 1:

There is a "friendly" mavoy, all people who belong to the "friendly" mavoy are one. He is from the other group. Okay.

He says like this, hoil uleirvu, even yeirvu, even erev, ah, there are two types of people, not me'arvim. A bunch of anti-social people who don't want to be part of the eruv, it's part of them. It's more that they want, it's more than not. Whatever, you say that anti-social is also a reason, but what I mean to say, he... There are two "kinds of" mevo'os in the area, one is eruv people, one is not eruv people, they become two groups. **Kedei shelo tehi asura**, a mavoy is not eruv for itself. Very good. Very good.

Now there is a new problem, which is a chatzer that has a... Further the chatzer, the chatzer that is open to the mavoy, but the other side is not open to the other mavoy, but it is open to a karmelis or to a reshush hayachid. Which is not a house, a place where one may not carry there. **Chatzer sheyesh lo pesach lemavoy, and the other pesach the chatzer has levika'a, lekarpeif etc. shehu karmelis**. So it is, **hoil ve'asur letaltel bechatzer le'oso karpeif**, he indeed may not carry from the chatzer to that karpeif, because that karpeif is a karmelis, he may not carry there. Does it mean we view it as if he has only one door. **Eino somech ela al pesach hasamuch lemavoy**, we only view it as if he belongs, as if he relies only to go out through the door where he may go,

through the pesach hamavoy. **Lefikach oser al bnei hamavoy ad sheyishtatef imahen**, because he is now considered as if he belongs only to one mavoy, the heter that one throws him to the other side is no longer there.

This is only when he indeed may not enter through that door, because that door is a karmelis. **Aval im haya karpeif beis sa'ayim mukaf**, it has a law like a reshush hayachid, **eino oser al bnei hamavoy, she'al hapesach shel reshush hayachid hu somech**. On the contrary, he becomes even more comfortable, he has a way to his private "back yard", there he may indeed carry more easily, there he indeed doesn't need any eruv at all, so he has a way of carrying smoothly. We view it as if he doesn't belong to the mavoy at all, as if he belongs to the other side door, and the mavoy can make an eruv without him. Very good.

One can learn about what happens when a guest comes, or how one can divide one mavoy to the other mavoy? Or one person?

Echad Mibnei Mavoy Shehalach Le'ir Acheres

Speaker 1:

Translation

No, or when one of the residents of the mavoy (alleyway) didn't prohibit the mavoy by not being a partner. Normally, if one of the residents of the mavoy sits there and he doesn't participate, he prohibits the others. That is, unless one gives him a share. But if one didn't give him a share, it's like this: **One of the residents of the mavoy who went to another city** - he went away for Shabbos, **he doesn't prohibit them**, we're happy, he's not there, so one doesn't need to participate. It doesn't state all the details from before, what is over, it's a close place, what is the measure of distance.

Speaker 2:

Residents of the mavoy means yes, one person. Interesting. Perhaps it's easier by the mavoy.

One of the Residents of the Mavoy Who Built a Partition at His Entrance

Speaker 1:

Apparently, another law, which was already stated above by the chatzer (courtyard), if **one of the residents of the mavoy** built a wall, he builds a partition, but a chatzer, the partition was regarding the water. The upper level, right, but it wasn't actually stated there, I mean, again, one needs to know, but here it states that it's only regarding the mavoy that it helps. He says, **who built a partition**, yes? **Four tefachim (handbreadths) wide at his entrance**, he placed there a partition, what is a dead person? He becomes separate from the mavoy. Yes, he's very prohibited no, he's not no. Yes, in practice, he places a, in short, nonsense. Partition means, he made there, for example, something that separates him from the mavoy. So **he doesn't prohibit them, because he has separated himself from them, and divided his domain**, he has separated himself from them, so his domain is a separate domain for itself, and he doesn't prohibit. The mavoy is, one considers as if he doesn't exist.

Very good. Fine.

