



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Bava Kamma Daf Tzaddik Zayin

- **Q:** How can we say that **Rav** holds that slaves have the status of land? We find that **R' Daniel bar Katina in the name of Rav** said, if someone grabs someone else's slave and works with him, he does not have to pay for the work done when he returns the slave to the owner. Now, if he holds that slaves are like land, he should say that since land can't be stolen the ganav was not koneh and he should therefore have to pay for the work of the slave!? **A:** The case there was where he grabbed the slave at a time when he wasn't working for the master, so the master suffered no loss. This is like the case of where a person lived in someone else's chatzer without the owner's knowledge, in which case **R' Huna** said that he does not have to pay for the use.
 - **Q:** That case is very different, because there is benefit from someone living in the house, because he keeps up the maintenance of the house, but in the case of the slave, the work weakens the slave, and therefore he should have to pay for the work!? **A:** The master is happy that his slave was put to work, so that he not learn to be lazy.
 - In the household of **R' Yosef bar Chama** they would seize the slaves of people who owed them money. His son **Rava** said to him, how do you use slaves that don't belong to you? **R' Yosef** answered, I am following **R' Nachman** who said it costs more to feed a slave than the value of his work, and since I am feeding the slaves I am using, the masters are happy that I am using them. **Rava** said, **R' Nachman** only said that about lazy slaves, not all slaves! **R' Yosef** said, I hold like **R' Daniel bar Katina in the name of Rav** who said, if someone grabs someone else's slave and works with him, he does not have to pay for the work done when he returns the slave to the owner. We see that a master is happy when someone works with his slave, so that he does not learn to be lazy. **Rava** said, that applies in a normal case, but since you are taking the slaves of people who owe you money, it looks like you are taking ribis, and **R' Yosef bar Menyumei in the name of R' Nachman** said, that although one who lives in another's chatzer without his knowledge need not pay rent, if the squatter is also a creditor of the owner of the chatzer, he must pay rent!? **R' Yosef** said, if so, I will stop seizing these slaves.
- If a person seizes another's boat and does work with it, **Rav** says the owner may either take rent or the depreciation to the boat, and **Shmuel** says he may only take the depreciation.
 - **R' Pappa** said, **Rav** and **Shmuel** do not argue. **Rav** was talking about a boat that was used for renting out, and **Shmuel** was talking about a boat that was not used for renting out. We can also say that they are both talking about boats that are used for renting out, but **Rav** is talking about a case where the person seized the boat with intent to pay rent, and **Shmuel** is talking about a case where the person seized it with intent to steal it.

GAZAL MATBEI'AH V'NISDAK...

- **R' Huna** said, when the Mishna says the coin broke, it means that it physically cracked, and when it says it became decertified as currency, it means that the king decertified it (so it is no longer valid currency anywhere). **R' Yehuda** said, decertification of the coin by the king is also considered to be a case of a coin that "broke", and the case of decertification in the Mishna refers to a case where the people of one city or country no longer accept this coin, but it is still accepted elsewhere.
 - **Q:** **R' Chisda** asked **R' Huna**, according to you who says decertification means the king did so and the coins are absolutely useless, why is that case different than when the ganav stole fruit or wine and they spoiled, in which case he can't just return the item, and must instead return the value as it was at the time of the stealing? **A:** **R' Huna** said, the fruits and wine have undergone a physical change, whereas the coin has not.

- **Q: Rabbah** asked **R' Yehuda**, according to you who says decertification of a coin by the king is equivalent to a physical change, why is this different than where he stole terumah and it became tamei, in which case the Mishna said he may simply return the terumah as is? **A: R' Yehuda** answered, the damage to the terumah is not noticeable. The damage to the coin is (because this coin is now different than all the other coins being used for currency).
- If a person lends merchandise to another person and they set a price to be paid back based on a particular coin, and the coin is then decertified, **Rav** says he must pay back with whatever the new currency is. **Shmuel** says, he can even pay with the old currency and tell the lender to go and use these coins in some distant land that still accepts them.
 - **R' Nachman** said, it would make sense that **Shmuel** only said this when the lender was planning to go to this distant land in any event. However, if he was not, he would not be able to repay with the old currency.
 - **Q: Rava** asked **R' Nachman**, a Braisa says one may not use coins that are no longer accepted as currency anywhere in the world, to redeem maaser sheini. This suggests, that if they are still accepted somewhere they can be used. This applies even if the owner of the food does not plan on travelling to the place that they are accepted!? **A: R' Nachman** said, the case in the Braisa is where the kingdoms don't mind if their citizens have currency of other kings. That is why it is valid.
 - **Q:** That would mean that the case of **Shmuel** is talking about where the kingdoms do mind. If so, how can the lender take the money and travel to that distant land? **A: Shmuel** is talking about a land where they mind, but they don't actively search for foreign currency by people. Therefore, with some difficulty, the lender could travel to the distant land with that currency and use it.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, a person cannot redeem maaser sheini in Bavel using currency of EY, and one cannot redeem in EY with currency of Bavel. However, one may redeem in Bavel with currency of Bavel. Now, the Braisa says coins of EY may not be used in Bavel even though the person will be going to EY. This refutes **Shmuel**!? **A:** The case here is that the kingdoms are particular against each other.
 - **Q:** If so, why can he redeem with coins of Bavel in Bavel, since he cannot bring them up to EY!? **A:** He can use the money to buy an animal in Bavel and bring it up to EY.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that the **Rabanan** enacted that all currency should be accepted in EY, so why does the Braisa say that Bavel currency would not be accepted in EY? **A: R' Zeira** said, this Braisa is dealing with a time when the Yidden controlled the other nations, whereas the other Braisa deals with a time when the other nations controlled.
 - A Braisa says, what is the coin of Yerushalayim? Dovid and Shlomo were on one side and Yerushalayim was on the other side. What is the coin of Avrohom Avinu? An old man and an old woman were on one side and a young man and young lady were on the other side.
- **Rava** asked **R' Chisda**, if one borrowed merchandise and set repayment based on a particular coin, and the government then increased that coin, would he have to pay using the new, larger coin or not? **R' Chisda** said, he would pay using the new coin. **Rava** asked, even if the new coin is really huge? He said, yes.
 - **Q:** The Gemara asks, if so he is getting more than the amount of the loan, and it is ribis!? **A: R' Ashi** said, we make a determination, and if the amount he can buy with the new coin is because of the larger size of the coin, he would reduce the payment.
 - **Q:** The larger size means there is more silver, so it is always more valuable!? **A:** We would reduce the amount of the payment so that the amount of silver borrowed is the amount of silver returned.