He left his craft; he has a *Chazokoh*

ירד מאומנותו יש לו חזקה –

OVERVIEW

The ברייתא rules that once a craftsman (אומן) leaves his trade and is no longer an אומן, he has a הזקה, meaning that he can claim that he bought any item which is in his possession (as opposed to an אומן who has no חזקה). The issue here is whether we mean that he has a חזקה even on the items which were in his possession while he was an אומן, or that he only has a חזקה on these items which came into his possession after he left the אומנות.

- מצינו לפרש מאותן כלים שנתן לו לאחר שירד מאומנותו דומיא דאריס שירד מאריסותוי לפרש נאריסותוי to be referring to those utensils that were given to him after he left his אומנות, similar to a sharecropper (אריס) who left his אריסות -

אי נמי אפילו אותן כלים שנתנו לו בשעה שהיה עדיין אומן -Or we can also say that the חזקה even regarding those items which were given to him while he was still an אומן -

 $^{-2}$ והוא ששהו אחר אומנותו כל כך שהוא רגילות שמחזירם לבעלים אחר פל כך שהוא רגילות פל פארים אומן after he left his trade to the extent that normally they would be returned to their owners –

תוספות draws a parallel ruling:

רנראה דבן אומן נמי דאמר לעיל³ דיש לו חזקה כי אמר⁴ בפנינו הודה -And it appears to תוספות that also regarding the son of the אומן, where the גמרא אומן, where the מערער שופיי שומן אומן when he claims that the מערער admitted in my presence to my father that he sold it to my father; the ruling is -

היינו אחר ששהה אחר מות אביו -

Only if the item lingered after his father's death for the above-mentioned period -

¹ When the ברייתא states that an אריס שירד מאריסתו יש לו חזקה in a field (for three years) after he left his אריסות, it is a valid הזקה. In that case the הזקה began only after he finished the אריסות, however the time he was an אריסות cannot be included in the three years necessary for a הזקה, similarly the הזקה of an אומנות begin after he left his אומנות, however if he had the item before he left the אומנות, there will be no הזקה, because we assume the item came into his possession as an jam, but not as an owner.

² Let us assume that items which are given to a tailor are picked up or returned to the owner within a month, but no one leaves it for more than a month. Therefore if the item was by the tailor (after he stopped tailoring), for more than a month, the tailor can claim, 'I bought it from you'. If it was not bought by the tailor, the owner would certainly have taken it back before the month was over.

³ See (also) עמוד on this עמוד [TIE footnote # 4].

 $^{^4}$ The הגהות הב"ה amends this to read אמר בפני (instead of אמר, אמר בפנינו הודה).

- דאי לאו הכי אין נראה שיהא נאמן במיגו דאי בעי אמר לקוח הוא בידי

For otherwise (if the dispute took place immediately after the father's death) it does not appear that the בן אומן would be believed (that מיגו with a מיגו with a מיגו that the בן אומן could have claimed, 'I bought it' -

דאי טעין נמי לקחתיה ממך לא היה נאמן:

For even if he would have claimed, 'I bought it from you; he would not be believed.

SUMMARY

An בן אומן שירד מאומנתו (as well as a בן אומן who claims הזקה) has a חזקה, even if the item was in his possession when he was an אומן, provided that an inordinate amount of time elapsed from when the owner should have retrieved his item.

THINKING IT OVER

- 1. These cases of בן אומן שירד מאומן, which תוספות is discussing, are they in situation of עדים (that he gave it to repair ראה and ראה (that we see it in his possession) or not (both not or one not)?
- 2. What would be the ruling by an לקחתיה מינך, in a case where the item lingered by the אומן for an extended period of time? Why?

_

⁵ The reason the בן אומן is believed (even if he claims he inherited it from his father the בפני הודה is when he adds the claim of בפני הודה. The reason we believe his claim of בפני הודה is because the בפני הודה has a בפני הודה of לקחתיה ממך מערער. However if the מערער made his claim immediately after the passed on, there is no מערער. The will claim, 'I gave in this item to be tailored less than a week ago and I wish to reclaim it. If the would be alive he would certainly not have a חוקה (since it came to him בתורת אומנות); the same is with the מערער we will argue in favor of the מערער has it from his father. However if a long time passed, we say to the מערער, if you did not sell it, how come you left it for such a long time in the possession of the בן אומן, in which case the שוון be believed, even a long time elapsed.

 $^{^6}$ See משה.