ומר סבר הולך לאו כזכי דמי –

And this master maintains הולך is not similar to זכי

OVERVIEW

ruled that if a לוה says to a שליח, 'bring this money to my מלוה ', the לוה מוס', the ימלוה יפודים ', the שמואל ', the ישמואל ', the '

– אומר טעם שאומר שמואל מתוך שחייב באחריותו חוזר לא עיקר טעם הוא And at this point it is assumed that the reason which שמואל gave (for his ruling that אם בא לחזור הוזר), which is, 'since he carries the responsibility for its loss, therefore he can retract'; that reason is not the main reason why he may retract, but rather the main reason is because הולך לאו כזכי.

מוספות adds that even though this is awkward, nevertheless we find this elsewhere as well:

בההיא דהלוקח יין מבין הכותים ² וכהאי גוונא אשכחן (לקמן דף כה,א) בההיא דהלוקח יין מבין הכותים And we find something similar regarding the case of one who buys wine from the -

- משום דלית ליה ברירה משום דרבי יהודה משום דרבי למימר דטעמא דרבי יהודה משום דלית ליה ברירה שוא wanted to say that the reason of ר"י is because he does not maintain the ruling of 'ברירה' -

אף על גב דקתני (שם כו,א) אמרו לו לרבי מאיר אי אתה מודה שמא יבקע הנוד כולי –

1

 $^{^{1}}$ If the שליח would lose the money, the לוה would still owe the מלוה the entire amount.

² The case (in that הרומה ומעשר) is where someone bought wine from a כותי (who presumably did not separate ברייתא from it), and the ישראל cannot separate the תרו"מ now (before שבת According to איסור מבל he may proclaim that the required percentage of the wine in this barrel is תרו"מ (thereby removing the איסור טבל from the wine) and drink some of the wine on שבת (making sure that there is enough wine left over in the barrel for the שבת he will separate the תרו"מ in the barrel from the rest of the wine

 $^{^3}$ יוסי 'ם and ר"ש disagree and maintain that it is forbidden to drink this wine since the תרו"מ has not been separated (and removed from the rest of the wine in the barrel).

⁴ The concept of 'ברירה' (verified) is that even though currently we are not sure of the status (we do not know which part of the wine is חרו"מ and which part is מרו"מ), nevertheless later when we will actually separate the מרו"מ from the rest of the wine, we will assume that retroactively the wine which was drunk was "חרו"מ and the wine which was separated later was מרו"מ all along. If we assume יש ברירה then [presumably] it will be permitted to drink this wine for (even now on שבת assume that the מרו"מ and wine are separated; however if one maintains אין ברירה and מרו"מ are all mixed together in the wine and it is forbidden to drink it.

Even though it states in that ברייתא, they (ר' יהודה, ר"י ור"ש) said to ר', 'do you not admit that perhaps the barrel will burst, etc.' 5

וכהנה רבות':

And there are many such instances, where the גמרא offers an explanation which differs from the explicit explanation given by the תנא/אמורא.

SUMMARY

The גמרא oftentimes offers an explanation for a ruling which may differ from the explanation given by the author of the ruling.

THINKING IT OVER

There is obviously a difficulty in the גמרא giving a reason different from the one presented. How is this difficulty alleviated by bringing similar examples where this difficulty exists? It is seemingly merely compounding the difficulty. How are we to understand this חוספות ?

_

⁵ אבת (even if we maintain יש ברירה) one may not drink this wine, for perhaps the barrel will burst on שבת (before we separated מרו"מ) and all the wine will spill out, and we will be drinking wine from which no ארו"מ were separated at all. It is evident that the reason of "" was because of שמע יבקע and nevertheless the אין ברירה (not as he explicitly said).

⁶ See 'Thinking it over'.

 $^{^{7}}$ See אמ"ה # 249-253. See (also) אמ"ה רבי יומא נו,ב ד"ה רבי יומא.