21.4.10
52b (ונותנה למע"ש) → 53b (אימא לא קלטו ליה מחיצות - קא משמע לן)

1. וְכִי יִרְבֶּה מִמְּךָ הַדֶּרֶךְ **כִּי לֹא תוּכַל שְׁאֵתוֹ** כִּי יִרְחַק מִמְּךָ הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר יִבְחַר ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְשׂוּם שְׁמוֹ שָׁם כִּי יְבָרֶכְךָ ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ: *דברים פרק יד פסוק כד*
2. **וַיִּשָּׂא מַשָּׂאת** מֵאֵת פָּנָיו אֲלֵהֶם וַתֵּרֶב מַשָּׂאַת בִּנְיָמִן מִמַּשְׂאֹת כֻּלָּם חָמֵשׁ יָדוֹת וַיִּשְׁתּוּ וַיִּשְׁכְּרוּ עִמּוֹ: *בראשית פרק מג פסוק לד*

I Analysis of last clause of משנה ו': use of "deficient coin" for חילול מע"ש – "because he is nothing but a miser"
- a *Implication*: someone who is overly selective when it comes to accepting coins is called נפש רעה
  - i *Qualification*: this holds as long as the coin is technically acceptable
- b *Support (for חזקיה's ruling)*: if he wants to redeem מע"ש on change from the coin, redeem as per its real value;
  - i *But if*: he wants to redeem on the entire coin, מחללה ביפה (assumed meaning – as if it were a complete coin)
  - ii *Challenge*: חזקיה rules that we don't treat redemption of מע"ש lightly:
    - 1 *חזקיה*: if he has מע"ש worth less than ש"פ, he may use coins already used for חילול in order to redeem the fruit along with the חומש (estimate liberally in favor of מע"ש)
    - 2 *Answer*: interpretation of מחללה ביפה: we redeem generously (to מע"ש), devaluating the deficient coin slightly due to its deficiency, so that we don't act liberally twice (accepting the deficient coin and overvaluing it)

II *Tangent*: Reevaluating חזקיה's ruling about פדיון מע"ש בפחות מש"פ (may redeem on coins already used for חילול מע"ש)
- a *Challenge*: ביכורים ב:א – differences between תרומה/ביכורים and מע"ש (all stringencies of the former as against the latter)
  - i *"Eaters"*- מיתה בידי שמים (if במזיד); fine of חומש (if eaten בשוגג), as a result of being forbidden to non-כהנים
  - ii *Ownership*: property of כהן for personal use (e.g. קידושין)
  - iii *Nullification*: 1/101
    - 1 *Implication*: מעשר is nullified ברוב (since this must be a leniency of מע"ש; if it doesn't require 1/101 →בטל ברוב)
      - (a) *Further*: we have an explicit ruling that מע"ש is nullified ברוב –
        - (i) *Case*: where the fruit is worth less than ש"פ…
          - 1. *Challenge*: if we accept חזקיה, חילול is always a possibility→it is דשיל"מ, never בטל (even 1/1000)
            - a. *Answer*: might be a case where he didn't redeem any other fruit (no "first coins" available)
          - 2. *Challenge*: bring other מע"ש and combine them
            - a. *Answer*: מעשר מה"ת ("new" מע"ש) cannot combine w/ מעשר מד"ס (mix, which is בטל ברוב מה"ת)
          - 3. *Challenge*: bring some מע"ש של דמאי (which is מד"ס) and combine with our mix
            - a. *Answer*: concern that next time he'll bring מע"ש which is certain (not דמאי) \
          - 4. *Challenge*: bring 2 פרוטות, redeem some on 1.5 and the "mix" on the remaining .5
            - a. *Answer*: 1 attaches to 1 פרוטה; other doesn't attach at all (פחות מש"פ) → מה"ת w/מד"ס
          - 5. *Challenge*: bring איסר (8 פרוטות) and redeem מע"ש worth less than איסר (leaving room for the mix)
            - a. *Answer*: concern that next time he may use פרוטות
        - (ii) *Case*: …or if it came through ים and left
          - 1. *Challenge*: why not bring it back in?
            - a. *Answer*: in this case, it had become טמא
            - b. *Challenge*: redeem it anyway, as per ר"א (vv. 1-2) who allows פדיון of מע"ש שנטמא – even in ים
          - 2. *Rather*: must be something bought with כסף מע"ש
            - a. *Challenge*: that may also be redeemed (מע"ש ג:י)
              - i. *Answer*: follows ר' יהודה who states (ibid) that it must be buried (no חילול)
              - ii. *Challenge*: according to ר"י, no need for יצא; even if it was נטמא בים must be buried
          - 3. *Rather*: must be still טהור; "יצא" means that the walls fell down
            - a. *Challenge*: רבא ruled that מחיצות enabling eating is מה"ת, but "holding" – מד"ס
              - i. *And*: it stands to reason that they didn't extend this גזרה when the walls fell
              - ii. *Rejection*: they didn't distinguish and if the walls were up when entering, נקלט
        - (iii) *Variant read (ר' ששת)*: it is 1 case – מע"ש<ש"פ that went into ירושלים and יצא
          - 1. *Challenge*: why not bring it back to eat
            - a. *Answer*: walls fell
            - b. *Challenge*: why not redeem, as per רבא (above); answer as per לא פלוג (above)
          - 2. *Challenge*: why note פחות מש"פ; in this case, even more than ש"פ cannot be redeemed
            - a. *Answer*: greater חידוש; if פחות מש"פ, we would think that there is no קליטת מחיצות – קמ"ל
  - iv *טהרה*: require נט"י, cannot be eaten before nightfall (on last day of טומאה, after טבילה); i.e. forbidden to טבו"י

 © Yitzchak Etshalom 2016