

**הנחה – And perhaps only a הנחה is not required** to be on a 'מקום ד' (according to ר"ע), **however an עקירה requires a 'מקום ד'.**

### Overview

The גמרא asked: Even though we see that ר"ע does not require a 'מקום ד', from the fact that he holds קלוטה כמי שהונחה דמי, however it may be that he does not require a 'מקום ד' for הנחה, but he does require a 'מקום ד' for עקירה.

The question arises: why should there be any difference between הנחה and עקירה? Since we see that ר"ע holds that הנחה does not require a 'מקום ד', why should עקירה be different? Did the גמרא note anything in the words of ר"ע that would cause this difference?

ר"ע and תוספות take different approaches to the גמרא's question 'ודילמא כו'. ר"ע learns that from ר"ע's words we can deduce that ר"ע holds, that עקירה is different from הנחה, while תוספות learns that inherently (without ר"ע's statement) עקירה is different from הנחה.

-----  
ר"ע explains that the גמרא is מדויק that ר"ע – פירוש רש"י דדייק מדלא חייב ב' would require a 'מקום ד' by עקירה, **for since ר"ע is not מחייב the זורק for two איסורים**

**הכנסה and one for הוצאה – one for הוצאה and one for הכנסה**, since ר"ע holds קלוטה, so when the object went from the רה"י to the רה"ר, there was a הוצאה, and when it continued from the רה"ר to the רה"י there was a הכנסה, so if ר"ע holds that a 'מקום ד' is not required neither by הנחה nor עקירה there should be two חיובים. However since it says ר"ע מחייב but not מחייב שתים, that means he is only חייב for one מלאכה, namely הוצאה, for we have a הנחה for the הוצאה but no עקירה for the הכנסה. The reason the הנחה is valid, is because it does not require a 'מקום ד', an עקירה however does require a 'מקום ד', and since there is no 'מקום ד' he is not חייב for the הכנסה. This according to רש"י proves that while a הנחה does not require a 'מקום ד', an עקירה however does require a 'מקום ד', and therefore he is חייב only once for הוצאה.

**And there is a difficulty with this deduction, for perhaps the reason that he is not חייב for two מלאכות** is not because there is no הכנסה, since an עקירה requires a 'מקום ד', it is possible that an עקירה also does not require a 'מקום ד', and the reason why he is not חייב for the הכנסה also, is because

**for there is a rule that one is not חייב (קרוב) אב on a תולדה when he does it together with the אב** and since the הכנסה is a תולדה of הוצאה, we cannot be מחייב him for the הכנסה when he is already חייב for הוצאה.

**and furthermore<sup>1</sup>** there is another difficulty with this פשט, **for רב יהודה will say, shortly**

**for זורק מרה"ר לרה"ר ורה"י באמצע מחייב רבי ב'** **that was מחייב רבי ב'** **מחייב היה רבי ב'** **הוצאה<sup>2</sup> and הכנסה**, **מלאכות** **for two**

**even though in the ברייתא it stated simply that רבי was מחייב**, not specifying how many חיובים, nevertheless רב יהודה understood it, to mean two, so therefore

**הכא נמי לר"ע מנא לן דלא מחייב שתיים** **here too concerning ר"ע, how can we be sure that he does not mean two?**

The question remains, why did the גמרא think that there should be a difference between הנחה and עקירה? תוספות answers:

**And it appears to תוספות, that the explanation**

**of the גמרא's question: that perhaps an עקירה requires** **דפריך הא עקירה בעי** **requires** **א עקירה**, as opposed to הנחה, is

**משכן מלאכת הוצאה** **from the משכן** **דילפינן ממשכן** **that since we learn out**

**where they would take the articles which they donated from their closets which were 4 טפחים by 4 טפחים** **the required space for an עקירה**

**and would then give it into the hands of the workmen** **which is not 4 by 4.** So there is good reason to distinguish between עקירה and הנחה for that is the way it was in the משכן. There was a מקום ד' by the עקירה and not by the הנחה.

**and according to what I explained previously<sup>3</sup>**

**that we learn out (and) the requirement for a מקום ד' איש ממקומו** **פסוק אל יצא איש ממקומו** **that no man shall take an object out of its place**

**it is also well understood the distinction between עקירה והנחה**, since this פסוק is **concerning עקירה**, for that פסוק is telling us that we cannot remove an object from *its* place (to another רשות), so we are talking about the עקירה, when we say 'from *its* place' thereby requiring a *place* of ד' על ד' for עקירה, but not necessarily for הנחה.

### Summary:

There are three ways to explain why the גמרא assumes that even though a הנחה does not require a מקום ד', according to ר"ע, nevertheless an עקירה may require a מקום ד'.

<sup>1</sup> Even if we were to say that ר"ע holds that אב is תולדה במקום אב, see שבת צז, ב, תוס' ד"ה למימרא, see צז, ב, ד"ה למימרא, where he is חייב אתולדה במקום אב, see צז, ב, ד"ה למימרא.

<sup>2</sup> See #1.

<sup>3</sup> See תוס' ב, א, ד"ה יציאות [הב'] ו' תוס' ד, א, ד"ה והא

ר"י learns that we deduce it from the wording of ר"ע, since he did not say חייב שתיים that proves that he is חייב only for the הוצאה but not for the הכנסה, because there was no עקירה ממקום ד'.

תוספות refutes this proof, and says that: 1) the reason that he is not חייב שתיים is because מקום ד' is because דלא מחייב אתולדה במקום אב and has nothing to do with a מקום ד', or 2) ר"ע really meant חייב שתיים.

תוספות offers two explanations, why עקירה should be different from הנחה.

Either because in the משכן there was a מקום ד' by עקירה and not by הנחה, or alternatively the פסוק requires a מקום ד' only by עקירה and not by הנחה.

### Thinking it over

1. Does not the phrase 'קלוטה כמי שהונחה דמי', itself suggest that this applies mainly to הנחה and not עקירה? Why don't we use this as proof?
2. How do ר"י and תוספות differ in understanding the קשיא, ודילמא הנחה הוא? According to whom is the word 'ודילמא' more appropriate?
3. How can we relate their differences in this תוספות, to the way they learn the גמרא, והא בעינן עקירה והנחה מעל גבי מקום ד' וליכא?
4. How will ר"ע hold regarding a need for a מקום ד' according to the מסקנא?
5. According to תוס', who explains that there is a difference between עקירה and הנחה, why did the גמרא assume originally that both עקירה and הנחה require a מקום ד'?
6. According to ר"י, why did ר"ע differentiate between עקירה and הנחה? Why didn't ר"י use that reason, in the manner that תוספות does?