

How do we know bringing in; it is logical, etc. – הכנסה מנלן סברא הוא כולי –

OVERVIEW

The גמרא asked (after we derived הוצאה from a פסוק), from where we know that the הכנסה is a מלאכה, and answered that it is logical. Our תוספות has a difficulty with this question and answer.

תוספות asks:

ואם תאמר מה צריך להאי סברא כיון דהוות במשכן כדאמר¹ הם העלו קרשים לעגלה כולי -

And if you will say; why is this reasoning required, since the הכנסה was in the משכן, as it states in the ברייתא, 'they lifted the beams onto the wagon, etc.' so also you should not bring from the רה"ר into the רה"י. The fact that the הכנסה was in the משכן should be sufficient to consider it a מלאכה without the סברא of עיולי מה לי אפוקי מה; now תוספות proves it -

דהא בסמוך משמע גבי זריקה² דאם היתה במשכן הוה אתי ליה שפיר³ -

For from the גמרא shortly it seems regarding throwing (מרשות לרשות), that if it was in the משכן we would have properly derived that it is a מלאכה!

תוספות answers:

ויש לומר דבזריקה נמי איכא סברא מה לי על ידי הוצאה מה לי על ידי זריקה⁴ -

And one can say; that also by זריקה there is the סברא; what difference is it whether he is taking it out or throwing it (out) –

תוספות clarifies a point:⁵

דאי לאו סברא לא הוה מחשבינן לה תולדה דהוצאה -

For if not for the סברא (that it is similar to הוצאה) we would not have considered

¹ לעיל מט"ב.

² See זריקת ד' אמות is (and which תוספות is referencing here) בסמוך גמרא which the זריקה מהרש"א is מה לי ע"י הוצאה מה; namely; the הכנסה as there is by סברא similar to זריקה [for by that זריקה מרה"י לרה"ר (not ברה"ר) לשון הזהב]. See however זריקה.

³ [This is now assuming that by זריקה there is no סברא that it is (very) similar to הוצאה, as there is by הכנסה. (This is all the more understood according to the מהרש"א (see footnote # 2) that we are discussing זריקת ד"א ברה"ר where there is seemingly no connection between הוצאה and זריקת ד"א.] Nevertheless all that was needed to consider it a מלאכה is the fact that it was in the משכן. The question is that since by הכנסה we know it was in the משכן, why do we need the סברא (of עיולי ומה לי אפוקי ומה לי עיולי) to consider it a מלאכה?

⁴ סברא is retracting his previous assumption that there is no סברא comparing זריקה to הוצאה (for there is a סברא comparing זריקה to הוצאה). According to the מהרש"א (see footnote # 2) we will need to say that זריקת ד"א is comparable to הוצאה for he is being מוציא from his own רשות (for each person has ד"א). See 'Thinking it over' # 1.

⁵ It would seem from our גמרא (alone) that we know that the הכנסה is a מלאכה for it is similar to הוצאה, and we would know that זריקה is a מלאכה if it would be in the משכן, so it appears that either being similar to הוצאה, or being in the משכן should be sufficient to consider it a מלאכה. However תוספות is saying that both are required; why is that?

הוצאה of תולדה as a (הכנסה or) זריקה

ואי לא הוות נמי במשכן לא הוה מחייבין עלה מסברא לפי שמלאכה גרועה היא:

But if הכנסה/זריקה was not also in the משכן we would not hold him liable just based on a סברה, since it is a מלאכה גרועה.⁶

SUMMARY

הוצאה, just like זריקה, has a סברא that compares it to הכנסה.

THINKING IT OVER

1. The מהרש"א explained that there is a סברא that ד"א ברה"ר is similar to הוצאה (for he is being מוציא from his רשות of ד"א).⁷ However, how can we explain the חיוב for מעביר ד"א ברה"ר; in this case he is never leaving his רשות for he is taking his רשות with him as he walks; why should it be חייב?!⁸

2. תוספות writes that in order to become a תולדה of הוצאה it requires a סברא, and also that it was in the משכן.⁹ Why therefore is הזורק מרשות לרשות a תולדה of הוצאה; where was it in the משכן?!¹⁰

⁶ הוצאה, since it is a מלאכה גרועה, requires that it be written in the תורה to establish it as a מלאכה (besides being in the משכן), and in order for הכנסה (and potentially זריקה) to be considered as a תולדה it requires a סברא (like לי אפיקי וכו') and also needs to be in the משכן. [See תוס' ב"א ד"ה פשט] See 'Thinking it over' # 2.

⁷ See footnote # 4.

⁸ See מהרש"א הארוך אות ד.

⁹ See footnote # 6.

¹⁰ See מהר"ם בד"ה (בא"ד) דא'.