Nullification of Domain in the Mavoy

Speaker 1:

Now, he says such a law. What happens? **The residents of the mavoy who made a partnership, some of them...** Now come the laws of nullification. Earlier we learned, just as one who forgot to make eruv tavshilin (preparation for cooking on Yom Tov for Shabbos) can make nullification, we learn that one can make such things regarding the mavoy. He says, **the residents of the mavoy who made a partnership, some of them**, part of the people participated and gave bread or food, **and part of the people forgot and didn't participate**, so it's like this: **they nullify their domain**, the people who forgot can nullify their domain **to those who participated**.

And what becomes the law? The law becomes just as we learned earlier regarding nullification of domain, **the law of nullification of domain is like the law of the residents of a chatzer**, just as we learned earlier, that the residents of a chatzer who forgot and didn't make an eruv, that their domain becomes nullified, and the other people may carry from their houses to the mavoy. And as it stated there, they made an eruv, it applies to all kinds of things that we learned there. Yes, whatever the law is, that is, they need to nullify, the laws just as, that is, if it's only one person, it's easier, because he's a guest, more than one person becomes complicated, etc. All the laws that are stated there, the same law.

And they already said, another thing, **and they already said that every person with his household members who rely on his table are considered as one person**, that one looks at each household as one thing, not every soul needs to be part of the eruv or mavoy. This is also a law regarding erugin of courtyards, and it's also here regarding partnerships of alleyways. That even if there is in one house more than one family, but they rely on one table, all the laws that are made for one person's family, work exactly the same for partnerships of alleyways as for erugin of courtyards.

One of the Courtyards Forgot and Didn't Make an Eruv — But They Made a Partnership in the Mavoy

Speaker 1:

Now it's like this, what happened if one made a partnership of the mavoy but not erugin of courtyards? One forgot to make erugin of courtyards. Just as we learned earlier, that even when one makes partnerships of alleyways, and then one looks at the entire mavoy as if it becomes a private domain, but there's still missing an additional rabbinic law, everything is a rabbinic law, but there's an additional decree of the Sages that one should also make erugin of courtyards.

What happens if one didn't do so? **A mavoy where all its courtyards made erugin, each courtyard by itself, and afterwards they all made a partnership in the mavoy**, but in practice it turns out, **one of the courtyards forgot and didn't make an eruv with the members of his courtyard**. The law says, **he hasn't lost anything**, it hasn't harmed him at all. Why? **Because they all made a partnership**, everyone participated, all the courtyards participated in the large mavoy. **And on the partnership they rely**, the reason why they all may carry is mainly because everyone became one large private domain, that the mavoy is the large private domain.

But, one also makes erugin of courtyards, so a person could think, no, I'm only part of the erugin of courtyards. He says no, **that they don't need erugin of courtyards with the partnership**, that even when one makes partnerships of

alleyways one also makes erugin of courtyards, it's not because one actually needs that all people should belong to the courtyard, **rather** the reason is **so that the children won't forget**. The children don't usually see what goes on in the mavoy, and the whole matter of erugin of courtyards is so that the children won't be mistaken. It's the whole thing not a matter of a reminder.

And they made an additional stringency that even when one makes a partnership of alleyways one also needs an eruv of courtyards. But when he made an eruv in the courtyards, he indeed did this matter also, because the children saw an eruv. And actually, he forgot to make a partnership of alleyways, not the entire courtyard forgot, because soon we'll see what it is when the entire courtyard forgot. So we're speaking that one person forgot, one hasn't lost anything, because one actually made, all the children see that one made bread, the children don't see who gives the bread, the Sages aren't concerned about this, they know this. And in practice an eruv exists, he's part of the larger mavoy, so there's no problem at all.

One of the Residents of the Mavoy Forgot and Didn't Make a Partnership

Speaker 1:

But if he forgot the partnership of alleyways **and didn't make a partnership**, he didn't make any partnership, one of those who isn't in the courtyard but in the mavoy itself, then **it's prohibited in the mavoy**. He didn't make any partnership of courtyards, he made a partnership of alleyways. Forgetting erugin of courtyards doesn't disturb, but forgetting partnership of alleyways makes it prohibited.

