18.01.09

13a(21) משנה לבנו גדול בבית – קנאו) $\rightarrow 14a(3a)$

Note: in order to allow someone to comfortably "put his affairs in order", חח"ל mandated that a שכיב מדע (someone on his potential deathbed) may make incomplete declarations, or directed gifts without a formal קנין, and they may be completed by his agents. In some cases, they may even be completed on his behalf posthumously. For example, whereas a proper שכיב מדע if a worders that some money be given to someone, it may be done so even if the money is currently out of sight.

רמב"ם הלכות זכיה ומתנה פרק ו הלכה טו

המשיא בנו גדול לבתולה בבית קנה הבית, והוא שיהיו נשואין ראשונים לזה הבן, ולא השיא האב בן אחר קודם לו ולא שייר האב בזה הבית שייחד לו כלום, ודברים אלו כהלכה שאין להם טעם הם, ונגעו חכמים בדבר הזה מאומדן הדעת, שמרוב שמחתו ואהבתו גמר והקנהו הבית, שהרי לא שייר בה לעצמו כלום, לפיכך אם שייר שם אפילו פך אחד לא קנה הבית, ייחד לו בית וכלי בית אע"פ ששייר בבית כלי אחד לעצמו או היה לו שם אוצר וכיוצא בו, קנה כלי הבית אבל הבית לא קנה.

- I משנה ו2: completing a death-bed order posthumously
 - a if someone orders a טו or שטר שחרור be given but dies before its completed it may not be given
 - b however: if he ordered a gift of money and died before it was given it may be given
 - limitation (רב): this is only if the money is bound and in a discernible place (e.g. under the bed)
 - 1 *question*: what is the case?
 - (a) If: it is a בריא, how does it help to have the money bound up there was no קנין משיכה
 - (b) If: it is a שכיב מרע, why the need for the money to be bound (see note)
 - 2 Answer1 (בי זביר): it's a בריא based on ruling #1 of רב בייא:
 - (a) *Rule of מעמד שלשתם* if A owes B money and B orders it be transferred to C if A, B and C are all present at the time, the transfer is valid
 - 3 Answer2 (שכ"מ it's a שכ"מ based on ruling #2 of רב פפא): it's a שכ"מ
 - (a) Limitation of מנה, if he gifts a specific מנה, it is valid; if an unspecified מנה, they may not give it, as he may have intended a specific, inaccessible one **Rejected**
 - (b) reason for not accepting רב זביד. he believes that בקדון's limitation applies equally to מלוה and to בקדון
 - (i) explanation: in neither case, do the moneys need be bound together and present
 - (c) reason for אב"ם not accepting משנה ד' פפא cannot be referring to שכ"ם, since had he lived, they could have given the מתנו, but the משנה added in "תנו" in the husband's order; in the case of תנו, שכ"מ is unnecessary, as we employ the rule that כתבו is good enough
 - (i) source: משנה ר:ה original ruling someone who is about to be executed and orders a א be written for his wife, they may write and give
 - 1. extension: ר"ש שזורי includes a שכ"מ in this ruling
 - (ii) rejection (שכ"מ): perhaps our משנה doesn't follow ר"ש שזורי (and a שכ"מ still must say תנו still must say תנו אשר)
- II Revisiting מעמד שלשתם 's ruling of מעמד
 - a It is valid even in case of הלוואה (certainly in case of פקדון)
 - i Explanation #1 (אמימר): it is as if at the time of the loan, the debtor accepted responsibility to pay the lender or anyone who comes to collect on his account
 - 1 *Challenge*: then if he tried to transfer it to someone who wasn't yet born at the time of the original loan, it shouldn't be valid
 - (a) Note: even אדם אוי who maintains that אדם מקנה דבר שלבל"ע that's if the recipient is "in this world"
 - ii *Explanation #2 (ר' אשי)*: with the benefit he gains by turning this loan into a newer note and he gains time to pay back, he is מקנה the debt to the new creditor
 - Challenge: if it is transferred to a strong man who will force immediate collection, it shouldn't work
 - (a) Note: this cannot be figured in Halakhically, due to the concern of נתת דבריך לשיעורים (the legal standard is subjective and non-standardized)
 - iii Explanation #3 (מכד זוטרא): this, along with 2 other laws, are considered "laws without rationale"
 - מעמד שלשתם בהלוואה 1st: מעמד
 - 2 2nd: if a man writes all of his possessions over to his wife, he is simply making her executrix over the estate
 - 3^{rd} : if someone marries off his adult son in a special house he built for it, the son acquires the house
 - (a) note: see ruling of רמב"ם above