

ותסברא והא רבה אית ליה דרבא –

And do you really think that this is so?! But רבא agrees with רבא

OVERVIEW

The term 'ותסברא' in the גמרא is generally used to refute a given proof; particularly in a case where it is clear that the text cited for the proof needs to be amended regardless of the proof. It seems that in some texts the term ותסברא was inserted to precede the question of 'והא רבה אית ליה דרבא'. However, רש"י and תוספות both agree that the term ותסברא should not be in the text.

לא גרסינן ותסברא כדפירש בקונטרס -

We do not read 'ותסברא' in the text as רש"י explains.¹

ובסמוך דקאמר אלא רבי שמעון בר אבא איניש אחרינא הוה בהדיה -

And shortly when the גמרא concludes; ‘however, we must say that concerning רשב"א there was another person with him’ -

לא גרסינן אלא דאינו בא לסתור תסתיים² -

The text should not state: 'אלא – however', for the intent of the question and answer was not to refute the proof that ריב"ל is the one who maintains לשמה.

למסקנת הגמרא offers an additional proof that the 'תסתיי' is valid

ובסמוך נמי קאמר הא מדרבי יהושע בן לוי סבר לפי שאין בקיאין לשמה וכולי:

And shortly the גמרא will also say, ‘that since ריב"ל maintains the reason for saying בפ"נ is because אין בקיאות לשמה etc.’ It is obvious that the גמרא accepts this proof that ריב"ל is of the opinion of אין בקיאות לשמה.

SUMMARY

The word **וְהָאֱלֹהִים** does not precede the question **וְהָאֱלֹהִים**.

THINKING IT OVER

How can there be a גירסא of ותסברא?³

¹ See רש"י ד"ה ותסברא stated דביאין לשמה וכו' indicating that בפ"נ was instituted because of לשמה like רבה.)

² The term 'א'ל' in the גמרא indicates that we are now retracting our previous opinion and are offering a new opinion. In our situation, however we are not rejecting the original hypothesis that ריב"ל follows the opinion of רבה; this still remains valid. 'ש'אין בקיאין לשמה' ריב"ל states clearly. The question "והא רבה וכו'" was merely to clarify the details of the story.

³See תפארת יעקב.