And the members of each courtyard are permitted to carry in their courtyard, in the courtyard they may indeed carry, if one made erugin of courtyards or one lives alone in the courtyard. **Because the mavoy is to the courtyards only as the courtyard is to the houses**. And just as one understands that by the courtyard, if one didn't make it doesn't work, so also in the mavoy, if one didn't make it doesn't help. But in their houses they may continue. The same way, if one forgot one of the residents of the mavoy, they may in the courtyard but they may not in the mavoy.

They Made a Partnership in the Mavoy and They All Forgot to Make Eruvin in the Courtyards

Speaker 1:

What if everyone forgot to make erugin of courtyards? **They made a partnership in the mavoy and they all forgot to make erugin in the courtyards**. So it's like this, if one makes abundant bread, if they're not particular about their bread, they allow themselves that other people should indeed eat from it, and therefore what? That is, one can say that in a certain sense, one can say that they indeed also have a certain bread, because one needs to have bread for the erugin of courtyards, they forgot to make an official erugin of courtyards, but in practice, if someone comes in and he takes a piece of bread from them, it doesn't disturb them. So there's as if also an eruv of courtyards like bread.

So it looks. The one who is particular about slices is a new one. It becomes like those partners who have a storehouse. There was also a thing of being particular, because here we're speaking of dwellings. There it's the opposite, that if one forgot, one says that a Jew allows people to eat with his bread, so they're as if partners in bread also. So this is **he relies on**

the partnership on the first Shabbos, because the first Shabbos when he forgot, one relied on those partners, on the partnership that he allows. And also one didn't make an eruv for Shabbos.

So the simple meaning is, whether you have a partnership of the mavoy, and whether you have here bread that they're as if partners, one can rely, but only the first Shabbos. And he says later, "**And when did they say this thing? Only in pressing circumstances**", it's not ideal. Therefore, it's two things: one, they only permitted that first Shabbos, and one, they only permitted when carrying that's important.

Discussion: Why Only the First Shabbos?

Speaker 2:

Ah, that's the explanation. I wanted to ask that it's the same thing. So first Shabbos means that you forgot twice in a row, hello, something is wrong with you, you're starting to forget, you're starting to remember. But what actually happened that you forgot twice in a row? What is then, doesn't it work? That is, it's no longer in pressing circumstances, it's just?

Speaker 1:

Ah, I see that the matter here is that in the eruv one makes with other foods, and for the mavoy one makes specifically with bread, yes? Yes, yes. So, on the contrary, an eruv is specifically with bread, but I understand, from this one needs bread. But one doesn't need any eruv of courtyards at all, the whole thing is only rabbinic. But just as the Rabbis decreed a serious decree, that if everyone forgot, then they only allow once to make this after the fact with the bread that one isn't particular about slices. So it looks like the...

Well, good. Now.

A Non-Jew in the Mavoy

Speaker 1:

And now one can learn about a non-Jew in the mavoy. We just learned laws of a non-Jew in the courtyard.

A Mavoy Where They Didn't Make a Partnership

Speaker 1:

Ah, it's a **mavoy where they didn't make a partnership**. Ah, what is the pressing circumstance that one has a mavoy where one forgot to make a... One didn't make any partnership of alleyways at all, so regarding eruv of courtyards and alleyways, if all the courtyards indeed made eruv, **one may only carry in it four amos like a karmelis (semi-public domain)**. Why? Why didn't one make eruv of courtyards and alleyways? Ah, one may not carry in it, in the mavoy, in the mavoy one didn't make a...

A Mavoy Where They Didn't Make a Partnership – Distinction Between Houses and Courtyards

Speaker 1:

Ah, it's one. One learned. Ah, **a mavoy where they didn't make a partnership**. Ah, what is the pressing circumstance that one didn't make a partnership of alleyways? No, one didn't make any partnership of alleyways at all. So eruv of courtyards and alleyways. If all the courtyards indeed made, each courtyard among themselves indeed made an eruv, so what is now open to the mavoy? Houses are open, because all the courtyards now become like a house. **The mavoy becomes as if only houses alone open to it without courtyards, therefore one may not carry in it at all**. Yes, **and if...** Carry on. **And if the residents of the**

courtyards didn't make an eruv, if the residents of the courtyards didn't make any eruv, then it's simple that to the mavoy are open different courtyards, not houses are open but courtyards. So then **one may carry in it vessels that rested in it, like a courtyard where they didn't make an eruv in it**. A courtyard where one didn't make an eruv, one may indeed carry vessels that were lying in the courtyard. The courtyard doesn't become like a karmelis.

