

## **בא זה ולימד על זה – This one comes and teaches about the other**

### **OVERVIEW**

The גמרא cited a ברייתא which stated that ויצאה חנם refers to ימי בגרות and אין refers to ימי נערות. The גמרא asked; it should only state נערות (that she leaves her master when she is a נערה) and it will not be necessary to mention בגרות (which comes after נערות); for she will already have been freed (by נערות). The גמרא answered ע"ז בא זה ולימד. Therefore both (ויצאה חנם and אין) are necessary. תוספות explores the necessity of both phrases.

פירוש<sup>1</sup> אי לא כתב אלא חד הוי מוקמי ליה בנראה יותר דהיינו בגרות<sup>2</sup> –

The explanation of the answer ע"ז בא זה ולימד is; if only one of the phrases were written (whichever one) we would have established it to refer to the more probable case which is בגרות. Therefore the תורה wrote two phrases, that even if one will be referring to בגרות, the other will perform be referring to נערות.

תוספות asks:

ואם תאמר ולמה לי ויצאה חנם ללמוד על אין כסף –

אין כסף And if you will say; and why is ויצאה חנם necessary to teach that כסף refers to נערות -

הא על כרחין לא הוה מצינן לאוקמי אין כסף בבגרות אלא בנערות –

For even without חנם, ויצאה, perforce we could not establish כסף to refer to בגרות, but only for נערות -

דהא מיניה דרשינן לעיל אבל יש כסף לאדון אחר ומנו אב<sup>3</sup> –

For previously we derived from כסף אין that 'however there is כסף for the 'other' master', and who is that, the father -

אם כן על כרחין האי קרא איירי בנערות –

Therefore perforce this פסוק of כסף אין (which teaches אחר (יש כסף לאדון אחר) must be discussing נערות -

דאילו בבגרות אין האב זכאי בקדושין דכיון שבגרה אין לאביה רשות בה –

For at the age of בגרות the father has no right in her קידושין, for since she became a בוגרת, her father has no authority over her.

<sup>1</sup> רש"י ד"ה בא.

<sup>2</sup> The purpose of ויצאה חנם וגו' is to teach us that an אמה is freed from her master even before the six year period of servitude is completed. It is logical to postpone that time to the latest possible date (for we are depriving the owner from the services of this אמה). It would seem appropriate that it should refer to בגרות when a woman becomes completely independent from her father (see וכן ד"ה ג, ב תוספות) and [therefore] also from her master.

<sup>3</sup> The דרשה of כסף אין כסף וכו' אבל יש כסף לאדון אחר teaches us that the כסף קידושין belongs to the father.

To summarize: **אין כסף** teaches us that the **קידושין** of a daughter belong to the father.<sup>4</sup> This obviously is not referring to a **בוגרת**, for a **בוגרת** has no **רשות** over a **בוגרת**. It must be discussing a **נערה**. Why then is **ויצאה חנם** necessary to teach us that **אין כסף** refers to **ימי נערות**, when the **דרשה** of **אחר** **יש כסף לאדון** teaches us that we are discussing **נערות**. There is (seemingly) no need for the **תורה** to write **ויצאה חנם**; **אין כסף** alone is sufficient to teach us that she is **ימי נערות**!

answers: תוספות

ואומר הר"ם<sup>5</sup> **דאי לאו ויצאה חנם** –

**And the ר"מ answered that if not** for the **פסוק** of **ויצאה חנם** –

**הוה מוקמין אין כסף ויתורא דיו"ד דאמר רבינא<sup>6</sup> חד לנערות וחד לבגרות**

**We would have established** (the two **דרשות**, namely) the **פסוק** of **אין כסף** and **נערות** and the extra **יו"ד** which **רבינא** mentioned, one of them to refer to **נערות** and the other to refer to **בגרות** –

**ודרשה דאין כסף לאדון זה לא הוה דרשינן<sup>7</sup> להכי איצטריך ויצאה חנם:**<sup>8</sup>

**And we would not have made the דרשה of אין כסף לאדון זה, etc.; therefore ויצאה חנם is necessary.**

## SUMMARY

If not for **ויצאה חנם** we would interpret **אין כסף** and the extra **יו"ד** for **נערות** and **בגרות**. **אין כסף לאדון זה וכו'** of **דרשה** and we would not know the **נערות** and **בגרות**.

## THINKING IT OVER

It appears from **תוספות** if there would be no **ויצאה חנם** we would utilize the two **פסוקים** for **נערות** and **בגרות**. Why could we not have said that the extra **יו"ד** in **אין כסף**, teaches **אין כסף לאדון זה וכו'**, which would force us to assign **אין כסף** to **נערות**, since by **בגרות** the **קידושין** cannot belong to the father? Why the preference for **נערות** and **בגרות** over **אין כסף לאדון זה וכו'**?

<sup>4</sup> This (seemingly) can be derived from the extra **יו"ד**. See 'Thinking it over'.

<sup>5</sup> Others interpret this to mean **ר' מאיר** (the son-in-law of **ר' מאיר** and the father of the **רשב"ם**). This however seems unlikely. It may be referring to others including (but not limited to) **ר' מאיר מרוטנבורג**, **ר' מאיר משפירא**, **ר' משה מאיברא**, **ר' משה מקוצי**.

<sup>6</sup> **אין כסף** taught previously (on this **עמוד**) that the **יו"ד** of **אין כסף** is superfluous it could have said **אין כסף**.

<sup>7</sup> The reason we have the **דרשה** of **אין כסף לאדון זה וכו'** is because **אין כסף** is superfluous, since it already states **ויצאה חנם** (see **ויצאה חנם**). However if there would be no **ויצאה חנם** (as **תוספות** asked), then there would be no **דרשה** of **אין כסף לאדון זה וכו'**, but rather the words **ויצאה חנם** and the extra **יו"ד** would be needed to teach us that an **אמה** is **נערה**, for one of them alone (say **אין כסף**) would only teach us that she is **בגורה**.

<sup>8</sup> Now we have two extra **לימודים**; **אין כסף** is extra since it already states **ויצאה חנם** and the **יו"ד** is extra. One of them teaches that she is **נערה** (for **בגרות** we already know from **ויצאה חנם**) and the other teaches us that **אין כסף לאדון זה וכו'**.