

**איצטריך סלקא דעתין אמינא הני מיילי היכא דשלח שלוחי –**

**It is needed; for it would have entered our minds to say, it is applicable, only when he sent it.**

### Overview

The גמרא (seemingly<sup>1</sup>) concludes that we derive both שן ורגל from the word ושלח (The word ושלח and משלחי רגל השור, through רגל) and שן through (משלחי רגל השור, through רגל) and teaches us that שן ורגל are even if initially when we derived שן from ובער through the פסוק of פסוק ובער, the גמרא asked why it is necessary for the ברייתא to cite the פסוק of פסוק ובער, to prove that שן refers to שן (which is derived from ושלח) or רגל (which is derived from ושלח). It is obvious that שן refers to שן, for it cannot refer to שן (which is derived from ושלח) or רגל (which is derived from ושלח). Tosfos asks that this same question can be asked now; there is no need for שן ורגל!

asks: Tosfos

**ואם תאמר תיקשי השתא הא דפריך לעיל –**

**And if you will say; you can ask now, what the גמרא asked previously; which is –**

**טעמא דכתב רחמנא כאשר יבער הגלל הא לאו הכי במאי מוקמית -**

The reason we derive שן (from ובער) is because the 'merciful one' wrote the פסוק of פסוק ובער (which indicates the connection between שן and ובער), but if it would not have been so (if there was no such פסוק of פסוק ובער), then we would not know שן; but this cannot be, for what else can שן be referring to (certainly not רגל, since it is derived from ושלח). The same question should be asked now; why is the פסוק of פסוק ובער necessary;<sup>2</sup> we know that שן is unnecessary from the פסוק of פסוק ובער. The פסוק of פסוק ובער is unnecessary!

**והשתא ליכא לשנויי כדלעיל –**

**For now we cannot answer as we previously answered.** Previously the גמרא answered that if it were not for the פסוק of פסוק ובער; we would assume that both ושלח and ובער refer to two types of רגל; ושלח when שלח שלוחי, and ובער when it is ממיילא. However now that we know שן from ושלח (and not [necessarily] from ובער), the פסוק of פסוק ובער is not necessary<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> See, however, ריש"י ד"ה קמ"ל.

<sup>2</sup> The intention of the question is why it is necessary for the תנא of the ברייתא to cite this פסוק (but not why is it necessary for the נביא to say it).

<sup>3</sup> It would be unreasonable to assume that כאשר יבער is required to inform us that the חיוב of חיוב, which we derive from ובער, refers to שן as well; for since ושלח refers to both שן ורגל, there is no reason to assume that ובער refers to only one of them.

answers: תוספות

**ויש לומר דהכי קאמר ברייתא דאלו לא נאמר ושילח הוה מפקינ מכאשר יבער הגלל**  
**And one can say; that this is what the ברייתא meant; that even if the word**  
**ושלח was not written** (so we could not derive שן from ושלח through ושלח  
(בהמות אשלח), **we would have derived** שן from כאשר יבער and applied it to  
ובער.

**וכי האי גוונא איכא בריש איזהו נשך (ב"מ ד סא,א):**

**And something similar to this can be found in the beginning of איזהו**  
**נשך<sup>4</sup>.**

### Summary

According to the מסקנא, the כאשר יבער of פסוק is unnecessary for teaching us  
the חיוב of שן. The ברייתא required it (only) if ושלח would not have been  
written.

### Thinking it over

1. ובער is assuming that both שן ורגל are derived from ושלח; and ובער  
teaches us the חיוב even if ממילא. How then do we know that שן ורגל are  
אזלא (to teach us שן ורגל) by חיוב? The word ובער refers to both שן ורגל (to teach us  
אזלא), and ובער indicates קרנא by both שן ורגל!<sup>5</sup>

2. כאשר יבער of פסוק ברייתא mentions the פסוק of ובער, it  
means that this פסוק is necessary if ושלח was not written. However, how did  
the גמרא ask why is כאשר יבער necessary to teach us שן, for ובער cannot mean  
רגל, since רגל is derived from ושלח; but now we are assuming that ושלח is not  
written, therefore if not for ובער, we may think that ובער is referring to  
רגל!<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> The states: פסוק (ויקרא [בהר] כה, לז) and כסף; it would seem that כסף and כסף have two separate לאוין (נשך for כסף and כסף for נשך). The ברייתא derives from a גזירה שוה (אוכל for מרבית and כסף for נשך). The גמרא states that the גזירה שוה is not necessary, for we read the פסוק in this manner: (two for נשך ובמרבית לא תתן אכלך and (כסף for לאוין) which makes two לאוין (אוכל for נשך). Why then, asks the גמרא does the ברייתא require a גזירה שוה?! In case we would not have this פסוק! The same applies here. In truth it was not necessary for the ברייתא to cite the פסוק of ובער יבער הגלל, for we derive שן from ושלח (which connects it to ושלח). The ברייתא states that if there were no ושלח and we could not derive שן from ושלח, we could nevertheless derive it from ובער, through ובער הגלל.

<sup>5</sup> See מהר"ם.

<sup>6</sup> See אמ"ה.