When all the courtyards are like houses, then the mavoy is a mavoy that becomes like a karmelis. Why? Because to the mavoy are open many houses. Okay, end, what's worse when courtyards are open? In short, if courtyards are open to it, then it itself has a law like a courtyard. It's like one courtyard that's only next to many courtyards. And in a courtyard one may carry vessels that rested in it. Yes, and if houses are open to it, then it's... I don't know why one shouldn't say that a mavoy that's open to houses is like a courtyard that's open to houses. It becomes something worse, it becomes something new. It becomes like a public domain or like a karmelis that's open to the houses?

Yes, the holy Rav also understood this law, "from lack of knowledge he wrote all this." Yes, it has to do with such a thing, yes. In short, it has to do with the decree, we learned that the Sages didn't decree on vessels that rested in the courtyard. But you see that in the mavoy perhaps yes, vessels that rested in the mavoy they indeed decreed, only if the courtyards have an eruv. So says the Rambam. The Rav doesn't say so.

Okay, not clear why the Rambam thought so. Ah, he says that this is the Rambam, he says this is the simple rule. This is the Rambam makes a distinction if it only has houses. We learned this earlier, and earlier on Shabbos in Eruvin, that in order for a mavoy to be able to carry with a lechi (sidepost) and korah (crossbeam) there must be **houses and courtyards open to it**. A mavoy where only houses open to it doesn't have the permission of a mavoy. Therefore, if there's an eruv, it has a law like such a type of mavoy that isn't permitted with lechi and korah, which then it remains rabbinically prohibited to carry there.

Ah, there are two types of rabbinic laws, that karmelis is a stricter rabbinic law, and mavoy is an additional law that one needs to make an eruv. You see that it's not so strict. Therefore, indeed when only the eruv is missing, one may use vessels that rested in it. Again, exactly. But when it's a bigger problem, when one looks at it like a karmelis, the vessels that rested in it don't help, one may only carry through clothing. The Rambam is an approach in this.

Just as he says it very clearly, he says, "**the mavoy becomes as if only houses alone open to it**". And this means the law that a mavoy where houses and courtyards don't open to it doesn't have the permission of this leniency. It's not a mavoy, it's called like another area. What is another area? A rabbinically prohibited area, an exempt place but prohibited, a karmelis. That's what it's called. Yes, go now.

A Non-Jew or Sadducee in the Mavoy

Speaker 1:

Okay, now we'll learn about a non-Jew or Sadducee whose area prohibits the mavoy. That one learned by a mavoy. He says like this, **a non-Jew or Sadducee who are prohibited in a courtyard where there's no mavoy**. So

it's like this, **his law among the residents of the mavoy is like his law among the residents of the courtyard**, just as we learned earlier, that what? That one needs to rent from him, one can't give him a share from a non-Jew, one rents from him. **That one rents from the non-Jew**, if one is in the landlord's, one can rent from the non-Jew, or just as one learned even from his wife one rents **his domain in the mavoy**. Oh, one will learn by a Sadducee, or the Sadducee needs to be, he needs to make nullification. No, they learned explicitly, a Sadducee one can't rent, not a non-Jew, he can't make any eruv, he doesn't believe in eruv, because nullification works.

And the same law, just as we learned there that one Jew with one non-Jew doesn't disturb, why? Because he's not going to live there anyway. **A mavoy of a non-Jew and one Jew doesn't need to make a partnership**. And the same thing, **the law of one Jew**, when the Rabbis are sitting at one table, the law of one, that is, what one learned that one Jew with one non-Jew is permitted, it doesn't need to be specifically one Jew literally, but it means one house, just as one learned. Whatever, the eruv doesn't help, because one says that one giving of an eruv prohibits the many with the non-Jew, we learned. But one family that doesn't need any eruv, then yes, it becomes the law of one, and therefore it doesn't need to be specifically one Jew, one Jewish family with one non-Jew, the Rabbis say that a non-Jew one needs to rent, and therefore the non-Jew is called, that one dwelling, an individual's dwelling is like an animal and one doesn't need any eruv.

