18.01.10; 14a (א"ל רב לרב אחא ברדלא) → 15a (סיום הפרק)

ז. עָשִׁיר בְּרָשִׁים יִמְשׁוֹל **וְעֶבֶד לֹוֶה לְאִישׁ מַלְוֶה**:מ*שלי כב, ז* 

- I Continued analysis of rule of מעמד שלשתם
  - a Story: מעמד שלשתם added "I promise not to go back on my word" in a מעמד שלשתם case with some saffron
    - i inference: he could have gone back on his word if he chose to do so → challenges efficacy of מעמד שלשתם
    - ii answer: what he meant was "I won't be able to go back on my word" due to it being במעמד שלשתם
      - 1 challenge: מעמד שלשתם what is he adding here?
      - 2 Answer: סד"א only applies to a large gift; a small gift doesn't require the recipient to be present קמ"ל
  - b Story: 5 gardeners who sell their produce divided up their profits and one apparently had 5 coins more than the rest; they owed a land tax to the owner of the field so they made a קנין במעמד שלשתם with the owner of the field for the 5 coins; he later realized that their accounting was in error and he had had no more than the others
    - that the others made from him קנין as well as the קנין במ"ש that the others made from him ה" נחמן
    - ii אני the entire קנין was in error due to bad accounting and should be reverted (accepted)
- II dispute between בר/שמואל re: ability of payer to retract agency when he has sent the payment with הולך
  - a רב: still responsible, but he cannot retract the agency
  - b שמואל: since he's still responsible, he may retract the agency
    - i suggestion: they disagree about הולך כזכי רב) זכי = הולך
      - 1 rejection: all hold that הולך כזכי; dispute is whether we apply מיגו reasoning as per שמואל
      - 2 support for ברייתא :ברייתא explicitly rules that in case of paying back loan or returning שליחות, the payer maintains responsibility but he may not retract שליחות
        - (a) challenge: in case of פקדון, let him say that the owner doesn't want his פקדון in another's (the שליח) hands, in which case the שומר handing it over cannot be classified as זכי
        - (b) answer: this only applies when the שומר has a reputation as a נפרן (someone who denies his debts)
    - ii story: מחוזא asked קנין asked קנין to pick up moneys owed him in מחוזא; he refused to make a קנין from the holders of the money; when he returned, ששת raised him as he avoided the responsibility (as per v.1)
    - iii Story: בבל and ר' יוסי בר כיפר, who were going to בבל (from א"י) to collect a silver cup of his from נהרדעא; when they took it, the holders demanded that they accept responsibility; מהרדעא
      - 1 Then: they harassed ר' דוסתאי, at which point ר' דוסתאי egged them on and they hit him
      - 2 Whereupon: on their return, 'דוסתא' explained his actions, due to the fact that these fellows were strongarmed men, who could order someone be arrested or flogged and they were close to the court

## III Further on הולך כזכי

- a Case: if A gives B money with "Cל" and C is no longer alive
  - i Opinion A: money returns to A
  - ii Opinion B: money goes to heirs of C
    - 1 Suggestion: their dispute is whether or not זכי=הולך
    - 2 Rejection: all agree that ~זכי=הולך
      - (a) Answer1 (שכ"ם, goes to heirs of C בריא, it returns to him; if שכ"ם, goes to heirs of C
      - (ד) ארים (דב זביד if C is alive at time of giving money, goes to his heirs; otherwise, back to A
      - (c) Answer3 (בריא: (ד' פפא); if C predeceases A, it goes back to A; otherwise, it goes to C's heirs
- b Suggestion: perhaps מחלוקת תנאים is a מחלוקת תנאים:
  - i ברייתא: A directs money to C, the agent finds C dead, returns to A; if A is dead:

	орініон	נדיא זו	no, ratner the case is שכ"ם
1	ר' נתן ור' יעקב –to A's heirs	הולך כזכי~	Follows ר"א (see below)
2	יש אומרים –to C's heirs	הולך כזכי	Follows רבנן (see below)
3	s wishes'מת fulfill בשם ר"מ	מצוה לקיים דברי המת but~, הולך כזכי	Follows מצוה לקיים
4	n – split	Unsure if הולך כזכי	Unsure if כרבנן or כרבנן
5	"Here" – judgment of שליח	Unsure – prefer to use שודא	Unsure – prefer to use שודא
6	ר"ש הנשיא (?) – case: to A's heirs*	Supports ruling of ר' נתן ור"י	Supports ruling of ר' נתן ור"י

Note: מתנת שכ"מ and מבנין disagree about מתנת שכ"מ – according to שכ"מ, ה"א has no extended privileges and any gifting must be completed with a proper מתנת שכ"מ say that any type of property may be distributed by a שכ"מ שכ"מ force of his words alone

<sup>\*</sup> יוסף rruled in accordance with ד", but we hold that שכ"ם has extended power of words; answer: he reads "to A", not "A's heirs" and understands the case to be about a בדיא