



A publication of the Rabbinical College of Australia & New Zealand

www.rabbinicalcollege.edu.au/Shiurim    shiurim@rabbinicalcollege.edu.au

שבת דף ב' עמוד א'

## יציאות השבת

Why does the תנא of our משנה use the term יציאות, and not the seemingly more accurate term הוצאות?

### ➤ The approach of תוספות

תוספות (in ד"ה יציאות) asks why the תנא of our משנה uses the term יציאות, which means “going-outs”. Instead, the תנא should have used the more accurate term הוצאות, which means “carrying-outs”. This word would seem preferable since the עני and the בעל הבית themselves are not going out. Rather, they are making the item go out.

תוספות answers that the תנא prefers using terminology similar to that which is employed in the פסוק from which the הוצאה of איסור is derived; the פסוק of איש ממוקמו.

The problem is that תוספות seems to merely deflect the question from the משנה to the פסוק. However, the פסוק itself remains difficult! Why does the פסוק use the term אל יצא (“do not go out”), and not the seemingly more accurate term אל יוציא (“do not make go out”)?

(a) In עירובין (דף י"ז ע"ב on), the גמרא discusses whether the פסוק of אל יצא teaches the איסור of הוצאה or the איסור of תחומין. The שיטה of תוספות (in עירובין) is that all agree that the פסוק of אל יצא teaches the איסור of הוצאה, and the אמוראים only argue about whether this פסוק teaches the איסור of תחומין **as well**. Now, according to the opinion that it is talking about the איסור of תחומין as well, we can answer that the פסוק needed to use the term אל יצא, for only then can it be interpreted as referring to both דינים. I.e. the פסוק can be read “do not go out of your place – the תחום שבת”, from which we would derive the איסור of תחומין. The פסוק can also be read “do not go – with a כלי – out of your place – the רשות היחיד”, from which we would derive the איסור of הוצאה. However, had the פסוק said אל יוציא (“do not make go out”), it could only be interpreted as teaching a דין about הוצאה, and the דין of תחומין could not be derived.

(b) in תוספות שבועות (עמוד 1) distinguishes between הוצאה performed by walking and הוצאה performed by (standing still and) stretching out one's hand.

The פסוק is talking about people carrying out a receptacle for the collection of מן; it is a case of הוצאה performed by walking. Accordingly, the פסוק accurately uses the expression אל יצא (“do not go out”) as opposed to the expression אל יוציא (“do not make go out”). Thus, the פסוק was never a problem to begin with. Only our משנה was questionable, for it discusses הוצאה which is performed by (standing still and) stretching out one's hand, and it would have seemed more accurate to use the term הוצאות (“carrying-outs”) as opposed to the term יציאות (“going-outs”).

☞ **The approach of רש"י and other ראשונים**

The approach of תוספות fits well with their שיטה in ע"ב; that the פסוק of אל יצא is definitely teaching the איסור of הוצאה – even according to those who maintain that it teaches the איסור of תחומין as well. However, many ראשונים maintain that the פסוק cannot be talking about both, and the argument between the אמוראים in עירובין is whether this פסוק talks about the איסור of תחומין and not the איסור of הוצאה, or whether this פסוק talks about the איסור of הוצאה and not the איסור of תחומין.

It is worthy to note that when רש"י (in the משנה) brings a source for the מלאכה of הוצאה, he quotes the פסוק ... וַיִּצְוּ מֹשֶׁה וַיַּעֲבִירוּ ... אֶל יַעֲשׂוּ עוֹד מְלָאכָה ... וַיִּפְּלֵא הָעָם מִהִבֵּיא פסוק. He makes no mention of מִמְּקוֹמוֹ. This is the basis of a מחלוקת regarding the opinion of רש"י:

- (a) Some ראשונים maintain that רש"י embraces the view that the פסוק of אל יצא talks about the איסור of תחומין and not the איסור of הוצאה. This is either because he accepts this to be the conclusion of the גמרא in עירובין, or because he wants to explain the משנה even according to that opinion<sup>2</sup>.
- (b) The פני יהושע suggests that רש"י might agree that the פסוק of אל יצא is talking about הוצאה, but he does not mention it here is because it is not the main פסוק<sup>3</sup>.