A Non-Jew Who Has an Opening to a Bik'ah — Distinction Between Bik'ah and Karmelis

Speaker 1:

Now another law, **who lives in a mavoy**, so it's like this, a non-Jew who lives in a mavoy where one discussed that one needs to rent the domain from him. But what happens like this, **if he has in his courtyard another opening to a bik'ah (open area)**. We learned earlier that a Jew who has an opening to a bik'ah, turns to the bik'ah is permitted in carrying or not. But by the non-Jew it's different, because he's open to the bik'ah, even if it's a bik'ah where one may not carry, one says that he belongs to that bik'ah, **he doesn't prohibit the residents of the mavoy**. He says, what happens if that opening isn't a proper opening, it's even a small door, **even if it's a small opening four by four**, and we know that in practice when he needs to take out larger things he uses the large door through the mavoy, **even though he takes out camels and wagons through the opening of the mavoy, he doesn't prohibit them**, because we say **that his mind is only on his opening that's designated for him that goes out to the bik'ah**. The opening that he has only for himself, he thinks more. He says an interesting thing, that it's special. By a Jew one says, that one looks at that opening how he may carry on Shabbos, but by a non-Jew there are no restrictions. One says, that even though the opening of the mavoy is much more convenient and one would think that the non-Jew will use that one, and the other is some small door, but in practice that one is his own, that only he uses. For him only open from his courtyard to the bik'ah. One says, that one is called his main door, because there he prefers to go, because that's his own thing. And that he uses the larger one is because it's large, because he needs to drive out there, but he doesn't feel that there is his.

General Rule: If There Was an Opening to a Karmelit vs. an Opening to a Valley

In general, **if there was an opening to a karmelit, it would prohibit the residents of the alley, but an opening to a valley does not prohibit them**. But if there is an open alley, it's exactly the opposite of what happens with a Jew. **He doesn't rely on it**, because it doesn't lead out to a normal place, it leads out to a troublesome place, he doesn't tend to place his things there, he withdraws himself. **He doesn't rely on it**, the gentile doesn't rely on that door, so it's as if he uses the door of the mavoy, **and he prohibits them until they rent from him**.

A Mavoy Where One Side is Gentiles and One Side is Jews — Eruv Through Windows

Speaker 1:

Okay, good. What about if... if there's a mavoy and there are windows? **A mavoy where one side is gentiles and one side is Jews**, one side of the mavoy is inhabited by gentiles and one side by Jews, **and there were windows open from courtyard to courtyard of the Jews, and they all made an eruv through the windows**. So the courtyards became like we learned earlier that one can often make several courtyards become like one courtyard, if one uses... if there's a door between them. **And they all made an eruv through the windows, even though they became like members of one household and are permitted to carry from one to another through the windows**, we said that through the opening between the courtyards they may carry, one might think that automatically they've already become partners and may also carry in the mavoy. But no, **they are prohibited from using the mavoy through their entrances until they rent from the gentiles, for the many are not prohibited like an individual in the place of a gentile**. If there's a gentile there, as long as one doesn't rent from him, we don't say that they've all become like one domain. Because even though they have one eruv, they don't become like one. When it's actually one family, as we learned about that, yes, but an eruv doesn't help with a gentile, because the gentile doesn't want you to become one domain with him.

Discussion: Why Doesn't the Eruv Help?

Speaker 2:

But what's the question? If one rents from the gentile, then yes it's fine. One just needs a regular eruv anyway.

Speaker 1:

One needs a shituf mavoy. A gentile is a rental, it doesn't make a shituf mavoy.

Speaker 2:

Makes sense. Okay, but there's one group, this whole group has an eruv. Why did they make an eruv?

Speaker 1:

They learned the stated law regarding a courtyard, it's not a novelty. The law of a courtyard and the law of a mavoy together in this case.

