

And here they said שודא is preferable

וכאן¹ אמרו שודא עדיה –

OVERVIEW

The ברייתא, regarding the case where a gift was sent and the intended receiver passed on, states that one may do as he pleases. Later the גمرا explained this ruling, that the maintains שודא will offer two interpretations.

מכאן מדקדק רבינו תם דאין לפרש שודא כמו שפירש בكونטרס בפרק הכותב (כתובות מה,ב) –
רש"י as שודא here, that we do not interpret it in R"t
- פרק הכותב

גבי² שניהם קרובים שניהם שניהם תלמידי חכמים שודא דעתני –
Regarding the case where both of them were relatives, both of them were neighbors, or both of them were T"ch in which case the rule is שודא דעתנא, and explained there³ –

זהינו שידדק הדין את מי היהओהב יותר ולמי היה בדעתו ליתן –
That means that the judge should scrutinize and find out whom did the grantor love more and to whom was the grantor's intent to give it (and the דין should award it to that party) -

וכאן נמי פירש בكونטרס⁴ כמו המתם –

And here too explained as he did there in כתובות Rash"i.

The ר"ת however infers from this, not like – רש"י

אלא יתן הדין למי שירצה כי הכא דאמר מה שירצה שליח יעשה⁵ וקרי ליה שודא:
But rather that means that the **should give it to whomever he wants, just like here where** the ברייתא states, ‘**the שליח should do whatever he wants**’, and the גمرا refers to this option as שודא, indicating that the דין (or in this case the שליח), may disburse the funds as they see fit.

SUMMARY

¹ In ד"ה וכואן, see בבל.

² The case there is where someone granted his estate to a person with a specific name, and there were two people with the same name. We assume that he meant to give it to his relative, or his neighbor, or to a scholar (as opposed to anyone else with the same name). The question arises where both people were equal (they were either the same relative, neighbor or scholar). The גمرا rules there, שודא דעתני.

³ בד"ה שודא.

⁴ ד"ה שודא and רש"י ד"ה מה.

⁵ See ‘Thinking it over’.

רשות' maintains that שודא requires a judgment call by the דין as to who was the intended receiver, while the ר'ת maintains that the דין has free rein by שודא.

THINKING IT OVER

proves from our גמרא that since we refer to the *shliah*'s doing what he wishes, as שודא, this indicates that שודא has no connection to evaluating the intent of the giver.⁶ However רשות' interprets the phrase מה שירצה *shliah* יעשה to mean how the *shliah* assesses the intent of the giver. How can we disprove this interpretation (besides [merely] stating that the obvious explanation of מה does not lend itself to a "sh" explanation)?⁷

⁶ See footnote # 5.

⁷ See תפא"ג.