[ולאפוקי מהאי תנא – And to exclude from this תנא

Overview

After the גמרא concludes that קנס is paid for חייבי לאוין and חייבי כריתות, the גמרא states that this opinion is contrary to the opinion of **this תנא** (in the singular), who is shortly cited. The גמרא then cites a ברייתא in which there is a מחלוקת between שמעון התימני (who rules that there is קנס by חייבי לאוין (but not by חייבי כריתות) and ר' שמעון בן מנסיא (who rules that there is no קנס even by חייבי לאוין [or even חייבי עשה]). Seemingly our משנה (which requires קנס for חייבי לאוין and חייבי כריתות) disagrees with both תנאים in the ברייתא. The question (which this ת"י addresses) is, why does the גמרא say that it excludes (only) this (one) תנא.

פירוש[1] תנא דברייתא אבל מפיק מתרוייהו תנאי שמוזכרים בברייתא] –

The explanation is that the phrase ולאפוקי מהאי תנא, is referring to **the תנא** that taught this **ברייתא; however** the intention of the 'לאפוקי' is to **exclude from both of the תנאים that are mentioned in the ברייתא.** The cited ברייתא was taught by a certain תנא who mentions the opinions of two other תנאים (namely שמעון התימני and ר' שמעון בן מנסיא). Our משנה disagrees with the תנא who taught the ברייתא, and by extension, also disagrees with both תנאים of this ברייתא. This explains why the phrase is mentioned in the singular.

Summary

The תנא of the משנה disagrees with the תנא who taught the ברייתא (of שמעון התימני and ר' שמעון בן מנסיא).

Thinking it over

1. Which of the two תנאים (שמעון התימני or ר' שמעון בן מנסיא) are closer (or further) from the opinion of our משנה?

2. How could it have been remotely possible (but not actually possible) that the משנה agrees with one of the תנאים of the ברייתא?[2]

---

[1] The word 'פירש' is (frequently) used by תוספות to indicate that the explanation of the גמרא is (somewhat) different that what may have been initially assumed.

[2] See following תוספות ד"ה חילולין concerning ר' יהושע.