21.3.5; 38a (משנה ו') → 39a (אפוטרופא לדיקנני לא מוקמינן)

1. וְחָרָה אַפִּי וְהָרַגְתִּי אָתָכֶם בֶּחָרֶב וְהִיוּ נְשֵׁיכֶם אַלְמָנוֹת וּבְנֵיכֶם יְתֹמִים: *שמות פרק כב פסוק כג* 2. וְהַשְּׁבִיעִת תִּשְׁמְטָנָּה **וּנְטַשְׁתָּה** וְאָכְלוּ אֶבְיֹנֵי עַמֶּךּ וְיִתְרֶם תֹּאכֵל חַיַּת הַשְּׁדֶה כֵּן תַּעֻשֶּׁה לְכַרְמְךְּ לְזִיתֶךְּ: שמות *פרק כג פסוק יא* 3. וְקָאם שָׁאוֹן בְּעַמֶּדְ וְכָל מִבְצָרֶיךְ יוּשׁד כְּשֹׁד שַׁלְמֵן בֵּית אַרְבֵאל בְּיוֹם מִלְחָמָה אֵם עַל בָּנִים **רֻשְשָׁה**: הושע *פרק י פסוק יד*

- I משנה ו' extent of care of a פקדון
 - a If: one is watching fruit of another, even if they stand to be destroyed (by mice, for example), may not sell them
 - i Reason
 - 1 ה' כהנא a person would rather a smaller amount that is his than a greater amount of another's
 - 2 "זנב"י. we are concerned that this fruit may have been designated as תרו"מ on other fruit
 - (a) Challenge (to "שומר may not sell it, therefore the owner may make it תרו"מ
 - (b) Answer: since he may not sell it, the owner may be assured it is still there and make it מרר"מ
 - ii Limitation (די יחקן, quoted by מרי:רגב"ת only if they aren't losing the customary tret; else, all agree they are sold
 - 1 *note*: certainly challenges רנב"י; but does it challenge ר' כהנא?
 - (a) Not necessarily: רוצה אדם בקב שלו... may be an exaggeration and he wouldn't extend it to great loss
 - 2 Challenge: therefore owner may make it תרו"מ; what if it exceeded מבל and he sold it → eats טבל
 - 3 Answer: great loss is unlikely;
 - (a) But: if it happens, food is sold to תרומה at הרומה value
 - (b) Challenge: why not answer for רנב"י that we sell to כהנים?
 - (i) Answer: their dispute is whether it is common to have such a loss
 - 1. *דבב"ח* rare; if it happens, it is slow and by that time, בעה"ב will have made it הרנים →sell to כהנים
 - 2. דעה"ב common; it may happen quick and by the time בעה"ב designates, may have been sold
 - a. therefore: may never be sold, as this may lead to mistake and he'll eat טבל
 - (c) challenge: מ"ח forbids selling, even if wine goes sour etc.; חכמים permit selling only to another בפני ב"ד
 - (i) parallel: גבאי אדקה may not make change to himself; גבאי תמחי may not buy excess donated food
 - (ii) note: ruling includes soured wine more than בכדי חסרונן
 - (iii) answer: even "only forbids selling if within limits; (wine (and honey etc.) won't get worse)
 - (iv) dispute: חכמים only concerned about great loss; חכמים even in case of small loss
 - b Dissent: רשב"ג sell in presence of ב"ד and is considered משיב אבדה
 - i הלכה :*רשב"ג* follows הלכה (sell)
 - 1 note: according to some אמוראים, no need to state this, as "יו always follows רשב"ג except אמראים א ציידן, ערב א איידן, ערב
 - ii חכמים follows הלכה .*ד"ג* (don't sell)
 - c suggestion:application of our positions to question of having an heir control land of captive relative
 - i איש would argue that we do in order to save the property (as here, where the מקדון is sold)
 - ii רבנן would argue that we don't as we don't save the פקדון by selling it
 - d disjunct: perhaps רשב"ג would disallow coming down, only allows selling to save entire fruit
 - i and: perhaps רבנן would allow heir to control land, but here, we don't sell as per either 'ר' כהנא's or 'ר' כהנא's reason
 - ii proof: שמואל maintains הלכה כחכמים, yet he allows an heir to control נכסי שבוי
- II Tangent: situations where abandoned property is opened to heir
 - a If captive and we haven't heard he died (if we heard he died, land is opened to heir)
 - i 27. don't allow him to control the land he may destroy it
 - ii שמואל. allow him to control land , since he will be credited like a sharecropper
 - b challenge: interpretation of v. 1 that we don't allow sons to control captive father's property
 - i means they can't sell it, but they may take it over (challenged by ruling of נהרדעא in נהרדעא)
 - c note: this issue is subject to a dispute of תנאים:
 - i if: we heard that someone died, heirs are let on to the property; even if we hear that they are coming, he harvests
 - ii but: נכסי נטושים (abandoned as per v. 2); meaning, we heard of their capture but not death may not control
 - 1 Dissent: רשב"ג these are treated the same (may control)
 - iii And: נכסי רטושים (as per v. 3) abandoned (we don't know whereabouts of owner) seizor is removed from land
 - 1 Note: we credit them like אריס (must be in re: רשב"ג s opinion, that שבויים::נטושים but not completely)
 - 2 Parallel: as we do when a man works his minor wife's land expenses credited like a sharecropper
 - iv Note: שמים לכולם includes case of someone who fled due to threat to his life from authorities; מיד appoints trustee to finish harvesting his field, but then allows heir to control land
 - 1 But: we don't appoint trustee permanently, as we only appoint such trustees for minors