

## אבל לקט דממון ידידה הוא - However, gleanings, which is his money

### Overview

כרם רבעי stated that the case of לקט, where it is his money, is different from רבא, which is not his money, therefore by לקט we would think that when it is not in his רשות, he cannot be מפקיר it. Our תוספות feels that this distinction was not necessary.

-----

תוספות anticipates a difficulty:

**לא הוה צריך למימר אלא דגבי לקט ליכא קרא -**

**It was not necessary for רבא to say that** לקט is ממון ידידה, **but rather only to say that** by לקט **there is no פסוק** that allows one to be מפקיר (or מחלל) something which is not ברשותו, as there is by כרם רבעי (and מעשר שני) –

תוספות responds:

**אלא לרווחא דמילתיה נקטיה דאפילו איכא קרא<sup>1</sup> לא דמי אהדדי:**

**Rather** it was **mentioned only to maximize the difference, that even if there is a פסוק, nevertheless they** (כרם רבעי and לקט) **are not similar to each other.**

### Summary

Occasionally the גמרא offers an answer more than is necessary

### Thinking it over

When תוספות writes קרא איכא דאפילו<sup>2</sup>, did תוספות mean an actual פסוק by לקט, or perhaps תוספות meant that there is a דרשה from which we can derive לקט from כרם רבעי?

---

<sup>1</sup> This means that even if there would be a פסוק that he can be מפקיר (or מחלל) the לקט, it is not similar to כרם רבעי (and מע"ש) for there it is ממון גבוה and yet he can be מחלל it, however by לקט it is ממון דיליה, so even though he can be מפקיר it, that is only when it is his and ברשותו. See 'Thinking it over'.

<sup>2</sup> See footnote # 1.