Shituf Medinah — How Do They Make Partnership in a City

Speaker 1:

Okay, with that we've finished shitufei mevo'ot. We learned that the third type of eruv is, if there's an entire city that is surrounded by doors, or doors that can be closed, it's

considered a reshut hayachid from the Torah, and one also needs a shituf afterwards, just as eruv chatzeirot was a shituf, one needs a shituf in the city, if one wants to go in the city.

How do they make partnership in a city? Says the Rambam, **each courtyard makes an eruv for itself.** First of all, he reminds us again of the law, that even if the entire city becomes one large reshut hayachid, it doesn't mean one doesn't need to make an eruv in each small courtyard. Each small courtyard must continue to make an eruv, for the reason **so that the law of eruv chatzeirot should not be forgotten.** But in addition, **all the people of the city make partnership according to the law of partnership in a mavoy.** Says the Rambam, according to the laws of shituf mavoy, whatever works for that.

Condition for Shituf Medinah — A City Belonging to an Individual

Speaker 1:

Says the Rambam, the law that one must make a shituf is only when the city... he doesn't say one must, one must always. What he says is, there's a way that one may not make one shituf for the entire city. So now it could be, when may one make one shituf for the entire city, and when may one not?

We don't have this limitation, we do make eruvin for entire cities, but according to what's written in the law one may not always do it in a city, only in certain ways.

If the city was the property of an individual, it belongs to one tenant, he owns the entire city, **even if it became the property of many,** even if other people rented, and it became a place where many...

Speaker 2:

I think it means that it became so later? First it was one, as in halacha 19, there was one individual who built it, afterwards it was sold, other people came to live, it became... yes?

Speaker 1:

Then what?

Speaker 2:

Then **they all make partnership with one shituf,** one makes one shituf medinah, or shituf mavoy for the entire city, and one may carry. **And similarly if it belonged to many,** the city belongs to many, **but it has one entrance,** there's one door to enter, **they all make partnership with one shituf.** That's when one shituf for the city is enough. When may one make it? When can't one make a shituf medinah?

But if it belonged to many and it has two entrances through which they enter by one and exit by the other, there are two doors, one can enter from one way and exit from the other way, **even if it became the property of an individual,** even if afterwards the individual bought the entire town, **they don't make an eruv for all of it,** one doesn't make one eruv for the entire city, **rather they leave out one place from it,** one leaves one place that isn't part of the eruv, **even one house and one courtyard,** one leaves over one house that one says isn't tithed, I mean isn't eruvd. **And the rest make partnership, and these partners are all permitted in the entire city,** everyone will be able to carry in the entire city where they made partnership, **except for that place that they left out,** there must remain a place where one doesn't make an eruv.

And those who remained are permitted in their place with the partnership they make for themselves. Actually what happens with that one courtyard? That one courtyard, they themselves can make an eruv among themselves and can carry in that one courtyard. **And those who remained are permitted in their place with the partnership they make for themselves, if those remaining were many.** Actually if there only remains one reshut hayachid of one person, he may carry in his reshut hayachid. And if it's a courtyard mavoy and several people, they can make an eruv chatzeirot, but they can't become partners with the large city. Good.

Discussion: The Reason for Shiur — Because of Recognition Speaker 1:

As if a city. And why is there a leaving out? And why does one do such a thing that one leaves out one place? What do we see? Because of recognition. This is an important thing, because of recognition. So that, an eruv is heard by everyone, it's written, house by house. Sign, yes. The point is this, that not everyone sees the eruv in the city. We want people to know that there's an eruv. People should know that the eruv is what permits them to carry in the city. Because it's a place of many, house by house. It doesn't look like a reshut hayachid, a place where many can move around. Right. So by leaving over one house where there's no part of the city partnership, everyone knows that this makes a distinction! This makes a distinction! The place that was left out and isn't for carrying, but rather as a sign and as a sign! This lets the whole city know that there's an eruv! That one needs an eruv it could be, that this means that perhaps an eruv chatzeirot was made even, but the point is perhaps... for the entire city, one doesn't see the partnership itself, the shituf mavoy. But from this one knows, and everyone knows that one can't just carry, only with an eruv can one carry.

