

That he picked it up in order to -¹ להוציאו ונמלך hide it and he reconsidered and took it out

Overview

The גמרא attempted to explain the reason why the חייב is גונב כיס בשבת והוציאו, and we do not say the חייב, is because the first הגבהה was not for the purpose of הוצאה, but rather להצניעו. Therefore the חייב גניבה began first (by the initial הגבהה), while the חייב שבת began later when he decided to take it out. תוספות clarifies the גמרא's explanation.

תוספות asks:

ואם תאמר וכיון דסלקא דעתיה השתא דמיחייב אהך הוצאה² -

And if you will say; but since the גמרא now assumes that he will be liable for such a הוצאה (even though he picked it up להצניעו and not להוציאו) -

אם כן הדרא קושיא לדוכתין דצורך הוצאה היא³ -

Therefore the initial question (goes back to its place) remains that the initial עקירה is necessary for the הוצאה -

תוספות answers:

ויש לומר דסלקא דעתין הא דנמלך והוציאו הוי עקירה שניה:

And one can say that the גמרא assumed that this act where he reconsidered and took it out, is considered a second הנחה, and therefore the חייב גניבה came before the חייב שבת. The initial הגבהה was not הוצאה צורך. The initial הגבהה was not הוצאה צורך.

Summary

The act of נמלך can be considered as a second עקירה.

Thinking it over

If we assume now that the נמלך is an עקירה שניה, so what is the חידוש of this דין?⁴

¹ In our גמרא the text reads עליו והוציאו (not להוציאו).

² We must be discussing a case where there is a חייב, since the ברייתא states סקילה איסור חייב.

³ The case is where he did not rest between the original עקירה (which was להצניעו) and the ultimate הוצאה (for if he made an actual הנחה, it is obvious that he is חייב for the גניבה, since the הגבהה for the גניבה ended when he made the הנחה, and is not connected at all to the הוצאה [see "Thinking it over"]. Therefore looking back we can argue that the only way he is חייב for the הוצאה is because of the initial עקירה/הגבהה, we should therefore say that הוצאה צורך and he should be פטור.

⁴ See footnote # 3 (in the parenthesis).