

22.8.22

135b (משנה 21) → 137a (משנה 137a)

- I 21 משנה: finding a will on the body of a former שכ"מ
- a If: someone dies and a דייתיקי (will) is found tied to his body – meaningless
  - b However: if he made a קנין on it via another (even if not the named recipient) while alive – valid
    - i Definition of דייתיקי (which works posthumously): if it states “this should be confirmed and fulfilled”
    - ii Definition of מתנה (which works for a בריא posthumously): must say ולאחר מיתה מהיום
  - c יוחנן’s ruling: if a שכ"מ said “write and give” and then died, we don’t complete it
    - i Reason: he may have intended to acquire through שטר, which cannot be executed posthumously
    - ii Note: ruling was formulated by ר"א and confirmed by ר' יוחנן, stating “it must be investigated”
      - 1 Meaning: a דייתיקי can cancel an earlier one;
        - (a) If: he intended to give the recipient more power through the שטר, we still write; if not – we don’t
          - (i) Challenge: if a בריא says “write and give” and then dies – we don’t write (שמא גמר להקנותו בשטר)
          1. Implication: for a שכ"מ, we write in any case
          2. Response: only in a case where we have evidence that he said כתבו to enhance his position
        - (b) Example of ייפוי כח: as per an addition of וקנינא or “אף כתובו” (clearly adding on to earlier command)
      - iii Ruling (שמואל): in case he is מייפה כח, we do write and give
- II 20 משנה: making a will effective posthumously and the status of the property in the meantime
- a Necessity of back-dating:
    - i ר' יהודה: must write “from today – after death” (so that it is retroactive and valid)
    - ii ר' יוסי: no need (the date on the שטר substantiates retroactivity)
      - 1 Note: no dispute in case of דייתיקי or regular הקנאה שטר; dispute limited to שטר זכרון דברים (without “קנין”)
      - 2 note: ולאחר מיתה ולאחר מיתה generates גט ספק, since we are unsure if ולאחר מיתה is a condition or reversal
        - (a) But: here it is valid, since the meaning is harmonious – acquisition now; rights to פירות after death
  - b Status:
    - i Father: may not sell – as he has written them to his son
      - 1 If: he sells, sale reverts to son upon father’s death
    - ii Son: may not sell, as they are not in his control
      - 1 If: he sells, buyer has no rights until death of father
- III Excursus: קנין פירות
- a If: son sold while father was alive and son predeceased father
    - i יוחנן’s ruling: buyer doesn’t get – קנין פירות (of father) are כקנין הגוף and son never “owned it”
    - ii ר"ל’s ruling: buyer gets it – קנין פירות לאו כקנין הגוף דמי and son always owned it (reverts to buyer after death of father)
      - 1 Note: this dispute already recorded in re: מקרא ביכורים by someone who bought a field for its פירות
      - 2 Defense:
        - (a) קמ"ל (ק"פ): here it is needed; סד"א that father is מוחל to his son (and cedes ownership in spite of ק"פ)
        - (b) קמ"ל – כקנין הגוף kept by owner is always ק"פ סד"א: here it is needed; ר"ל
      - 3 Challenge (ר"י to ר"ל): the rule of אחריו supports ק"פ לאו כקנה"ג
        - (a) Argument: if it were כקנין הגוף, if #2 in line dies, it should revert to heirs of principal, not of #1
        - (b) Answer: אחריו is a unique case – implies a gift of גוף and פירות
        - (c) Challenge: ברייתא rules that it reverts to heirs of principal!
        - (d) Answer: this is a dispute רבי/רשב"ג in an אחריו case (involving a sequence of 2)
          - (i) If: #1 sells or spends
            1. #2 may seize from buyers (אחריו is “total”)
            2. רשב"ג: #2 only receives whatever remains from #1’s stewardship (אחריו is limited)
              - a. Challenge: reversed ברייתא –
                - i. רבנן: #1 may sell and spend
                - ii. רשב"ג: #1 only has פירות אכילת
            3. Resolution:
              - a. רבנן: if he gave פירות – limited; if he gave הקרקע – total
              - b. בדיעבד vs. לכתחילה רשב"ג
                - i. Note: רשע אביי defines a רשע (“clean”) as someone who advises a “#1” to sell such property as per רשב"ג