## There is a monetary involvement

- דאיכא דררא דממונא

## **OVERVIEW**

The גמרא explains the necessity for the משנה to teach us that הפה שאסר הוא הפה is effective by the case of שהתיר and by the case of שהתיר של אביך היה ולקחתיה ממנו העדים שאמרו כתב ידינו הוא זה אבל אנוסים היינו. We would not be able to derive that the are believed to say אבל אנוסים היינו (on account of הפה שאסר) from the fact that the buyer is believed to say ולקחתיה הימנו (on account of הפה שאסר). The reason is that by דררא there is a דררא, however by העדים שאמרו there is no דררא there is no דממונא. Our תוספות explains this difference.

פירש רבינו חננאל שהאומר הוא מוחזק בשדה אבל העדים אין בידם כלום: The ד"ה explained that in the case of שדה זו של אביך היה he is believed because the one who is saying שדה זו כו' ולקחתיה ממנו is in possession of the field, therefore the הפה שאסר supports his חזקה and is effective; however the witnesses are not in possession of anything (they are not in possession of the money which the לוה may owe the שאסר we may have thought that in this case הפה שאסר is insufficient. Therefore it was necessary for the משנה to teach us that הפה שאסר is effective even if he is not a מוחזק.

## **SUMMARY**

There may be more reason to say מוחזק if one is a מוחזק than if he is not a מוחזק.

## THINKING IT OVER

The ה"ח explains that by 'שדה זו וכו' he is the מוחזק, therefore the הפה שאסר is effective; seemingly implying that the פה שאסר preserves the status quo where the money is.<sup>2</sup> However, the same is by עדים, when they say אבל אנוסים היינו (and the שטר is פסול they also maintain the status quo that the money remains שטר by the לוה. What is the difference between the two?!<sup>3</sup>

 $<sup>^1</sup>$  תוספות is negating (ב"מ ב,ב שבל) המשוב ווא אבל). According to ב"מ ב,ב אבל) the term דררא דממונא means a loss of money, therefore he explains the גמרא here to mean that since the buyer will suffer a loss if he says שדה זו של אביך היה, therefore we are more inclined to say that he meant to continue and say ולקחתיה so as not to suffer a loss; however the עדים suffer no loss when they say זה הוא הוא therefore it is possible that they did not [necessarily] intend to say אבל אנוסים היינו. However, תוספות interprets דררא דממונא (ibid) to mean that בלא טענותיהם יש ספק לבי"ד (because each one has a legitimate claim), therefore here too תוספות prefers the דררא דממונא that דררא דממונא means he has a monetary interest and therefore as a מוחזק there is more reason to believe him. See 'Thinking it over'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See (end of) footnote #1.

 $<sup>^3</sup>$  See אילת השחר בד"ה והנה מדברי הר"ח.