

מגרר ויוצא איצטריך ליה -

Dragging and exiting, were necessary for him to mention

Overview

The מגרר here explained that the reason the תנא mentions the פטור of the גנב by מגרר (instead of זורק) is to teach us that there is a חיוב הוצאה (even) by מגרר.¹ Previously the גמרא (also) asked why teach the פטור by מגרר when it can be taught in the case of עמד לכתף. The גמרא there did not answer ליה מגרר איצטריך, but rather dismissed the entire answer of כשעמד. Our תוספות explains why the גמרא did not offer the answer of ליה מגרר איצטריך, previously.

לעיל² דפריך דליפלוג בין לפוש ובין לכתף לא בעי לשנויי הכי³ -

Previously when the גמרא asked that the תנא should have rather differentiated between stopping to rest (where the גנב is חייב), and stopping to adjust (where he is פטור), the גמרא did not wish offer this answer that ליה מגרר איצטריך; the reason is -

משום דלכתף פטור נראה לו חידוש טפי⁴ מחידוש דמגרר⁵ -

Because it appears to the גמרא that being פטור by לכתף is a greater novelty than the novelty that he is פטור by מגרר.

An additional reason why the גמרא did not say previously ליה מגרר איצטריך:

[ועוד⁶ דהכא לא הוי לגמרי בדידה⁷ אבל לעיל דהוי ממש בדידה לא שייך⁸ לשנויי הכי]:

[And additionally that here the cases of מוציא and זורק, are not completely the same (בדידה); however previously, where the case of לכתף is exactly the same (בדידה) as לפוש, it is not applicable to give such an answer].

¹ See previous תוס' ד"ה אבל [TIE footnote # 2]. There is a חידוש that he is פטור by מגרר, therefore the תנא mentions it.

² At the beginning of this עמוד.

³ The גמרא could have answered that the תנא stated מגרר because of the חידוש in מגרר, as it answers here.

⁴ See 'Thinking it over'.

⁵ [Possibly תוספות means] The חידוש of מגרר is that there is a חיוב הוצאה for מגרר (even though he did not pick it up), and once we know that there is a חיוב שבת we understand that the גנב is פטור, since the הוצאה והגבהה happen simultaneously. Regarding לכתף, however the חידוש is (not that there is a חיוב הוצאה, since he ultimately took it out, but rather) that the first עקירה צורך הוצאה was not nullified by his stopping, and therefore it is an הוצאה so it is a case of קלב"מ, and this is what the תנא wants to teach us; not so much the חיוב שבת, but rather the rule of מ"ק.

⁶ A marginal note indicates that this bracketed answer is from יד תוס'.

⁷ See previous תוס' ד"ה אבל that תוס' needs a reason why זורק is more בדידה than מגרר, therefore the answer of מגרר איצטריך is sufficient (since in the question here, it is not so obvious that זורק is more בדידה than מגרר).

⁸ The fact that there is an (unrelated) חידוש by מגרר (see footnote # 5), does not allow us to ignore that לפוש and לכתף is certainly בדידה; in both cases he stopped, and nevertheless these דינים are different. When differentiating we are always searching for the two cases which are most similar which in this case is לפוש and לכתף, but not מגרר.

Summary

The **לכתף** of **חידוש** is greater than **מגרר**, therefore the **גמרא** previously did not answer **מגרר איצטריך ליה**.

Thinking it over

מגרר איצטריך ליה the reason the **גמרא** did not answer previously is because **לכתף** is a 'greater' **חידוש** than **מגרר**.⁹ Seemingly even if **לכתף** and **מגרר** are at the same level of **חידוש**, he should say **לכתף** because **נפלוג וניתני בדידה**. Why does **חידוש טפי** need to say that **לכתף** is a **חידוש טפי**?!¹⁰

⁹ See footnote # 4.

¹⁰ See **מהרש"א**.