22.4.2

i

62a (אין פחות מששה עשר) → 63a (אין פחות מששה עשר)

- I Interpreting the terms of the שטר מכר boundaries
 - a *27*, if he wrote a long boundary on one side and a shorter one on the other side only gets the smaller area
 - *challenge (ר' אסי and ר' אסי)*: why doesn't he get a diagonal (from edge of longer boundary to edge of smaller)? (silent) 1 note: מסוב agrees in case where there are 4 adjacents owners; A & B on N, C & D on S, and he wrote long
 - and short, he intended a diagonal (else, could have written A and C)
 - b if: A abuts his property on N & S, and B abuts on E & W, must write "both sides of A", "both sides of B"
 - i else: he'll only get a diagonal cut
 - c *questions*: if he only marks the corners, describes a Gamma (Γ) or identifies every other adjacent owner, does he get entire area? **πrqι**
 - d *if*: He marks 3 boundaries, not the fourth
 - i 27. gets everything but the land of the fourth boundary
 - ii שמואל. gets all
 - iii קוא אסי gets only a strip of land adjacent to each of the three marked boundaries
 - 1 *reason*: he accepts רב's principle, that the owner has withheld something; and rules minimally
 - iv *ruling (רבא*): follows רב
 - 1 *Version 1*: only if 4th boundary sits apart from land
 - (a) *And*: has a row of trees and 9 קבין of planting area
 - (i) Implication: if included within land, even if it has a row of trees etc. all is included in sale
 - 2 *Version 2*: if 4th boundary is within land, all included
 - (a) *But*: only if it doesn't have a row of trees and 9 קבין of arable land
 - (i) *Implication*: if not included within boundaries, even if it doesn't have trees etc. *ex*cluded
 - 3 General implication: nothing is withheld from field
 - 4 And: if inside boundary and has no row of trees etc. included
 - 5 And: if outside of boundary and has row of trees etc. excluded
 - (a) Split the difference: if inside with row, or outside without depends on versions of רבא
 (i) Ruling: שודא דדיני (judges should determine intent of seller)
- II רבה: interpreting meaning of seller's designation (if seller is a 50% owner of land)
 - a *if he writes*: "the half that I own in the land" 50% of entire plot
 - i *but if he writes: "half of what I own" 25% of entire plot (half of his holding)*
 - 1 *challenge* (*אביי*): why the distinction?
 - (a) אביי was silent אביי assumed that he had retreated from his position
 - (b) but: שרות later saw שטרות from ב"ד a that indicated same (50 or 25%, depending on wording)
 - *if he writes*: "the land from which half has been cut off", buyer gets half (away from boundary)
 - i *but if he writes:* "the land from which a piece has been cut off", buyer gets 9 קבין (furthest from boundary)
 - 1 *challenge (אבי*): why the distinction?
 - (a) $\mathit{Onlookers:}$ assumed that אביי meant that both should always be half
 - (b) *Correction:* אבי meant that either wording would grant half if he wrote "with these boundaries";
 - (i) *But*: if he doesn't write the boundaries, either wording grants only 9 קבין (minimal "field")
 - c Related analysis: if a שכ"מ says "A shall share my property", obviously he gets 50%
 - i *But:* if he says "A shall take a portion of my property" how much should he be given?
 - ii Answer (from סומכוס: if he gives a portion of the cistern he gets ¼ of the בור
 - 1 But: if he stated "give him a portion for his..."
 - (a) barrel: he gets 1/8
 - (b) *pot*: he gets 1/12
 - (c) *drinking cup:* he gets 1/16
 - (i) application: most ראשונים understand that these שיעורים are unique to the cistern/water case and we use ¼ as the basic model of "portion"
 - (ii) however: הלכות זכיה ומתנה יא:ז) rules that we use smallest שיעור here (1/16) as model

h