31.1.9; 10b (איתיביה לא רצה לפדותו) → 11b (ברשותיה דכהן קאי)



- (b) Support (רבא): our משנה rules that you may redeem with גדול וקטן
 - (i) *Rejection*: perhaps it means a healthy one (small) or at least worth more קמ״ל
- 4 Practicum: סלע generous gives 1 סלע, stingy 1 סלע (1/2 שקל) normal is רגיא (3/4)
- (a) Note: contradiction resolved: if he asks, we tell him 3/4; if he doesn't ask, any amount is sufficient
- e כהן the value of the donkey זייל if someone has no lamb to use he may pay the value of the donkey
 - i *Author*: must be ר' יהודה) ר' rules that the only (שה is via a שי)
 - r, identified contradiction we always rule like ר״, over איז, and our סתם משנה follows ר״, follows ר״,
 - 1 *But*: ר״ל rules like ר״ש
 - 2 *Rather*: even ר' יהודה would agree with פ״ח ;ר״ל isn't more limited than הקדש
 - (a) שה: is a leniency for the owner
 - (b) *Note*: ר׳ נחמיה would redeem מ״ח with boiled vegetables (at value)

ii

ii

- f מי"ח the redemption is valid לי"ח if someone redeems a fellow's רמי the redemption is valid
 - i *Question*: does the donkey belong to the owner or the redeemer?
 - 1 Note: according to ר"ש, obviously belongs to owner (since it was always מותר בהנאה)
 - 2 But: according to ר"י is it akin to הקדש (per v4* belongs to redeemer)
 - (a) Or: since he acquired it with the incremental value over the שה, it is dissimilar from הקדש,
 - if someone steals פ״ח, he pays כפל to the owners even though he doesn't own it now he may later
- 1 *Must be*: ר"ש (per הקדש, he owns now); isn't like הקדש, else v5 and its implied exclusion of הקדש would apply; QED Continued analysis of משנה ד משנה ג
- a If: he had two חמורות מבכרות and they had 2 males →2 kids to כהן; M&F or 2M&F→1 kid to כהן; 2F&M/2M→1 kid, keeps
- b If: he had one מבכרת and one non-מבכרת and they had 2 males→1 kid to כהן; M&F→1 kid, keeps
- c Source: v1 may be lamb/goat, male/female, big/small, בעל מום/תמים
- d And: he may reuse the מע"ב ceturns it to him) and it goes into corral for מע"ב and if it dies may get הנאה
 - מע"ב going into corral can't be the one given to כהן; since a bought or gifted animal is exempt from ברייתא
 - 1 *Must be*: ישראל who had 10 ספק פ״ח he has to designate 10 kids, allot מע״ב and he keeps them
 - 2 שראל 10 ישראל ו פ״ח had 10 ישראל if שראל if פ״ח had 10 ישראל grandfather, who got from his ישראל grandfather
 (a) *He must*: designate 10 מע״ב allot מע״ב and he keeps them
 - 3 *Parallel*: ישראל with piled אול שנא which he got from grandfather כהן, which he got from grandfather ישראל (a) *He must*: separate הרו״ and then may keep them
 - 4 Justification: if we only learned ruling re: מ״ח, since the kid is already separate from the 9 others –
 (a) But: in case of the געל, it's all mixed in and מתנות שלא הורמו כמי שלא הורמו למי

 - (a) *But*: since the שה is distinct, maybe he has to give it to צריכא כהן
 - ii תרו"מ if someone buys piled טבל from a non-Jew; must separate תרו"מ but he may keep them
 - 1 *Question*: who did מירוח? If the non-Jew did, then דגנך and not his מירוח is liable (→exempt)
 - (a) *Rather*: the Jew must have done מירוח under his watch
 - (i) Therefore: he separates מעשר, because אין קנין לגוי בא"י להפקיע
 - (ii) But: he keeps them, since he can argue that he comes from ownership of a non-accessible defendant
- e *דמאי ג:ד* if someone enrusts his fruit to a כותי, they are assumed not to switch (vis-à-vis מעשר ושביעית)
 - i *But*: if he entrusts it to a non-Jew, it is treated like his own (the non-Jews)
 - 1 דמאי it is treated like דמאי
 - (a) גייא all agree that he must separate; dispute is whether he owes it to כהן (or may keep it)
 - (i) *הת״ק*. the non-Jew certainly swapped them *-*רד*מ*, must give to כהן, must give to
 - (ii) דמאי *:ר"ש*
 - (b) אב״ only due to שנק if we knew that he switched them, all would agree that it is לכהן.
 - (i) *Challenge*: ruling of ר' חנינא (above)
 - (ii) *Possible answer*: the dispute is only in re תרו"ג, but all agree that he keeps תרו"מ
 - (c) *ריב"ל* if someone buys piled אררו" from a non-Jew, it is exempt from *הריב"ל*, per v6
- f Analysis of last clause: if the שה dies, he may get הנאה
 - Can't mean: if it died in כהן's house, that he may get הנאה (too obvious)
 - 1 Rather: it died in owner's house and the כהן may benefit also פשיטא מאטא
 - 2 Justification: until it gets to the כהן, he doesn't have קמ״ל זכייה, at moment of designation, belongs to כהן