18.04.09 40b (משנה דבר הכל) → 42a (משנה דבר הכל)

> 7. כָּי כֹה אָמָר ה' בּוֹרֵא הַשָּׁמֵיִם הוּא הָאֱלְהִים יֹצֵר הָאָרֶץ וְעשָׁה הוּא כוֹנְהָה **לֹא תהוּ בְרָאָה לֶשֶׁבְת יִצְרְה** אֲנִי ה' וְאֵין עוֹד:ישעי*תו מה, יח* 2. וְאִישׁ כִּי יִשְׁכָּב אָת אִשְׁה שִׁרְבַת זֶרַע וְהוֹא שִׁפְחָה נְחֵרֶבֶת לְאִישׁ **וְחִפְדֵּה לֹא נִבְּדְתָה אוֹ חָפְשָׁה לֹא נִמְן לָה** בְּלֶּב בְּלֶב הְבְּיִר הָשְׁה יִיקרא י*ט, כ* 3. כִּי יִקָּח אִישׁ אִשָּׁה וּבְעֵלָה וְהָיָה אָם לֹא תִמְצָא חֵן בְּעֵינְיו כִּי מְצָא בָּה עָרְוֹת דָּבָר **וְכָחֵב לֹף, סְפָר כִּרְיחִת** וְנְתַן בְּיֶרָה וְשִׁלְּחָה מִבְּיתוֹ ב*ִרִים כֹּר, א*

- משנה דב: the עבד marked for collection
 - a if an עבד was made an אפותיקי אפותיקי ($\upsilon\pi o\theta\eta\chi\eta$: assigned collateral for collection) and was freed
 - i properly: the slave owes nothing
 - ii however: שטר and *he* writes a שטר for the slave's value
 - 1 Dissent: מטר *he* writes nothing, the "liberator" writes the שטר (and owes the money)
 - iii The players:
 - 1 משחרו" (doesn't consider the 2nd "master" to be a "משחרו", therefore the 1st master must be the one to write the שט"ח
 - (a) שחדר. the 1st owner (i.e. the borrower) freed him
 - (b) properly: the slave owes nothing, since חמץ, הקדש ושחרור trump שעבוד
 - (c) however: so מלוה won't seize עבד to write אט"ח and עבד writes שט"ח for his value (lost to מלוה)
 - (i) dissent: the slave doesn't write it, rather the משחרר (borrower) writes it
 - (d) crux of dispute: if someone damages another's חייב, is he תייב yes; רכמים no)
 - 2 עולא. (doesn't consider the 2nd "master" to be "רבר")
 - (a) שחדר the 2nd master (the lender)
 - (b) properly: the עבד isn't obligated in מצוות (since the lender never owned him to liberate him)
 - (c) however: since he's already known as a freeman, we force the 1st owner to free him and the עבד writes a שט"ח for the surplus (beyond the debt)
 - (i) dissent: the liberator (2nd master) writes a שט"ח for the surplus value of the slave (above the debt)
 - (d) crux of dispute: whether intangible damage is דיס היוק שאינו ניכר) רשב"ג (היוק שאינו ניכר) יוֹד it is; די it is;
 - b more on the אפותיקי: if someone assigns a field for collection and it's flooded
 - i if: he merely assigned it, the lender may collect from other property (but not for מתובה, according to רשב"ג
 - ii *however*: if he said "you may only collect from here", the rights to collection are lost
- II משנה ה': the ½ עבד, ½ חורין
 - a ב"ה he works for himself every other day, for his master every other day
 - b ב"ש that leaves him unable to marry (contra v. 1) rather, we force the ½ master to free him ב"ה agreed)
- III Efficacy of freeing ½ a slave:
 - a רבי valid (½ is freed)
 - b חכמים invalid (nothing is freed)
 - i frame of dispute:
 - 1 בכסף only if freed by שטר (but if freed בכסף, all agree that it is valid)
 - (a) כסף: עטר works halfway, so does כסף works halfway, so does שטר
 - (b) אשה::עבד to equate אשה; just as an אשה cannot be ½ divorced, so too an עבד (freed via שטר)
 - (c) suggestion: dispute revolves around preference for היקש or מיש or היקש (לה::לה) (לה::לה)
 - (i) rejection: all prefer גז"ש
 - (ii) rather: this עבד could be challenged an אשה can never be divorced via עבד, unlike an עבד
 - 2 בשטר) כסף only if freed by בשטר) בשטר all agree that it is invalid)
 - (a) challenge: explicit dispute about freeing ½ a slave בשטר
 - (i) possible 2nd challenge: implication that they agree about כסף
 - (ii) אייסף. perhaps they disagree about both and dispute about שטר was taught to demonstrate the extent of רבי's position (which is preferable to show as רבי')
 - 3 challenge(s): v. 2 indicates that may be somewhat freed via יסס, extended to יעטר via יעטר via לה::לה vv. 2-3)
 - (a) extended: to ½ free via שטר through חופשה ← חופשה (חופשה)
 - (b) *analysis*: this works with רבי (after his adjustment) ברייתא authored solely by רבי (who allows ½ freedom via both mechanisms);
 - (i) $\it however$: according to רבה, the רישא is consensus and the רבי (שטר) is רבי
 - (ii) response: indeed the דברי הכל and the סיפא is only רבי
 - (iii) perhaps: רבי will have to assign our משנה exclusively to רבי
 - 1. defense: case could be 2 owners, where even רבנן will agree that freeing ½ is valid