

They were severed, they became prohibited

נפסקו נאסרו -

Overview

The ברייתא states that if one made an עירוב between tied ships and the bonds were severed, one may not carry between the ships. תוספות explains why this is not in conflict with a seemingly contradictory ruling.

תוספות responds to an apparent difficulty:

ולא דמי לעירב דרך הפתח ונסתם¹ -

And this case of the ships is not similar to a case where an עירוב was made by way of an opening, and the opening closed up during שבת -

דאמר רב הונא ורב יהודה בסוף פרק קמא דעירובין (דף יז,א) דשבת הואיל והותרה הותרה -

Where מסכת עירובין פרק of ר"י and ר"ה both ruled, in the end of the first חצירות, since it was already permitted, it remains permitted, so why do we not give the same ruling here by the ships that since the עירוב was effective on the beginning of שבת it remains effective regardless?

תוספות replies:

דהכא כיון דנפסקו הוי כאילו הוי רשות הרבים ביניהם³ -

For here, since the ties were severed, it is considered as if there is a ר"ה between the ships; and we know -

ואם עירבו ג' בתים⁴ (ביניהם⁵) ונפל האמצעי ונעשה רשות הרבים⁶ -

That if they were מערב three houses and the middle house collapsed and it became a ר"ה -

פשיטא דלא אמרינן הואיל והותרה הותרה :

It is obvious that in that case we do not say הותרה הותרה, הואיל והותרה, but rather that one may not carry from one house to the other through the ר"ה; the same applies to the ships.

¹ There were two courtyards (חצרים) with people living in both, and a wall divided the two חצירות, however there was a proper opening in the wall so they could [and did] make one עירובי חצירות for both חצירות together (so that every member of both חצירות can carry in both חצירות). During שבת the opening closed up, the question is whether the עירוב is still valid (so that one may carry from one חצר to the other through small openings [which are not valid for an עירוב]).

² When the ships become untied, the sea, which is a כרמלית (not a ר"ה) separates them, nevertheless since מדברנן it is forbidden to carry from/in a כרמלית, therefore תוס' writes that it is כאילו a ר"ה separates them.

³ However by the two חצירות they are both a ר"ה and there is no כרמלית or ר"ה separating them (they are in reality one large ר"ה), therefore we are more lenient and say הותרה הותרה. See אור החמה.

⁴ Three houses belonging to three different people which were attached to each other and an עירוב was made to permit carrying from one house to the others.

⁵ The 'ביניהם' deletes the word 'מהרש"ל'.

⁶ Presumably this means that people began walking there between the two houses. See 'Thinking it over'.

Summary

We do not say הו"א הו"א הו"א if there is a איסור between both רה"י.

Thinking it over

1. This which the גמרא states that נפסקו נאסרו, is that valid even if the ships did not separate from each other (so there is no הפסק between them)?⁷ However by the three houses the collapsed house became a רה"ר; דאורייתא; there it is פשיטא that the עירוב is not valid; by the ships however it was merely a כרמלית which separates them (which is only a רשות דרבנן),⁸ perhaps there we should say הו"א הו"א הו"א like by the שנסתם?!

2. This which the גמרא states that נפסקו נאסרו, is that valid even if the ships did not separate from each other (so there is no הפסק between them)?⁹

⁷ See footnote # 6.

⁸ See footnote # 2.

⁹ See מלאכת שבת