

לכם למה לי לכדתניא – ברייתא as we learnt in a for; What is לכם

Overview

The גמרא explained the reason we derive איסור הנאה from ערלים and not from לא יאכל is because the תורה writes לכם concerning ערלה. This would indicate a היתר הנאה; therefore an extra פסוק of ערלים is required for איסור הנאה. The גמרא subsequently asks that ultimately why the תורה wrote לכם (it cannot be for היתר הנאה for we derive the איסור הנאה from ערלים). The גמרא answers that the word לכם teaches us the rule of נטוע לרבים.¹

In summation: there are four words to indicate איסור הנאה (including לא יאכל and three 'ערלים') to teach us three איסורים (including וחדלקה and צביעה) [and one לכם to teach נטוע לרבים]. It seems that two ערלים and לא יאכל should be sufficient to teach the three איסורים. Why are there three ערלים?! Our תוספות discusses this issue.²

asks: תוספות

הקשה הרב יעקב מקורבל אמאי איצטריך ג' ערלים –

The ר"י asked why are three ערלים necessary to teach איסור הנאה, איסור
- איסור הדלקה and צביעה

ליכתוב תרי ערלים לצביעה והדלקה –

Let the תורה write two ערלים for the צביעה and איסורי הדלקה (and איסור הנאה)
- (לא יאכל will be derived from)

ועל כרחך אתיא לכם לנטוע לרבים –

And perforce the לכם will teach the rule concerning publicly owned plantings. - ממעט הדלקה and נטוע לרבים will teach לכם explains why תוספות

דאי להיתר הדלקה³ אתא לא לכתוב לכם ולא חד מהנך ערלים –

For if לכם is coming to teach permission for הדלקה then the תורה should not have written לכם and also not have written one of these two ערלים
(instead of writing two ערלים and then excluding one of them with לכם) -

ונאסור מלא יאכל הנאה ומחד ערלים צביעה -

And we would prohibit הנאה from יאכל, and we would prohibit צביעה
from the one ערלים -

ולהדלקה אין קרא לאסור –

¹ This can be להיתר or לאיסור depending on the opposing views of the ת"ק ור"י.

² It may be advisable [for others] (that after a cursory reading of the תוספות) to read the 'Appendix' first and then review the תוספות thoroughly.

³ It appears from תוספות that איסור הדלקה is the biggest חידוש and would be the first to be excluded. This is also apparent from the fact that the גמרא mentions it last (ולא ידליק). See footnote # 9.

And we would permit הדלקה for there is no פסוק to prohibit הדלקה.

anticipates a possible solution to his question and rejects it:

ואין לומר⁴ דמלא יאכל משמע לאסור אפילו צביעה והדלקה –

And one cannot say that from לא יאכל we assume that even צביעה והדלקה is prohibited -

ואי הוה כתיב לא יאכל וחד ערלים הוה אסרינן מלא יאכל כל הנאה –

And therefore if לא יאכל and only one ערלים would have been written we would have prohibited all הנאה (including צביעה והדלקה) from לא יאכל -

וערלים לשום דרשה –

And ערלים would teach us some other דרשה. Therefore it was necessary to write two ערלים and לכם to exclude הדלקה.

anticipates a difficulty with the proposed solution:

והא⁵ דמצרכינן קראי לצביעה והדלקה –

And that which the ברייתא required additional פסוקים (the two additional ערלים) for צביעה והדלקה and we could not derive them from איסור הנאה; nevertheless it is not difficult, for we can still maintain that if the תורה would have written only לא יאכל and one ערלים (and no לכם) we would have derived צביעה והדלקה. The reason the ברייתא requires additional ערלים for צביעה והדלקה –

היינו משום דכתב לכם –

That is because the תורה wrote לכם -

דלכם משמע להתיר כל הנאה –

For הנאות indicates to permit all לכם. However we are discussing that it should not say לכם and only one ערלים. Then indeed we would derive from לא יאכל all איסורי הנאה including צביעה והדלקה. -

ולהכי אי הוה כתיב תרי ערלים ולכם הוה שרינן הדלקה –

And therefore if two ערלים and לכם would be written we would permit הדלקה and not know לרבים. That is why it is necessary to write all three ערלים. This would seem to answer the initial question of the ר"י מקורביל.

⁴ The proposed solution of the אין לומר is as follows. If the תורה would write two ערלים and לכם we would say that the לכם excludes the הדלקה. We cannot say that if the purpose of לכם is to exclude הדלקה then the תורה should not have written לכם and only one ערלים, (and I would understand the הדלקה as (היתר הדלקה) as pointed out in the question; This is not so. If the תורה would have written only one ערלים and לא יאכל (and no לכם) I would assume (וצביעה) from איסור הדלקה, and I would not know the הדלקה, therefore the תורה wrote לכם and two ערלים to exclude הדלקה from איסור ערלה. In conclusion; if there would be only two ערלים I would not be certain that לכם teaches לרבים but rather I could assume that the לכם is for היתר הדלקה (and there is no other way to teach that היתר besides writing לכם).

