

And let us say, that it is hers

ואימא לדידה –

OVERVIEW

The גמרא seeks to derive the rule that כסף קידושין belongs to the father from the פסוק of כסף אין כסף. ויצאה חנם אין כסף. The (seemingly) extra phrase of כסף אין teaches us that כסף לאדון זה however כסף לאדון אחר referring to the father. The גמרא challenges this inference; perhaps the כסף לאדון אחר merely means that there is an exchange of כסף when she leaves her father's רשות, but not necessarily that the כסף goes to the father, perhaps it goes to the daughter. כסף אין כסף of פסוק asks why, if the כסף goes to the daughter, is the כסף necessary at all.

asks: תוספות

ואם תאמר הא על כרחך לא איצטריך קרא אלא לומר שהן לאב –

And if you will say; but perforce you must say that the פסוק of 'כסף אין' is not necessary for any other reason except to teach us that the כסף קידושין belongs to the father; it cannot be merely teaching us כסף קידושי –

דהא דמקדשה בכסף גמר קיחה קיחה משדה עפרון¹ –

For the rule that a woman becomes מקודשת with כסף we already derived that through the קיחה קיחה גז"ש from שדה עפרון. The only purpose of the פסוק אין כסף would (seemingly) be to teach us that the כסף קידושין belongs to the father.² The question therefore is how can the גמרא ask that the monies should belong to her?!

answers: תוספות

ויש לומר דמכל מקום מיתורא לא נאמר שהן של אב אם אין משמעות דקרא³ –

And one can say; that notwithstanding the above, (just) from the fact that the פסוק of כסף אין is superfluous, that is not sufficient to derive that the כסף קידושין belongs to the father, unless it is also indicated in the פסוק.

responds to an anticipated question:⁴ תוספות

דלקמן במסקנא אמרינן דהני תרי קראי צריכי:

¹ See 'Thinking it over'.

² Without כסף אין one would assume that the כסף belongs to the בת, for she is being מקודשת. The fact that there is an extra פסוק teaches us that it is taken from the בת and given to the father (who is the אחר אדון).

³ In order to teach us such a novel idea that the כסף קידושין (of a נערה; who is a גדולה) belongs to the father, a superfluous פסוק is insufficient. It is also necessary that it be (somewhat) indicated in the (extra) פסוק.

⁴ The following follows the explanation of the מהרש"א (based on the תוספות in ואימא לדידה). See also מהר"ם and מהר"ש for alternate explanations.

For (only) later⁵ in the conclusion⁶ of this discussion does the גמרא state that these two פסוקים are necessary. However before we know the מסקנא that we can derive קידושיה לאביה from the דקרא משמעותא דקרא, we would not have assumed that the קידושיה לאביה alone can teach us that יתורא דקרא.

SUMMARY

We cannot utilize a יתורא דקרא in order to take money from one party and assign it to another. It is necessary for the פסוק to indicate this transfer.

THINKING IT OVER

כסף קידושי from קיחה קיחה.⁷ Why does תוספות asks that we already know כסף קידושי from קיחה קיחה?⁹ assume⁸ that that אמר רב ר"י agrees to the קיחה קיחה תוספות

⁵ ד,ב. The גמרא there states if the תורה would have only written קיחה קיחה (and not ויצאה חנם) we may have thought that the קידושין belongs to her, therefore the תורה writes ויצאה חנם to teach us that the קידושין belongs to the father. This would seemingly indicate that we derive קידושין לאביה from the additional פסוק of ויצאה חנם (as תוספות maintained in the question). See following footnote # 6.

⁶ The גמרא later on ד,א explains how the משמעותא דקרא of ויצאה חנם וגו' teaches that קידושיה לאביה (and not merely דקרא דקרא).

⁷ See footnote # 1.

⁸ See ד"ה ותנא, רש"י ד,ב, who seems to be saying that there is a מחלוקת from where we derive כסף קידושי.

⁹ נה"מ.