

And here the principal is destroyed

והא דמכליא קרנא –

OVERVIEW

The גמרא stated that were it not for the פסוק of משלחי רגל וגו' I could have interpreted the entire פסוק of ושלח את בעירה ובער וגו' to be referring to שן only. The word ושלח would be referring to שן when it is not מכליא קרנא, and the word ובער would be referring to a שן, which is מכליא קרנא (and we would not know that רגל is a מזיק). מכליא קרנא explains the need for the second word (ובער) to teach us מכליא קרנא.

תוספות asks:

ואם תאמר ולכתוב רחמנא ושילח ולא בעי וביער¹ -

And if you will say; and let the 'merciful one' write only ושלח and it will not be necessary to write ובער. If we know (from ושלח)² that even מכליא קרנא is חייב, certainly ושלח את בעירה (which is derived from ובער) is חייב. The תורה should have only written ושלח את בעירה (omitting the word ובער) בשדה אחר.

תוספות answers:

ויש לומר דהוה אמינא דוקא דשילח שלוחו כדלקמן:

And one can say; that I would have thought that one is liable for שן **only** if the animal **was sent** (by its owner), as the גמרא states **later**. The word ושלח indicates that the animal was sent by its owner. We would have thought that שן is חייב only when the owner sends it into another's field. Therefore the תורה writes ובער (as well) to indicate that the חייב of שן is even when the animal entered the neighbor's field by itself (without the owner sending it there). Both ושלח and ובער are necessary for שן.

SUMMARY

If (there would be no פסוק of משלחי רגל, and) the תורה would only state ושלח and not ובער (we would know that שן is חייב even if קרנא, but) we would assume that it is חייב only if שלוחו שלוחו.

THINKING IT OVER

At this point when the גמרא explains that we need the פסוק of משלחי רגל, for otherwise, ושלח alone would indicate only מכליא קרנא (as the גמרא states) and ושלח

¹ question is that the פסוק of משלחי רגל is not needed. We cannot say that the פסוק of ובער וגו' is referring only to שן; for why would the תורה write ושלח and ובער, when ושלח alone is sufficient for שן.

² (seemingly) maintains that the word ושלח cannot be referring to קרנא (only). If the תורה meant (only) a case of מכליא קרנא, it would have chosen a different word (such as ובער). See רש"י ד"ה אידי who (seemingly) disagrees with תוספות. See מהרש"א (הארוך), מהר"ם וכו'. See 'Thinking it over'.

would indicate only שלח שלוחו (as תוספות states); how can the גמרא ask (shortly) why it is necessary to have the פסוק of הגלל יבער? It is necessary for otherwise we would need both words for רגל to include לא מכליא קרנא (which we derive from ושלח) and אזלא ממילא (which is derived from ובער)!