

ומה אילו עבד כהן שברח ואשת כהן שמרדה על בעלה כולי –

And what if by an עבד כהן who escaped and an אשת כהן who rebelled against her husband, etc.

OVERVIEW:

The גמרא continues its explanation of ר"מ that שחרור is a חוב for עבד, since he can run away and still eat תרומה. However ר"מ also includes אשת כהן that she can eat תרומה even if she rebels against her husband. תוספות explains why it was necessary for ר"מ to discuss אשה where everyone agrees that גט is a חוב for her.

לכך מזכיר אשת כהן כלומר כמו שאתם מודים לי באשה שהוא חוב אודו לי נמי בעבד - אשת כהן mentions אשת כהן, meaning that just as you admit to me regarding an אשת כהן that גט is a חוב for her, so too should you admit to me regarding עבד that it is a חוב for him, since they both lose the תרומה rights.

והא דמסיים נמי אבל באשה חוב הוא לה הכל מדברי רבי מאיר¹ מדלא קאמר² אמרנו לו: And that which the ברייתא also concluded, 'אבל אשה חוב הוא לה' (but by a woman it is a חוב for her), it is all a continuation of ר"מ's argument, since the ברייתא did not interject the words אמרנו לו (we said to him [to ר"מ]) before the words of אבל אשה, as the ברייתא interjected previously each time a different party made a statement.

SUMMARY

עבד by the אשה it is similarly a חוב by ר"מ argued that just as it is a חוב

THINKING IT OVER

According to תוספות that ר"מ made the argument of 'אבל באשה וכו'; why does it say 'אבל', which (seemingly) indicates that אשה is different from עבד?³

¹ The גמרא knew that ר"מ was comparing an עבד to an אשה since in the original ברייתא (on יב,ב) it clearly states: אבל אשה חוב הוא לה וכו'; indicating that ר"מ was referring to אשה in his argument as תוספות explains here.

² תוספות rejects the notion that אבל אשה was said by the רבנן to differentiate אשה from עבד [see on רש"י], as תוספות proves that it cannot be the רבנן since the ברייתא did not insert אמרנו לו as it did the previous times.

³ See סוכ"ד אות ב and רש"י ש.