

## However, not the entire world

## אבל כולי עלמא לא –

### OVERVIEW

רב ruled that the concept of לי לדידי (by פדיון הבן) applies (only) to רב כהנא and the like, who are men of great stature, however ordinarily if the חמש סלעים is not worth כהן, the חמש סלעים cannot claim that לי לדידי for חמש סלעים and it is a valid פדה"ב. Rather the פדיון requires that the כהן receive the full חמש סלעים. Our תוספות questions this ruling and resolves it.

asks: תוספות

ואם תאמר מאי טעמא דלא מהני מי גרע ממתנה על מנת להחזיר –

And if you will say; what is the reason that לי לדידי does not apply to everyone; is it inferior to a מתנה ע"מ להחזיר, concerning which -

– דאמרינן לעיל (דף ו,ב) דשמה מתנה<sup>1</sup>

It was previously taught that it is a valid מתנה concerning פדיון הבן, even though the כהן did not actually receive anything of value, for he is required to return the חמש סלעים. Why is it that here when the כהן claims that this item is valued for him as חמש סלעים that the פדיון is invalid? He is (seemingly) receiving more value in the case of לדידי (where he at least receives some value) than in the case of ע"מ להחזיר (where he [eventually] receives nothing).

answers: תוספות

ויש לומר דאין הכי נמי דמיגרע גרע –

And one can say; that indeed it is so; the case of claiming לי לדידי is inferior to a case where he received the הפדיון כסף as a מתנה ע"מ להחזיר -

– דהתם איכא דבר חשוב דהוי מתנה אף על פי שנתן על מנת להחזיר<sup>2</sup> –

For there by a מתנה עמ"ל there is something of value which is being given, even though it was given ע"מ להחזיר, nevertheless the value of חמש סלעים was given, and therefore it is a valid פדיון -

אבל הכא גבי פדיון לא היה שוה אותו סודר חמש סלעים –

However here by the פדיון, that סודר was not worth חמש סלעים -

ומתחילה כשנתן לו לא יצא ידי נתינה:

<sup>1</sup> We can derive from מתנה עמ"ל that even though the כהן was meant to receive חמש סלעים, nevertheless if he agreed to return the חמש סלעים to the owner it is a valid פדיון, because it is considered as if the כהן agrees that in this transaction he received חמש סלעים. The same should apply here when the כהן says לי לדידי; it should be considered that the כהן agrees that he received חמש סלעים.

<sup>2</sup> After the כהן receives the הפדיון כסף he may do with it as he pleases. If he should decide to destroy it, it will nevertheless be a valid פדיון. The same is true if he agrees to return it to the owner after he received it and it becomes his; it is also a valid פדיון.

So that initially when it was given to the כהן, the ישראל **did not fulfill the obligation of giving** חמש סלעים to the כהן.

### **SUMMARY**

A מתנה ע"מ להחזיר is considered a gift in the amount given (even though it is returned); however by לי לדידי חזי לי is not considered as if the named amount was actually given.

### **THINKING IT OVER**

Is the מצוה of הבן פדיון הבן that the ישראל should give חמש סלעים (to the כהן), or that the כהן should receive חמש סלעים (from the ישראל)?