20.10.5

114b (משנה ג') → 115a (משנה מנרשאה) → 115a (משנה ג')

- I משנה ג': recovering stolen property
 - a If: someone recognizes his goods in another's hands,
 - b And: there was a report of his items being stolen
 - c Then: the holder can testify how much he paid, and the victim can pay him and recover his items
 - d However; if there was no such report, he has no such power; we assume he sold it to another and this fellow bought it
 - e Question: why does the report of a theft justify his action; perhaps he manufactured the report to recover the sold item
 - i Answer (כדב): if there was exacting testimony of people in his house who found the route taken by the thiefs who had earlier lodged with the נגזל
 - 1 Challenge: רב maintains that someone who comes through מחתרת is exempt from paying he "earned" the theft by risking his life
 - 2 Answer: only true about someone who burrows into the house; these people came in properly as his "friends"
 - (a) Note (נרבא): this demand is only true in case of בעה"ב who regularly sells his household items;
 - (i) However: if he doesn't usually sell, since there is a general report of theft in his house, that is sufficient
 - f Related discussion: if the גוב is recognized afterwards,
 - i בעה"ב :*רב* goes directly to גנב
 - ii בעה"ב בי יוחנן goes after the buyer
 - 1 Resolution #1 (ר' ייסף): all accept ר' חסדא 's ruling about ייאוש
 - (a) If: there was no ייאוש at the time of sale, בעה"ב goes to buyer, seizes his property, and the גוב sues the גוב
 - (b) If: there was already בעה"ב, ייאוש goes directly to the גנב and the buyer is out of the picture (keeps the item)
 - (c) Challenge (מביי): in case of מתנות כהונה which are always considered כהן suggests that the כהן suggests that the מפפs after the גולן
 - (i) Answer: טבח's ruling there is that the סבח may also go after the טבח in addition to buyer teaching that מתנ"כ fall under rubric of מזילה
 - 2 Resolution #2 (אביי): dispute is whether to accept ר"ח's ruling about אביי): rejects ר"ח
 - 3 Resolution #3 (ד' זביד): dispute is in case ייאוש happened after purchase;
 - (a) אויאוש happens after sale, no בעה"ב goes after בעה"ב goes after גנב
 - (b) ד' יוחנן. the order is insignificant; if there is ייאוש and קנה שנוי רשות
 - 4 Resolution #4 (כ' פפא): whether we apply בעה"ב (and בעה"ב must pay לוקח to retrieve item)
 - (a) なた doesn't apply
 - (i) Challenge: חנן בישא student, applied חקנת השוק to a case of חנן בישא
 - (ii) Defense: in his case, he had nothing with which to pay treated as if we didn't identify
 - 1. Note: תקנת השוק says תקנת השוק doesn't apply to a well-known thief
 - a. But: חנן בישא was well-known? (answer well-known as a bad guy, not as a thief)
 - (b) תקנת השוק :*ד' יוחנן* applies
 - g Limitations of תקנת השוק.
 - i If: the thief used the theft to pay back a loan or credit no תקה"ש
 - גנבה says to מלווה you didn't lend him/give credit based on the גנבה
 - ii If: he used the גנבה as collateral for a smaller loan there is תקה"ש
 - 1 But: if it was an even amount
 - (a) תקה"ש חקה"ש (people generally don't lend for a collateral of same amount)
 - (b) מר זוטרא; there is הלכה תקה"ש
 - iii If: he sold it for fair market price תקה"ש applies
 - 1 But: if he sold it for a greater price
 - (a) תקה"ש no ר' ששת.
 - (b) הלכה it applies הלכה (applies in all cases except using to pay back loan/credit)
 - iv story: רבינא's father-in-law was owed money by someone, who paid him back with a גובה's father-in-law was owed money by someone, who paid him back with a גובה's father-in-law was owed money by someone, who paid him back with a גובה's father-in-law was owed money by someone, who paid him back with a גובה's father-in-law was owed money by someone, who paid him back with a גובה's father-in-law was owed money by someone, who paid him back with a גובה's father-in-law was owed money by someone, who paid him back with a גובה's father-in-law was owed money by someone, who paid him back with a גובה's father-in-law was owed money by someone, who paid him back with a גובה's father-in-law was owed money by someone, who paid him back with a גובה's father-in-law was owed money by someone, who paid him back with a supplied by the then lent him another sum; when he was identified:
 - 1 מקה"ש מדבינא attaches to first sum; 2nd sum must return גנבה to owner and collect from them
 - 2 בחן perhaps 2nd sum was given on trust and owners can collect without paying at all (הלכה ד' אבהו)
 - v Story: man from מחוזאי stole book, sold to פפונאי for 80, who sold to מחוזאי for 120
 - אביי : owner collects book from מחוזאי, paying him 80; מחוזאי goes to מפנאי for other 40
 - (a) Challenge: תקה"ש if we have אולה with one purchaser, certainly with two
 - (b) Rather: collect and pay 120 to מחואי then go to פפונאי for 40 and original גנב for 80