## 22.10.7

והדר זבנה ניהלה באחריות) → 169b (משנה וו)

- I משנה וו: processing an erased שטר
  - a If: someone has a שטר חוב that got erased, he brings witnesses (that know when it was written and the contents) and they come to ייום; this man's שטר was erased on such-and-such a day and so-and-so are his עדים
    - wording of דיינים צ .קיום sign that 'ב came before them and such-and-such a date and עדים were his עדים
      - 1 if: they added "we investigated the עדים and their words jibed" he may use the טטר to collect
        - (a) if not: he may not collect without substantiating the שטר
      - 2 if: the שטר was deliberately torn (by ב"ד) may not use
        - (a) Marker (רב יהודה): if the names and date and תורף were torn
          - (i) Alternatively (אביי): if it was torn both length-wise and width-wise
    - ii Story: Arabs were taking land and forcing owners to give them their deeds of sale
      - 1 Owners: came to אביי, asking him to write a 2<sup>nd</sup> טטר on their property so they could claim it back
        - (a) He refused: as per ר' ספרא cannot write 2 סטרות on 1 field (see below)
        - (b) When pestered: he had his סופר erase and write a מחק on מחק (invalid)
          - (i) Challenge (ר' אחא בר מניומי): if the original writing is there, שטר is valid
            - 1. Answer: he directed that gibberish be written, then erased
  - b Related ברייתא:
    - If: someone lost his שנר חוב, even if he brings ערים who testify that they signed it cannot write another
      - אחריות without its שטרי מקח וממכר without its שטרי מקח וממכר
        - (a) Reason: as per בע"ח we don't write 2 בע"ח on one field, lest בע"ח reuse to seize property improperly
          - (i) Explication: the לקוחות could seize it once, then this fellow could seize property from later לקוחות, have בע"ח allow him to live on it a few years, then he'll re-seize it and our fellow will re-claim loss from later לקוחות
            - 1. Challenge: when בע"ח seizes it the first time, we tear up his שטר הלוואה (can't reclaim)
              - a. As per: ruling that a טירפא must read "we tore up his שטר הלוןואה)
              - b. And: an אדרכתא must read "we tore up his טירפא"
              - c. And: שומא must read "we tore up his אדרכתא"
                - i. *Answer*: if he claims a theft from his father (and brings עדים that it belonged to his father) he can wait a few years and make that claim again
            - 2. Challenge: why does שטרות have to let him wait a while on the field; since he has 2 שטרות, he can immediately seize from other לקוחות
              - a. *Answer*: he doesn't want to deal with many litigants (he's afraid that his deception will become known if he has to seize from multiple בעלי דין within a short time)
            - 3. Challenge: why not write a proper שטר מכר with אחריות and give the seller a שובר, indicating that all שטרי מכר are invalid except for the one produced on that day
              - a. Students to שובר this implies that we don't write a שובר
              - b. *Rejection*: we generally write a שובר; but here, we are concerned that the בע"ח will seize property from this שובר and then they'll seize it from another לוקח, who doesn't have the שובר
                - i. Block: eventually, the מוכר will produce the שובר to reinstate the land
                - ii. *Answer*: in meantime, מירות will have eaten some of the פירות (may not be recoverable)
                - iii. Alternatively: could be sold to a לוקח שלא באחריות and he'll have no recourse
              - c. Challenge: same should apply to שטרי if we allow שובר, same scenario may play out
                - i. Answer: in case of money, לוקח knows that the מוכר may have come to an agreement with the בע"ח and he won't relinquish property without checking first (~=מכר=)
        - (b) Formulation (w/o שטר shis שטר isn't to be used for collection even from בני חרי just as a deed
          - (i) Conclusion (אחריות: is to be assume (אחריות טעות סופר) if this weren't writte, we could collect
          - (ii) Dissent (משנה is that we don't write אחריות in the שטר is that we don't write משנה in the שטר
            - 1. Case: woman sent man to buy her some land, which he bought שלא באחריות
              - a. *Her claim*: I sent you to repair things, not to foul them up
              - b. Solution (ב"ג) שליח has to re-purchase it שלא באחריות and sell to with אחריות
      - 2 Dissent: רשב"ג doesn't allow writing שטרי מקח וממכר either
        - (a) As per: his מתנה שטר that if someone writes a שטר מתנה and the recipient returns the מתנה is returned
        - (b) חכמים. gift is not returned