**ותו איבדה למה לי – And furthermore why** state **‘she lost it’**

Overview

The ברייתא states: 'איבדה כתובתה הטמינה כתובתה נשרפה כתובתה', in all these cases she collects her כתובה with עדים. According to רב פפא we interpreted איבדה to mean נשרפה. The גמרא asked several questions on this assumption. The first was 'היינו נשרפה' and the third was 'ותו איבדה למה לי'. Our תוספות differentiates between these two seemingly identical questions.

------------------

תוספות anticipates a question:

**אף על גב דלכאורה היינו פירכא קמייתא דפריך היינו נשרפה -**

**Even though that seemingly this** question of 'איבדה למה לי' **is the same as the first question that** the גמרא **asked:** that איבדה **is the same as נשרפה.** What is the difference between the first question 'היינו נשרפה' and this question 'ותו איבדה למה לי', they seem to be the exact same question. Both questions are seemingly asking that if איבדה means נשרפה, then why does it say both איבדה and נשרפה.

תוספות responds:

**יש ליישב דהכי קאמר ותו אפילו אם נאמר דנשרפה הוי פירושא דנאבדה[[1]](#footnote-1) -**

**It can be answered, that this is what** the גמרא **is asking** in the last question, **and furthermore;** meaning **even** **if we assume that 'נשרפה' is the interpretation of 'נאבדה'**; this may seem to answer the first question, that it is necessary to state נשרפה in order to explain what was meant by נאבדה. Nonetheless even if we agree that the first question is answered by assuming that with נשרפה that תנא is explaining what he meant by [[2]](#footnote-2)נאבדה –

**מכל מקום תקשי איבדה למה לי:**

**Nevertheless it is** still **difficult why we need** to say **איבדה,** and then explain that it means נשרפה, when the תנא could have said just נשרפה and not mentioned נאבדה at all.

Summary

The first question היינו נשרפה may be answered that נשרפה is explaining נאבדה, but the last question is, merely say נשרפה so there will be no need to explain נאבדה.

Thinking it over

How can תוספות even assume that נשרפה explains נאבדה,[[3]](#footnote-3) if the case of הטמינה separates them?![[4]](#footnote-4)

1. See ‘Thinking it over’. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Occasionally a תנא may find it necessary to use a certain word, and then be required to qualify it. The third question may be why is it necessary to use the word איבדה (and then explain it). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See footnote # 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. See מהר"ם שי"ף. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)