

**Now that he can be – האיש מקדש. השתא בשלוחו מקדש בו מיבעיא –**  
**with his שליח is there any question concerning himself**

### OVERVIEW

The משנה stated that a man can be מקדש by himself or through a שליח. The גמרא asks that if he can make a שליח to be מקדש then he can certainly be מקדש himself. Why is it necessary for the משנה to mention בו? Our תוספות explains why the classical answer of לא זו אף זו does not apply here.

-----  
ואין שייך לתרץ הכא לאו דוקא ורצונו לומר לא זו אף זו<sup>1</sup> –

**And it is not possible to answer that here the משנה is not exact** when it states בשלוחו, but rather **the intention** of the משנה is **to teach** us that **not only** בו, but **also** בשלוחו. The reason we cannot explain the משנה in this manner is -

**דלא שייך לשנויי הכי אלא בשתי בבות<sup>2</sup> אבל בשתי תיבות לא:**

**because it is not possible to use this answer of לא זו אף זו except by two phrases, but not by two words.**

### SUMMARY

may explain two בבות but not an extra word.

### THINKING IT OVER

Perhaps<sup>3</sup> רבי heard the first תנא teach בו האיש מקדש and the second תנא said combined them, and therefore the explanation of לא זו אף זו can apply!<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Literally: 'not (only) this (but) also this'. When two cases are mentioned and the first can be derived from the second (making it [seemingly] superfluous), many times the גמרא explains that it was taught in a manner of לא זו אף זו; not only is the ruling valid in the first case (which is more obvious), but the ruling also applies to the second case (which is not as obvious). Seemingly the גמרא could have explained our משנה in this manner as well.

<sup>2</sup> When two separate cases are mentioned in the משנה it is possible that one תנא mentioned the first case only (which has some novelty) and a second תנא mentioned the second case (which has a greater novelty). רבי (who was מסדר the משנה) may have heard the first case and noted it and then heard the second case and added it to the first. Therefore we can say לא זו אף זו. However when it is just a matter of a word (בו) it is obvious that there were no two statements (by two תנאים), but rather only one statement (by one תנא) of ובשלוחו; the question remains that בו (which besides that it can be derived from ובשלוחו, in addition it has no novelty at all [see "פנ"] is superfluous (see "עצמ"). See 'Thinking it over'.

<sup>3</sup> See footnote # 2.

<sup>4</sup> See (also) נח"מ.