

## רבי אמי For

## לכדרבי אמי –

### OVERVIEW

The established גמרא that שלוחי מצוה are not hurt even on their return trip. The question is asked why the דרשה of ארצך את איש ולא יחמוד is necessary. The גמרא answers that the פסוק of ולא יחמוד comes to teach the ruling of ר' אמי, that only one who has קרקע is required to be עולה רגל. Our תוספות (based on the previous<sup>1</sup>) has a difficulty with this.

תוספות asks:

ואם תאמר והשתא את למה לי למידרש בהליכה<sup>2</sup> –

And if you will say; and now that we derive that no damage will be sustained when one is עולה רגל from the פסוק of ופנית בבוקר, why is the word את necessary to teach us that there will be no harm when going to be עולה רגל. We know it already from ופנית בבוקר וגו'!

תוספות answers:

ואומר רבינו יצחק דלא נכתב אלא משום דבר שנתחדש בה<sup>3</sup> משום חידוש דארצך –

And the ר"י replies that the פסוק of ארצך את איש ולא יחמוד was written only for the novelty it contains, namely on account of the novelty of ארצך; which teaches us as רב אמי states that only a person who has land is obligated to be עולה רגל; and once the תורה wrote this פסוק for this novel purpose, the תורה -

כתב נמי את למדרש אף על גב דלא איצטריך:

Also wrote the word את to be interpreted as including the livestock in the protection, even though it is not necessary, for we already know that even the livestock is always protected from the פסוק of ופנית בבוקר וגו'.

### SUMMARY

The פסוק of ולא יחמוד was written primarily for ארצך to teach that מי שיש לו קרקע עולה לרגל; however the תורה (unnecessarily) added the את to teach that the livestock are also protected.

<sup>1</sup> ד"ה מלמד.

<sup>2</sup> See previous תוספות ד"ה מלמד.

<sup>3</sup> In reality the entire פסוק of ולא יחמוד וגו', which indicates that one's property will not be harmed, is extra for we derive it from ופנית בבוקר. However the תורה chose to write this seeming superfluous פסוק, since there is some חידוש there, namely the qualification for עוליה לרגל. It is apparent that the תורה may repeat itself as long as there is some חידוש, the same will apply to the 'את'.

### **THINKING IT OVER**

Why do we not say that 'את' teaches that if one possesses (only) livestock he is also obligated to be עולה לרגל (or that one must also possess livestock in addition to קרקע)?!