One explanation for this is that the פסוק of אל יצא in and of itself could equally be referring to the איסור of הוצאה or the איסור of תחומין. The only reason we conclude that it is talking about the איסור of הוצאה and not the איסור of תחומין is because we have proof from the other פסוק (of וַיִּצְוּ מֹשֶׁה וַיַּעֲבִירוּ גו') that הוצאה is forbidden.

Furthermore, the פסוק of אל יצא only indicates that הוצאה is forbidden, but not that it is a מלאכה, with all of its associated consequences. Based on this פסוק alone, one could have thought הוצאה is nothing more than an איסור לאו, punishable by מלקות. [In fact, according to the opinion that תחומין is forbidden מדאורייתא, it is nothing more than an איסור לאו, punishable by מלקות.] Therefore, רש"י quotes the פסוק of וַיִּצְוּ מֹשֶׁה וַיַּעֲבִירוּ גו' ... אֶל יַעֲשׂוּ עוֹד מְלָאכָה ... וַיִּפְּלֵא הָעָם מִהִבֵּיא פסוק, for it proves that הוצאה is a מלאכה.

[This also explains something else: Immediately after bringing the פסוק of וַיִּצְוּ מֹשֶׁה וַיַּעֲבִירוּ גו', we see that רש"י goes on to discuss the consequences of transgressing the איסור of הוצאה. What is the connection? The answer is that since רש"י brought the פסוק of וַיִּצְוּ מֹשֶׁה וַיַּעֲבִירוּ גו' to prove that הוצאה is a מלאכה and not just an איסור לאו, it makes perfect sense to specify the practical applications of this immediately afterwards.]

In any case, according to a number of ראשונים, and perhaps רש"י as well, it emerges that the פסוק of אל יצא is not necessarily talking about הוצאה at all. Accordingly, we cannot explain that the תנא regards יציאות as an expression of the פסוק of מִמְּקוֹמוֹ, for that פסוק is not talking about הוצאה at all!

These ראשונים would possibly agree with the תוספות of סברא (in רבא (הב') ע"ב ד"ה רבא) that this question (why the תנא used the term יציאות and not הוצאות) is what prompted רבא to state (at the

<sup>1</sup> This is the explanation of הגהות ר"א גוטמאכר.

<sup>2</sup> This is the explanation of פני יהושע.

<sup>3</sup> The reason why two פסוקים are necessary will be explained in a forthcoming Shiur.

end of 'ב' (עמוד ב') that יציאות means רשויות. According to רבא, the תנא said יציאות and not הוצאות, because he meant רשויות<sup>4</sup> and not הוצאות.

☞ **In light of קבלה and חסידות**

The אריז"ל explains that "שתיים שהן ארבע" refers to the four-letter Name of ה' – the הוי"ה שם.

שתיים refers to the first two letters which form the main part of the הוי"ה שם, and which themselves are a Name. [This is also why the גמטריא of ה"א equals 26 – the same גמטריא as the four letters of the הוי"ה שם.]

ארבע refers to all four letters of the הוי"ה שם.

The Rebbe adds that is why the תנא of the משנה begins with the words יציאות השבת, for their ראשי תיבות are the first two letters of the הוי"ה שם.

What does this all mean? It is well known that the שם אלקים is the Name of ה' associated with nature. During the six days of creation, the תורה mentions only the שם אלקים. However, on שבת, the תורה states "ויכל אלקים", which can be interpreted as "the שם אלקים stopped". This is because שבת is associated with the higher הוי"ה שם, which transcends creation. [This is also why the era of משיח is called שבת, because then, more than ever, the הוי"ה שם will be revealed.]

This ties into what was explained in Shiur 3; that שבת in general, and the מלאכה of הוצאה specifically, affirms that the entire world is unified with ה', and submits to His singular reality. This is emphasized with the הוי"ה שם, which transcends creation.

<sup>4</sup> וצ"ע דלכאור' יש להקשות לאידך גיסא למה קתני יציאות ולא קתני רשויות או עכ"פ מוצאות או תוצאות.