

TosfosInEnglish.com

done separately (בשתי העלמות ובמזיד); the advantage of this approach is -

דהשתא¹⁰ על כרחך טעמא דרבי יהודה לאו משום דמחייב אתולדה במקום אב¹¹ -

That now (if they were done separately) perforce the reason why ר"י is מחייב -
מחייב אתולדה במקום אב is not because he is שתיים

אלא משום דאבות נינהו:

But rather because שו"מ are אבות.

SUMMARY

The refutation that we cannot prove that ר"י is מחייב אתולדה במקום אב is that the case of שו"מ is by two העלמות and מזיד. They argue for which אב are we מתרה him

THINKING IT OVER

seemingly has two questions, one on the הו"א of מאי לאו וכו' and the other on the מסקנא of להא לחודה וכו'.¹² However it appears that תוס' wanted to erase only the הלשון מיושב¹³ regarding the הו"א it was merely מיושב, but no erasure is required. Why the difference?¹⁴

¹⁰ If the dispute between ר"י ורבנן is in a case where they were done אחד בהעלם, we can debate what are the reasons of ר"י. We can say they are arguing whether one is מחייב אתולדה במקום אב (the רבנן no and ר"י yes), or we can say that they argue whether שו"מ are אבות (ר"י) or not (רבנן). There is nothing conclusive. However once we establish their dispute בשתי העלמות (and in a מזיד case), the only rational explanation of their argument is whether שו"מ are אבות (ר"י) or not (רבנן). Now our גירסא is correct; in the הו"א we assumed it was בהעלם אחד therefore one can (possibly) prove that ר"י is מחייב אתולדה במקום אב, and the מסקנא is that it was בשתי העלמות (and במזיד) in which case it is impossible to say the reason for חיוב according to ר"י has anything to do with אב מחייב אתולדה במקום אב.

¹¹ It is not a תולדה במקום אב. In this case all agree (even the רבנן) that he is חייב שתיים, since it was done בשתי העלמות.
See footnote # 5.

¹² See footnote # 6.

¹³ See footnote # 7.

¹⁴ See לשון הזהב.