23.3.8 31a (משנה ח') → 31b (סיום הפרק)

> 1. וְקַרְאוּ **לו** זְקָנֵי עִירוֹ וְדִבְּרוּ אֵלָיו וְעָמֵד וְאָמֵר לֹא חָפַצְתִּי לְקַחְתָּה: *דברים כה, ח* 2. עָשִיר בְּרָשִׁים יִמְשׁוֹל **וְעֶבֶד לֹזֶה לְאִישׁ מַלְוָה**: מ*שלי כב, ז*

- I 'משנה מים: appealing a decision
 - a Without conditions: he may bring proofs as long as he wants and nullify the decision
 - i But if: they told him to bring any evidence he has within 30 days
 - 1 If: he brought it within 30 days nullifies; if not ruling stands
 - 2 Dissent (דשב"ג): he can bring them later as well
 - (a) בידעבד follows רשב"ג, even בידעבד (emphasized by his noting אין הלכה כדברי חכמים
 - ii If: they requested that he provide עדים or evidence and he said that he has none
 - 1 And then: he found עדים or evidence this is meaningless
 - 2 Dissent (א"בש"): he can bring ראיה or ראיה later as well (he didn't know about them then)
 - (a) חכמים follows הלכה בר רב הונא בשם ר' יוחנן, even אין הלכה כדברי רשב"ג and אין הלכה
 - (i) *Purpose*: to counter 'בב" s report of י"ז that הלכה כרשב"ג anywhere in the משנה except for משנה anywhere in the אידן, ערב and (our case) אידן, ערב that the only exception is ראיה אחרונה
 - (ii) Story: orphan was sued and when asked if he had any evidence, said "no" and was found liable
 - 1. When: others heard him crying, witnesses came forward
 - 2. Ruling (ר"ב): here, we certainly accept "ראיה אחרונה", as he couldn't have known about them
 - iii If: he saw that he was about to lose the case and said "ים come and testify for me" or he pulled out evidence from his belt this is meaningless (מי is silent here)
 - b Story: woman was holding a שליש as a שליש, she testified that it had been paid off
 - i Ruling (ד"ג): believe her
 - 1 Challenge/question (רבא): is this following אותיות נקנות במסירה, who says אותיות נקנות במסירה?
 - 2 Response: she is believed based on a מיגו she could have burned the שטר
 - ii *Alternate version of ruling*: מיל did not believe her
 - 1 Challenge (מיגו): she could have burned it (believe her due to מיגו)
 - 2 Response: once the מיגו has seen the שטר, this type of מיגו ceases to be usable
 - (a) Challenge (עדים השטר on it, requires קיום השטר): a receipt that has עדים on it, requires קיום
 - (i) But: if it has no שליש but is held by a שליש is believed ד"ג (version #2) is refuted
 - c Analysis (ר' יוחנן)
 - i אי זימי. he can keep arguing until he has no more arguments, and then summons witnesses
 - רשב"ג Challenge: this is contradictory, as first clause follows רשב"ג, last one
 - (a) Cannot say: that the entire רשב"ג is משנה and his "voice" is explaining, as above (הלכה כחכמים)
 - ii שמואל בר יהודה. he can keep arguing until he has no more evidence; then ד"ל tells him to bring witnesses and he says he has none; to bring evidence and he says he has none
 - 1 But if: עדים suddenly came from abroad or he discovered his father's satchel (with שטרות) he may use these
- II Change of venue
 - a ר' יוחנן .ד' דימי ruled that either party can force the case to be heard in a district court
 - i Challenge (מנה someone lent a מנה, shall he spend a מנה to collect (travel)?
 - ii Rather: he can force the other to accept judgment in his town
 - iii Support: ר' ספרא ruled that he can force judgment in his town, and if they needed information from the district court, they can send a letter; and if the losing side wants to know why the district court ruled against him, he may request a written explanation
 - 1 But: the יבמה must follow the חליצה to get חליצה in his city (as per v. 1)
 - 2 Final ruling (אמימד): the party can be forced to go to the district court
 - (a) Challenge (ר"א: 'ד"א): א argument (above)
 - (b) Answer: that only applies to the מלווה but the מלווה can force the move as per v. 2
 - iv Story: letter written to מר עוקבא, requesting that he judge there and if not send the טבריה to בעל דין
 - 1 Note: this is a contradiction
 - 2 Resolution: if he won't accept your judgment, send him to טבירה
 - 3 מר עוקבא it was a case of יני קנסות; the opening line was written to honor מר עוקבא; the opening line was written to honor