הא תו למה לי היינו רישא –

Why do we also need this; it is the same as the רישא

Overview

רב פפא establishes the ברייתא that there are עדים שנשבו and there is an עד אחד who says exactly the opposite of what she says.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # |  | היא אומרת | ע"א אומר | היא | חברתה |
| 1 | רישא דרישא | אני טמאה וחברתי טהורה | את טהורה וחברתך טמאה | טמאה | טהורה |
| 2 | סיפא דרישא | אני טהורה וחברתי טמאה | את טמאה וחברתך טהורה | טמאה | טהורה |
| 3 | רישא דסיפא | אני וחברתי טמאה | את וחברתך טהורה | טמאה | טהורה |
| 4 | סיפא דסיפא | אני וחברתי טהורה | את וחברתך טמאה | טמאה | טהורה |

The גמרא asks two questions on רב פפא; the first one (which our תוספות references) is that we can derive #3 (רישא דסיפא) from #2 (סיפא דרישא). Then the גמרא asks that we can derive #4 (סיפא דסיפא) from # 1 (רישא דרישא). Our תוספות explains why the first question (from סיפא דרישא) was not asked from רישא דרישא as was the second question.

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

תוספות asks:

ואם תאמר ואמאי לא קאמר הכא מרישא דרישא כדקאמר בסמוך –

And if you will say, but why did not the גמרא ask here (on #3) from the רישא דרישא (#1) as the גמרא asks shortly (on #4).

תוספות explains how #3 can be derived from #1(as well as from #2):

דהא שמעינן מרישא דרישא דאיהי שויתה לנפשה חתיכה דאיסורא[[1]](#footnote-1) –

For we know from the רישא דרישא that when she says אני טמאה she is אסורה since she made herself into a ‘forbidden piece’ -

וחברתה משתריא אפומא דידה –

And we also know from #1 that חברתה is permitted based on her testimony (that וחברתי טהורה) even though there is an ע"א who testifies that חברתה טמאה -

וכל שכן דמשתריא אפומא דעד אחד[[2]](#footnote-2) –

So certainly (in #3) חברתה will be טהורה based on the testimony of the ע"א (who says חברתה טהורה) even though she says וחברתי טמאה. The question is that the גמרא could (should) have said that #3 is superfluous for we know it already from #1 (רישא דרישא) as the גמרא shortly states regarding the question on #4.

תוספות answers:

ויש לומר דהכא ניחא ליה למנקט סתמא דהיינו רישא –

And one can say; that here the גמרא is satisfied to state generally that the teaching of #3 is the same as the רישא (without being specific as to which part of the רישא) -

משום דמרישא נמי שמעינן[[3]](#footnote-3) דחברתה משתריא אפומא דעד אחד[[4]](#footnote-4) –

Because from (#2) the (סיפא ד)רישא we can also derive that חברתה is טהורה based on the testimony of an ע"א (as we can also derive this from (#1) the רישא דרישא) -

אבל בסמוך לא מצי פריך אלא[[5]](#footnote-5) מרישא דרישא:

However shortly the גמרא cannot ask on #4 only from (#1) the רישא דרישא, therefore the גמרא states specifically מרישא דרישא.

Summary

Case #3 can be derived from either case #1 or #2; however case #4 can only be derived only from case #1.

Thinking it over

תוספות states that if the אשה is מהימן (when she says אני טמאה וחברתי טהורה [#1]) then certainly the ע"א is נאמן (when she said אני וחברתי טמאה and the ע"א says חברתה טהורה [#3]).[[6]](#footnote-6) Seemingly in #1 since the woman initially says חברתי טהורה she has the נאמנות of שתים (for at the time of her testimony no one is contradicting her), however in #3 once the woman said חברתי טמאה and the ע"א says חברתה טהורה, he is מוכחש from the אשה so perhaps he will not be believed.[[7]](#footnote-7)

1. Therefore similarly by #3 where she says אני [וחברתי] טמאה she is also טמאה since שויתה לנפשה חתיכה דאיסורא (even though there is an ע"א who says that she is טהורה) as in #1. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The testimony of an עד כשר is better than the testimony of an אשה. See ‘Thinking it over’. See however תו"י who states: וי"ל דס"ד דהיא מהימנא טפי מע"א לפי שנשבית עמה יודעת יותר. [‘And one can say that we may have thought that she is believed more than an ע"א, for since she was in captivity together with חברתה she knows more than the ע"א’.] Therefore we could not derive #3 from # 1 (only from #2). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. תוספות does not address how we derive that she is believed to say טמאה אני (even though an ע"א contradicts her and says טהורה) since שויא אנפשא חתיכא דאיסורא. We cannot derive this from #2 (where she says טהורה אני) only from #1 (where she admits that אני טמאה). Perhaps תוספות assumes that this ruling of שויא אנפשא חתיכא דאיסורא is so obvious (and known) that we do not need to derive it from elsewhere (even though previously תוספות said that we derive שויא אנפשא וכו' (in #3) from #1 [see footnote #1]) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Seemingly תוספות is answering that when the גמרא asks הא מרישא שמעינן (generally, without being specific whether it means רישא דרישא or סיפא דרישא) that is because indeed the question is from either one (but not that it excludes the רישא דרישא). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. We cannot derive that וחברתי טהורה נאמנת (even against an ע"א) except from רישא דרישא (for in the other two cases she is claiming וחברתי טמאה). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. See footnote # 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. See אהבת ציון. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)