

19.01.06

7b (כגון דנפיק על ידי הדחק) → 8a (בעי רבא שתי בנותיק)

1. אם עוד רבות בשנים לפיהן ישיב נא לתו מקסוף מקנתו: ויקרא כה, נא

- I Analyzing the פרוטה – 3 hypothetical questions – all unresolved (תיקו)
- a רבא: if he said (to a father of קטנות/נערות) “I’m מקדש your 2 daughters with a פרוטה”
- i lemma1: we look at the קנין from the perspective of the donor and donee – and we have a פרוטה
- ii lemma2: we look at the קנין from the perspective of the מתקדשות – and there is less than a פרוטה for either
- b ר' פפא: if he said (to the father of a קטנה/נערה) “your daughter and cow for a פרוטה”
- i lemma1: did he mean “each for a ½ פרוטה” – invalid
- ii lemma2: did he mean “your daughter for the פרוטה and the cow via משיכה” – valid
- c ר' אשי: if he said “to the father of a קטנה/נערה” – “your daughter and land for a פרוטה”
- i lemma1: did he mean “each for a ½ פרוטה” – invalid
- ii lemma2: did he mean “your daughter for the פרוטה and the land via חזקה” – valid
- II שומא – the possible requirement to determine the value of the vehicle for קידושי כסף
- a story: a man offered קידושין with some silk
- i דבה: no need for an appraisal
- ii ד' יוסף: must be appraised
- 1 version 1: disagreement only in a case where he declared them to be worth X and they were worth X
- (a) reason: if he didn't declare a value – she accepted them at “face value”
- (b) and: if he declared a value (“X”) and they were worth less – מקח טעות
- (c) positions:
- (i) דבה: since they were worth the declared value – no need
- (ii) ד' יוסף: since a woman isn't typically familiar with these values, she doesn't rely on it
- 2 version 2: disagreement even if he doesn't declare a value
- (a) positions:
- (i) שווה כסף: just as כסף has a clear, set amount, so too with שווה כסף
- (ii) Argument1: v. 1 – עבד עברי – buying his way out –
1. note: he may use שווה כסף (as per ישיב) but produce and vessels are excluded
2. case: שווה כסף has value (ש"פ >) but they weren't appraised → not considered שווה כסף
3. counter (רבה): can't be transferred a la תבואה וכלים (i.e. חליפין) (i.e. חליפין)
- a. Block: ר"נ already ruled that פירות can't be used for חליפין – so what's excluded
- b. Rather: case is where the מטלטלין were worth < ש"פ
- i. סד"א: since the seller gets immediate benefit (e.g. fruit) he'll accept at < ש"פ – קמ"ל
- (iii) argument2: from rule of הבן פדיון
1. if: a man gives an item (e.g. animal, clothing) to כהן without specifying an amount – לא פדוי
2. but if: he declares it to be worth 5 שקלים – valid
- a. case: must be where it was worth 5 – but without appraisal/declaration – invalid
- b. counter: it may have been worth less, but if it has subjective value to כהן – כהן valid
- i. support: רב כהנא accepted a (less expensive) turban – to him it was worth טלעים
- ii. Note: only applies to people (like רב כהנא) who, due to their station, need a סודר
- III קידושי כסף and partial payments
- a ר"א: if he offered a מנה (דינר 100) and gave her a קידושין-דינר are valid immediately and he owes her the rest
- i reason: the “100” should be seen as a condition (and all ע"מ are understood as מעכשיו)
- ii challenge: if he said “100” and was counting it out, even at the final דינר, either can back out
- 1 answer: in that case, he said “this מנה (100 דינר)”
- 2 block: the סיפא of that ברייתא invokes מנה זו; implying that the רישא was מנה (w/o זו)
- 3 defense: the סיפא is explaining the רישא
- (a) support: else, סיפא is tacit, since if מנה סתם doesn't work, certainly זו מנה
- (b) block: perhaps the סיפא is coming to clarify that the רישא, even though it's מנה סתם, is still invalid
- 4 alternate answer (רב אשי): counting it out is different; they intend the full amount (and can back out until then)
- 5 note: ברייתא invoked copper דינר (invalid) and “bad דינר” (valid, but he must exchange it)
- (a) Definition of “bad דינר”: if it can't be used at all (no one will accept it) should be same as “copper”
- (i) Rather: it can be used in exigencies (most merchants won't accept it)