Even in a case where one made an eruv chatzeirot, as was said regarding a borrowed vessel dispute, but in practice the public doesn't see the eruv of the city, and one must see it, by the fact that one house remains where one may not. And in fact you see that one doesn't act, and he says - he brings from you still, Rav, that since one acts that today he doesn't say a reshut harabim is a street, that he says wicked, that so what I don't have any connection what does he have to do with anything, anything. So the decree isn't such a big decree, the decree is, that the person goes and sees and carries in the city, they'll think one may also carry in a reshut harabim. But it's not! The city is actually a complete reshut hayachid.

Speaker 2:

I don't understand. I closed the city.

Speaker 1:

But I did say, it's rabim bekim bo. Yes, it does look like, the Rambam says rabim bekim bo.

Speaker 2:

No, but it does look like rabim bekim bo. A crowd does move around there. So it looks like a reshut harabim. And he doesn't know precisely the law of reshut harabim.

Speaker 1:

I think one doesn't act, and one doesn't act. In this matter one does act. And who is afraid? I remember that later authorities say that in practice there isn't any city where one can make an

eruv in a city, and he says he leaves out a public. I haven't heard. It seems it's only a rabbinic decree, and besides that he says, nowadays, I don't know if anyone knows at all about the whole eruv chatzeirot.

Speaker 2:

Anyway, I don't understand what you're saying. One knows about the eruv. Tell someone that he makes the eruv kosher, he'll stop shouting.

Speaker 1:

Okay, fine.

Digression: The Difference Between One Entrance and Two Entrances

Speaker 1:

Now we'll learn about the rental. We learned that by eruv chatzeirot there's usually rental. A bit before that, the law of reshut harabim that has one entrance, and they said that when there's one entrance we may yes. Ah, that's actually the point. Excuse me, I'll go back. When there are two entrances, one clearly sees that it has to do with because it looks like a reshut harabim, because he says it has two entrances, and it's rabim bekim bo, so it doesn't look to a person like it's one domain.

Halacha 22 — The Law of a Ladder in the Wall

Speaker 1:

A city of many that has one entrance, it has only one door. **And a ladder in one place**, and there's another way out through a ladder, one can climb over the wall through the ladder. We don't say that this also counts as a city that has two entrances, the ladder doesn't count as an entrance, **and they make an eruv for all of it**, one may make one eruv for the entire city, **and it doesn't need a shiur**, it doesn't become the law like a city that has two entrances where one must make a shiur and leave out one house. Why isn't the ladder in the wall considered like an entrance? The ladder in the wall doesn't count as an entrance. What's different from what we spoke about earlier that a tel hamitlakek eser, a city where instead of there being a door, there's also how one can jump with a catapult, I mean like that.

The Law of Which Houses Can Be Used for Shiur

Speaker 1:

Okay, the Rambam says this, "**The houses that they leave to make the measure**", the house that must be considered to make the shiur, which house should one use. Says the Rambam, "**even if there is one adjacent to the city**", even if there's a house that isn't open to the city, its door isn't to the side of the city, "**rather its back is to the city and its front is outward**", it's at the corner of the city, there's basically no door from his house to the city, he goes out to the other side. He goes out directly, he's like Rachav the innkeeper, he can dance and take a leap.

Except that he has a measure, one may use this house for a measure. Well, when one hasn't left out even. Meaning, the main thing is that one should see that there's a house that isn't part of the eruv, and through this one already knows that there's an eruv. It's in the Gemara, one wouldn't have even been able to use the eruv because his entrance isn't open to the eruv. It's a shiur, it's a piece of a fence, he can dance and jump. I don't know what's interesting that it's called a shiur, which isn't a real shiur. The whole shiur is that someone should see, can perhaps hang a sign?

Speaker 2:

Yes, it could be that there's a forgetting, hang a sign.

Halacha 23 — The Law of Acquiring Partnership on Behalf of City Residents

Speaker 1:

The Rambam says further like this, a law, you asked about we learned that one can acquire an eruv for other people when it's a benefit. But here, when it's only a benefit for your thing, but for the other parts of the city it's not a benefit for anyone, except for the one leaving out something. So one simply acquires on behalf of the city residents, they won't lose anything, the one shiur won't cause them to lose anything.

