

קא סלקא דעתין בצררי קשיא לחזקיה -

We assumed it was bundles; this is a difficulty for Chiz'keyoh

Overview

חזקיה maintains that even though there is a requirement to take out the entire object into the other רשות to be חייב, nevertheless if one is carrying out a utensil which contains many small items and some of these items were completely in the other רשות, one is חייב even if the utensil itself is not completely in the other רשות. He maintains אגד כלי לא שמיא אגד. The גמרא challenged חזקיה from the ברייתא of קופת (basket) which contradicts חזקיה [if we were to assume that the קופה contained many small bundles]. תוספות explains why in the ברייתא we are assuming that it was צררי, even though in the משנה (which also mentions קופה), we already stated (according to חזקיה) that it was filled with long vegetables which were not completely in the other רשות).

ואלימא ליה ממתניתין משום דסתם קופת הרוכלים אית ביה צררי -

And there is a stronger indication in the ברייתא than in the משנה that we are discussing צררי, because presumably a peddler's basket contains small bundles -
וכן משמע מדקתני ובה מינין הרבה¹ -

And it is so indicated, since the ברייתא reads, 'and in it (in the קופה) there were many types' of merchandise, seemingly indicating many small bundles -

ומשני באורנסי ובה מינין הרבה² אורחא דמילתא נקט וכל המינין ארוכים:

And the גמרא answered there were long stalks of spices; and when the ברייתא stated he merely mentioned that which is common by a peddler, but all the types were long, not as we had assumed that they were small bundles.

Summary

It is more likely that a קופת הרוכלין (especially one with מינין הרבה) would have צררי, than a regular קופה.

¹ See the המוציא וכו' ובה מינין who (based [presumably] on this תוספות) changes the גירסא in our גמרא to read, (המוציא וכו' ונתנה וכו' הרבה) instead of (המוציא וכו' ונתנה וכו' הרבה). The ברייתא seemingly had no reason to mention מינים הרבה, everyone knows that in a קופת הרוכלים there are different items for sale; we must therefore conclude that it meant that there were many items which were so small that they were already in the other רשות before the entire קופה was taken out. This is the חידוש of the ברייתא that nevertheless he is פטור. This contradicts חזקיה. See 'Thinking it over'.

² תוספות is responding to the inference which was made previously in footnote # 1. There was no real purpose in mentioning מינין הרבה (since we are discussing long items), nevertheless the תנא mentioned it as אורחא דמילתא.

Thinking it over

1. According to our גירסא in the גמרא, where ובה מינין הרבה is not mentioned, how would we explain why the גמרא asks from קופת הרוכלין (after we established the משנה [of קופה שהיא מליאה פירות] by long vegetables)?
2. Can we say (not like the³ מהרש"ל) that the גירסא (even according to תוספות) is like our גמרא (without ובה מינין הרבה) and when תוספות writes ובה מינין הרבה he is paraphrasing the end of the ברייתא, which states פ' שרוב מינין בחוץ, which lends itself to mean that most of items were already outside?

³ See footnote # 1.