

It was also stated, etc.

איתמר¹ נמי כולי –

OVERVIEW

The גמרא initially cited a ברייתא where רבי taught that a person is חייב only if he does the entire מלאכה unassisted. Then the גמרא continues with a statement by גמרא בר that agrees with the ברייתא. Our תוספות explains the need and purpose of such a supportive statement.

asks: תוספות

תנימה דמייתי סייעתא משמעתא לברייתא –

It is astounding that the גמרא should bring support from a statement of - ברייתא to אמוראים

ובפרק קמא דקדושין (דף ו,א) פריך יהודה ועוד לקרא² –

For in the first פרק of קדושין, the גמרא challenges; 'is the custom of יהודה necessary as an addition to the פסוק!'

replies: תוספות

ויש לומר דנזרקה מפי חבורה דקאמר היינו חבורה של תנאים –

And one can say that when רחב"ג stated, 'it was uttered from the mouth of the study group'; he meant a חבורה of תנאים (not the אמוראים of his generation).

offers an alternate solution: תוספות

ורבינו יצחק תירץ משום דברייתא דלעיל לא מתניא בי רבי חייא ורבי אושעיא³:

And the ר"י answered that the assistance from אמוראים is warranted since the previous ברייתא (of ר' אומר מעם הארץ בעשותה וכו') was not taught in the academy of ר"ה ור"א. Therefore it lacked sufficient authority on its own. It was subsequently supported by the חבורה of אמוראים.⁴

¹ The term איתמר (it was stated) indicates that the statement following was made by אמוראים (ים) as opposed to תניא (or תנן) which refers to statements by תנאים in a ברייתא (or a משנה respectively).

² The גמרא there ruled that if a man said to a woman את חרופתי, is she is מקודשת, since we find in a פסוק (ויקרא [קדושין] יט,כ in והיא שפחה נחרפת לאיש (as it is written קידושין in regards to חרופה. The גמרא continues with an additional reason חרופה לארוסה חרופה; and furthermore in יהודה an ארוסה is referred to as a חרופה. The גמרא challenges this additional reason as unnecessary, saying, ויהודה ועוד לקרא, is it necessary for the custom of יהודה to support the פסוק. Similarly here, once we have a ברייתא there is no need for support from אמוראים. See 'Thinking it over' # 1.

³ See ברייתא which was – כל מתניתא דלא תניא בי ר"ה ובי ר"א משבשתא היא כו' ר' זירא where חולין קמא,א,א. See 'Thinking it over' # 2.

⁴ See (gloss in margin and) 'Thinking it over' # 2.

SUMMARY

The *ברייתא* of רבי was supported by a *חבורה* of *תנאים* (not *אמוראים*). Alternately the *ברייתא* of רבי required support (from the *אמוראים*) since it was not taught in the academies of *ר' חייא ור' אושעיא*.

THINKING IT OVER

1. *אמוראים*⁵ asks why the *ברייתא* of רבי requires support from the *אמוראים*. Perhaps the *אמוראים* are teaching us that this *מיעוט* (of *בעשותה*) is not the exclusive view of רבי (and others argue with him), but rather that this *מיעוט* has been universally accepted!

2. There is a gloss at the end of *תוספות* (cited in the margin)⁶ which refers us to a *תוספות* in *ואיבעית* ד"ה *ב"ב סא,א ד"ה ואיבעית*. There the ר"י states that the problem in *קידושין* with bringing the proof from *יהודה* is because the word '*ועוד*' was used (indicating that it is an equal proof as the *פסוק*), however when there is no *ועוד* used then we can bring additional proofs even if they are inferior to the initial proof. How can we reconcile (the ר"י in) that *תוספות* with (the ר"י in) our *תוספות*?⁷

⁵ See footnote # 2.

⁶ See footnote # 4.

⁷ See *פני אברהם*.