Speaker 2:

No, because otherwise... true, that one simply acquires on behalf of the city residents, **we say to him is it your eruv, there's no need to inform them**, one doesn't need to inform all the city residents, it's enough that one person acquires the benefit for them, and they're fine.

Speaker 1:

The Rambam says further, "**And this is the law of one who forgot and didn't make partnership from the city residents, or one who went to dwell in another city, or...**" We had all these things, he forgot and didn't become part of the eruv, or he went away for Shabbat. And he didn't make the eruv, oh, like a gentile dwelling in the city. It's not worth calculating now exactly whether it's nullification, whether it's forcing, whether it's tzurat hapetach. All these laws are the same. **One law for them except for mavoy guards**, look there.

Halacha 24 — The Law That One Doesn't Make an Eruv for Half a City

Speaker 1:

So he nullifies. So there's such a thing, **a city that has several mevo'ot, except for one mavoy**. A city that has several mevo'ot in it, and all the mevo'ot made a partnership with this, but one mavoy doesn't want to, one alley in the city is extra, doesn't want to, isn't part of it. One prohibits all of them. What does it mean more than a city where everyone made partnership? Right, and just as each has advice, it's enough to count for advice.

But what is the advice? As we spoke, the same situation, the "went out to outside his place" that you say what he wants, what he wants to separate, what he wants to make that it's extra, a platform, a piece of such a thing, something so we know the reality. But presumably there was such a type, a person built such a structure, saying I'm not part of here, don't knock me into the door. If he made such a structure at the entrance of the mavoy, he separated himself, he said that the mavoy isn't part of the city, then he doesn't prohibit them, so the entire other city could make it, and the mavoy itself didn't, so he's part of it.

Says the Rambam, **therefore, regarding the law that one mavoy prohibits the entire city, one doesn't make an eruv for half a city**. One can't make one city, say half a city became part, became an eruv. **Rather either all of them or mavoy by mavoy**. Either each alley should make a separate eruv, or one should make one eruv for the entire city. And then, after one made an eruv for the entire city, what if one

mavoy doesn't want to? They should make a matzevah. That's what he means, understand?

Right. **Each mavoy should build a matzevah at its entrance if they didn't want to make an eruv so that they shouldn't prohibit the other mevo'ot.** The last law looks like a political law, a practical law. When the rabbi of a city makes an eruv, one can't do half. So there are only two options, either in the city there's no general eruv, each mavoy is on its own, or there's a large eruv. And what happens with the people who say they don't want to, he doesn't want to? Make yourself, you have advice, make a matzevah. Whoever doesn't want to be part of the eruv, let him please build a matzevah in front of his house. And whoever doesn't want to be with the living, let him be with the dead.

Speaker 2:

Presumably. Matzevah originally means a matzevah that one places for a marker also, because matzevah simply means like a stone. A standing stone. Matzevah means a stone, yes, it doesn't mean anything more than that. The language of netzavah, a stone that one sets up. Yes, there's such a thing, the matzevah that one may not make, yes, which... in short, some stone that stands, something like... some marker, some monument. That one may not do. There's some part of idolatrous nonsense, some kind of thing. Hey.

Speaker 1:

With that we've finished the laws of eruv chatzeirot. The last three chapters are already...

Halacha 24 (Continued) — Matzevah at the Entrance of the Mavoy

Speaker 1:

Yes, just. Let him make himself some kind of movement.

A matzevah, originally, a matzevah that one places at a grave is also, because a matzevah simply means like Yaakov Avinu, **"the stone which I set up as a matzevah"**. Matzevah means a stone, yes, it doesn't mean anything more than that. The language of netzavah, a stone that one sets up.

Yes, but it's the matzevah that one is not allowed to make, yes, which is, in short, some kind of stone that stands, something like that, something like that, some kind of marker, something like that, what is that? That one is not allowed to do.

Conclusion of Chapter 5 and Beginning of the Laws of Eruv Techumin

Speaker 1: Until here Chapter 5. With this one has completed the Laws of Eruv Chatzeiros. The last three chapters are already the Laws of Eruv Techumin.