### - מנא אמינא לה דתניא עגל זה

## From where do I derive this; for we learnt, 'this calf', etc.

### **OVERVIEW**

רב יוסף רב יוסף offers proof to his view that צריכי שומא, from a ברייתא which states that if an עגל is offered for פדיון הבן it must be initially established that it is worth חמש סלעים. This indicates that even if it is worth חמש סלעים, however if it was not קייץ the פדיון is invalid. One may think from the expression of the twas not לישנא בתרא that 'וכיון דלא קייצי לא', that this is proof for the לישנא בתרא which requires שומא (according to רב יוסף) even by כל דהו שומא because כסף שומא bowever disagrees with this interpretation.

# :2 ללישנא קמא מייתי ראיה

רב יוסף is bringing a proof according to the first view, which maintains that יוסף requires או in a case of חמשין ושוו חמשין ושוו חמשין, however in a case of כל דהו, then קב יוסף agrees that אומא is not needed. The case of עגל is similar to the case of שומא, for by פדיון אומא an amount of five סלעים is required, and we are not certain (initially) whether the עגל is worth five שיראי are worth קילעים, just as we are not certain (initially) whether the שיראי are worth עגל זה בחמש סלעים, indicates that if we are not sure of the value, it must be verified before the transaction (whether קידושין or קידושין or קידושין are worth.

### **SUMMARY**

We can derive from the עגל of עגל that שומא is needed to achieve trust, however we cannot derive from this ברייתא that שומא is needed to achieve קיץ.

### **THINKING IT OVER**

We can assume that the עגל is surely worth חמש סלעים (which would be a proof ללישנא בתרא), and we can assume that it is unclear whether the עגל is worth חמש סלעים (which would prove the מניל לישנא קמא); why does תוספות assume the latter and not the former?

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See אמ"ה footnote # 129 and onwards.

 $<sup>^2</sup>$  According to the לישנא בתרא מוסף אבריכי שומא צריכי שומא צריכי שומא צריכי שומא (meaning that even if we know that there is sufficient money for the transaction to be executed, nevertheless שומא is required in order that it be עגל (קייץ), then there is no proof from the עגל (see "עגל ש since we are not certain that the שומא המש סלעים (see "Thinking it over"). See 'Thinking it over'.