

That ר"ע maintains that we derive the laws of throwing an object רה"ר מרה"י לרה"י דרך רה"ר, from the laws of handing over an object רה"ר מרה"י לרה"י דרך רה"ר

Overview

הוצאה established in the beginning of the פשט דף ב, א ד"ה פשט that since הוצאה is a מלאכה גרועה – *an inferior¹ type of מלאכה* – therefore any תולדה of הוצאה, has to be in the משכן in order to be חייב, and not like all other מלאכות, where only the אב needs to be in the משכן² but not the תולדה. Therefore the questions arise, if זורק was in the משכן, then: 1) why does ר"ע need to derive it from מושיט, and 2) why do the רבנן argue that זורק is פטור since it was in the משכן, just like מושיט. And if it was not in the משכן, then how can ר"ע maintain that he is חייב.

if you ask, but we must assume that מרה"י לרה"י דרך רה"ר – throwing זורק מרה"י לרה"י דרך רה"ר לא היה במשכן, was not in the משכן,
משכן זורק was in the משכן – דאם הי' במשכן
that it מושיט is there to derive it from מושיט – מה צריך למילף ממושיט חייב, obviously it is חייב, since it was in the משכן?
and furthermore if זורק was in the משכן, what is the reason of the רבנן who say that he is פטור
as we just proved with the previous two arguments, the question arises
why does ר"ע maintain that he is חייב – אמאי מחייב ר"ע
for we have already established that concerning any תולדה of הוצאה (which זורק would be), since הוצאה is a מלאכה גרועה, the rule is
that we cannot say that these תולדות are חייב, only specifically those that were in the משכן,
as I expounded previously (on פשט דף ב, א).
The question is: why does ר"ע maintain that זורק is חייב (because he derives it from מושיט, but that is insufficient) since it was not in the משכן, and תולדות of הוצאה are חייב only if they were in the משכן?

¹ There are different reasons why הוצאה is considered a מלאכה גרועה, among them that it is hard to understand what is the difference in the work that is done whether one carries on object from a רה"י to a רה"י or he carries it from a רה"י to another רה"י (פשט); or that in הוצאה there is no physical change to the object, as opposed to the other מלאכות, i.e. planting, cooking, writing, etc.

² In fact that is what distinguishes between an אב and a תולדה, namely that the אב was in the משכן as opposed to the תולדה which was not.

ר"ע – we can say, in answer to this question, **that ר"ע סבר maintains**

מושיט, **that זורק is more similar to מושיט**, **than the similarity, that other תולדות of** **הוצאה** are similar **to הוצאה**, therefore even though as a rule every תולדה of הוצאה must be in the משכן in order to be חייב, the תולדה of רה"ר is so similar to מושיט, that ר"ע maintains, that it is חייב even though it was not in the משכן³.

Summary

There are exceptions to rule that all תולדות of הוצאה have to be in the משכן, namely זורק, because it is so similar to מושיט (or מוציא), therefore it may be חייב even if was not in the משכן.

Thinking it over

1. Why is זורק more similar to מושיט, than הכנסה is to הוצאה?
2. See footnote 3.

³ There is another case of זורק that was not in the משכן, and still everyone agrees (not only ר"ע) that he is חייב, namely if one is זורק מרה"י לרה"ר or זורק מרה"י לרה"ר and there everyone agrees that we derive it from either הוצאה or הכנסה. One must find a reason why the חכמים derive זורק מרה"י לרה"ר from הוצאה, yet do not derive זורק מרה"י לרה"י דרך רה"ר from מושיט.