⁵ How can the 'ואין לומר' suggest that if there was no לכם and one ערלים we would assume that the לא יאכל teaches איסור הנאה, when the גמרא states clearly that three ערלים are required to teach איסור הנאה but without the three ערלים we would not include צביעה והדלקה in the איסור הנאה.

איסורי צביעה והדלקה will be necessary for ערלים, and only two, יאכל, This is the basic question of הר"י מקורביל.

ועל כרחך וכו'

There is however a difficulty with this suggestion. When there are three נטוע (which teach ערלים), then the לכם must teach (איסורי הנאה צביעה והדלקה) ערלים, and the three לרבים (for the היתר (aspect) of לכם is cancelled by the לא יאכל and the three teach us [so there is no real purpose in (נטוע לרבים) unless to teach ערלים]. However if there would only be two ערלים and לא יאכל, we may (mistakenly) assume that לכם is teaching us היתר הדלקה and not לרבים. (There are only three פסוקים, so even if the היתר of לכם is cancelled by one of them, there remain only two וצביעה והנאה לאיסור. (That is why three ערלים are necessary to make sure that לכם teaches לרבים and is not excluding הדלקה. This would seem to answer the question of the מקורביל ר"י.

דאי להיתר הדלקה וכו'

However this difficulty can be circumvented. If there are only two ערלים and לא יאכל there are two possibilities how to interpret the פסוק. Either the לכם comes for נטוע לרבים and the three איסורים of צביעה והדלקה are derived from לא יאכל and the two ערלים (this is the option preferred by the ר"י מקורביל), or לכם teaches היתר הדלקה and not לרבים and only וצביעה והנאה איסור. Logic dictates that we take the first option, for if the intention of the פסוק was to permit הדלקה (and not teach us לרבים) then the תורה would have only written לא יאכל and one ערלים (this would teach us איסור הדלקה and נטוע לרבים either, then we would not know מותרת (as the second option suggests). Why then would the תורה write two extra words (לכם and ערלים), when it can all be accomplished by omitting one ערלים and לכם). Since we see that the תורה wrote two ערלים and לכם we are forced to conclude that the two ערלים and לא יאכל teach the three איסורים, and לכם teaches לרבים. The initial question of the מקורביל ר"י remains: why write three ערלים, when two would suffice.

The question of הר"י מקורביל is based on the assumption that if the intention of the תורה would be to be מתיר הדלקה and no לימוד of לרבים, then there should be only one ערלים and לא יאכל but no לכם.

ואין לומר וכו'

One can however question this assumption; Perhaps the intention of the תורה was to be מתיר הדלקה (and therefore the לכם is required to be מתיר הדלקה) and the reason the תורה did not write one ערלים (and no לכם) is because we would

then assume that לא יאכל includes הנאה צביעה והדלקה and the ערלים is for some other unspecified דרשה and we would not know היתר הדלקה. Therefore the תורה must write לכם for היתר הדלקה. [This is the 'ואין לומר' of תוספות.]

והא דמצריכנן וכו'

One would seemingly challenge this approach (of the לומר). How can we say that לא יאכל would include צביעה והדלקה, when our גמרא clearly requires separate לימודים for צביעה and for הדלקה? The answer would be that the גמרא is discussing the פסוק where לכם is written. Therefore once the תורה writes לכם which indicates a היתר הנאה one requires additional לימודים for צביעה; however we are now discussing a case where there is no לכם (and only לא יאכל and ערלים), in this case perhaps לא יאכל can include צביעה והדלקה as well. If we accept this assumption then again there is no compelling logic to assume that if the תורה wants to be מתיר הדלקה it should omit לכם, and have only one ערלים, for we can argue if there is no לכם then צביעה והדלקה (alone) will include לא יאכל.

Therefore there is no question of הר"י מקורביל; the reason the תורה writes three ערלים is to make sure that הדלקה is אסורה for if there were only two ערלים we may think that הדלקה is מותרת, and we cannot know that from one איסור צביעה והדלקה can include לא יאכל without לכם because לא יאכל and ערלים. This concludes the entire לומר. At this point the question of הר"י מקורביל is answered. This answer is based on the assumption that if there is no לכם, then לא יאכל will include צביעה והדלקה. According to this לומר the reason the גמרא required three לימודים for צביעה והדלקה is only because the word לכם is written; otherwise הנאה צביעה והדלקה can be derived from לא יאכל.

א"א לומר כן

however rejects this assumption (that [לכם] [without לא יאכל] includes צביעה⁹ because לא יאכל can certainly not include צביעה), because צביעה is צביעה והדלקה and is not included in the הנאה derived from לא יאכל.

Therefore since לא יאכל alone cannot include צביעה therefore if the intention of the תורה was היתר הדלקה it should have written לא יאכל and ערלים; this would teach us איסור הנאה (from לא יאכל) and איסור צביעה (from the ערלים) and הדלקה would be מותר because there is no לאיסור and we would not know נטוע לרבים. Since the תורה writes two ערלים and לכם then we are forced to conclude that the intention is איסור הדלקה and נטוע לרבים. The question remains why the need for three ערלים!!

⁹ Seemingly, תוספות means [even] צביעה and certainly [not] הדלקה. See 'Thinking it over'.