הכי גרסינן הך דהואי במשכן חשיבא קרי ליה אב הך דלא הואי במשכן חשיבא קרי ליה תולדה –

This is how we read the text: Those מלאכות which were prominent in the משכן are called אב those that were not prominent in the משכן are called תולדה.

## **OVERVIEW**

The גמרא differentiates between an אב and a תולדה, by stating that an אב was a מלאכה in the משכן. There are different גירסאות as to the exact difference between an אב and a תולדה. This תוספות offers us two גירסאות, which explain the terms אב ותולדה, differently.

ולפי הך גירסא בא לאפוקי כמה מלאכות שלא היו חשובין והיו במשכן -And according to this reading of the text, the גמרא is coming to exclude various מלאכות. which were not prominent and were in the משכר

דתולדות נינהו ולא אבות מלאכות כדאמרינן בפרק במה טומנין (שבת דף מט,ב) -For these מלאכות are תולדות and are not אבות מלאכות; as the ברייתא states in - במה טומנין

הם העלו הקרשים מקרקע³ לעגלה⁴ דהיינו הכנסה ומושיט בדיוטא אחת הם העלו They (the משכן picked up the boards (the קרשים of the משכן) from the ground unto the wagon; which refers to the תולדות of הכנסה, and מושיט in one upper story. The מושיט and מושיט are deemed תולדות, even though they took place in the משכן. However, they were not השובות מלאכות therefore they are not considered אבות.

 $<sup>^{1}</sup>$  See מהר"ם who interprets this to mean that even if it was in the משכן it is still necessary for it to be חשיבא, in order to be considered an אב. However, if it is a גירסא, it is considered an אב according to this גירסא, even if it was not found in the משכן. The following גירסא disagrees with this. See footnote # 7.

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$  The ברייתא there is giving examples of various משכן which are found in the משכן.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The ground is considered a רשות הרבים.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The wagon is considered a רשות היחיד. Moving an object from a רה"ר to a הכנסה of מלאכה, which is considered to be a הולדה of הוצאה (moving an object from the רה"ר to the רה"ר).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> The מושיט ocnsists of passing an object from one רה"י, to an adjacent רה"י (separated by a רה"ר), when both are on the same side of the הה"ר. An example would be two porches of two adjacent detached houses, on the same side of the street, which overhang the רה"ר. The place underneath the space between the two porches is a רה"ר as well. Passing an object from one porch to someone on the other porch is the עגלות משכן. In the עגלות משכן (which were a רה"ר) to carry the קרשים were lined up in the direction of traffic of the רה"ר. There was a slight space between the front of the rear of the rear of the front גגלה. This space was part of the גלה. The קרשים were first raised onto the rearmost wagon, and then passed on to the ליי who was on the wagon directly in front of it; thereby passing the object מרה"י דרך רה"ר.

תוספות offers an alternate גירסא:

ואית דגרסי הך דהוה במשכן וחשיבא קרי לה אב -

And others have the text read as follows; 'those that were in the משכן and are prominent are called אב -

- הך דלא הוה במשכן ולא חשיבא קרי לה תולדה

Those that were not in the משכך (and)  $[or^6]$  are not prominent are called 'תולדה'-

 $^{7}$ ולפי גירטא זו צריך לומר דבעי תרתי אבל חשיבא ולא הוי במשכן או איפכא הוי תולדה: And according to this גירטא גירטא it is necessary to maintain that two criteria are required to be considered an אב חשיבי and דשיבי השכן; however, if a מלאכה is משכן and it was not in the משכן or the reverse, it was in the חשיבא is a מלאכה is a מלאכה  $^{7}$ 

## **SUMMARY**

According to the first אב אב must be השיבא; according to the second גירסא, an must be משכן, according to the second משכן, an משכן  $^8$ 

## THINKING IT OVER

- 1. According to the first גירסא why did the גמרא mention משכן at all; seemingly (according to the מהר"ם) it depends solely whether it is השיבא or not?! $^9$
- 2. Why is העלו קרשים חעלו not considered a מלאכה חשובה? $^{10}$

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> See מהרש"א.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> According to the first אכרסא, however, we exclude only a מלאכה which is not משכן (even if it was in the משכן), but we do not exclude a משכם (even if it was not in the משכן). Therefore the first אכרסא excluded (only) הכנסה (which were in the משכן but are not משכן), but it did not exclude a משכן which was not in the ומושיט. See footnote # 1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> See מה"ם who disagrees with the מהר"ם and argues that according to the first משכן the מלאכה had to be משכן (at least) in the משכן; while the second משכן maintains that it had to be השיבא in general (not only in the אירסא). However both גירסאות agree that it had to be in the משכן.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> See (מהרש"א) מהוד"ב.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> See נחלת משה.