

It does not state, 'by his friends'

במכרי לא קתני -

Overview

The משנה stated that if one lent money to a כהן, etc., he may withhold the תרומה as a payment for his loan.¹ The גמרא asked how can this be, since the כהן never received the תרומה?² רב answered that the משנה is discussing מכרי כהונה so it is considered as if the כהן received it.³ שמואל answered that he was מקנה the תרומה to the כהן (through an agent). The גמרא explains that שמואל does not learn like רב since the משנה does not mention מכרי כהונה, and רב does not learn like שמואל since the משנה made no mention of מזכה ע"י אחר. This obviously requires some clarification since the difficulty in each פשוט is the same (that it is not mentioned in the משנה), why did each one (רב and שמואל) choose his particular interpretation?!

responds to the anticipated difficulty:⁴

אף על גב דמזכה נמי לא קתני⁵ מכל מקום ניחא ליה לאוקמי במזכה דאירי בכל כהנים⁶ -
Even though that מזכה is also not mentioned in the משנה, nevertheless it was more feasible to establish the משנה by מזכה since it is applicable to all כהנים, rather than establishing the משנה by מכרי כהונה which applies to a limited amount of כהנים -
ומאן דמוקי לה במכרי משום דמזכה לא קתני אף על גב דמכרי נמי לא קתני -
And who established the משנה by מכרי since the משנה does not state מזכה, even though it also does not state מכרי, because -

משמע ליה מפרישין עליהן סתם⁷ בלא שום זיכוי:

It seems to רב that the term מפריש עליהן which is stated simply without qualification indicates that it is done without any זיכוי (transference of ownership).

Summary

The advantage of מזכה is that it applies to all כהנים, and the advantage of מכרי כהונה is that it fits well with מפרישין.

¹ The lender separates the proper amount of תרומה and instead of giving it to the כהן, he may keep it or sell it and deduct the value of the תרומה from the amount the כהן owes him, thereby reducing the loan until it is paid up.

² רש"י ד"ה ואע"ג.

³ רש"י ד"ה במכרי.

⁴ See 'Overview'.

⁵ Why therefore did שמואל choose the interpretation of מזכה over מכרי כהונה, since both are not mentioned in the משנה.

⁶ The משנה seems to be saying that this tactic may be done by all כהנים, not only מכרי כהונה, therefore it makes more sense to establish the משנה by מזכה.

⁷ The משנה seems to indicate that all that is required is to be מפריש, without any other action (including זיכוי) therefore רב would rather establish the משנה by מכרי כהונה.

Thinking it over

Why did the גמרא have to mention, מכרי לא קתני and קתני לא, when the גמרא could have offered תוספות explanation why רב ושמואל disagree with each other?