



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

### Bava Metzia Daf Mem Hey

- The Gemara now brings a second version of the machlokes between **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish** as to the explanation of the machlokes between **B" S and B" H** in the Mishna regarding redeeming maaser sheini and the use of gold coins. One holds that the machlokes is only regarding taking the kedusha from silver coins and transferring it onto gold coins. **B" S** say the pasuk of "hakesef" teaches that maaser sheini money may not be redeemed onto other money, and **B" H** say that the multiple use of the word "money" teaches that maaser sheini can be redeemed onto other money. However, all would agree that actual maaser sheini produce can be redeemed onto gold coins. The other one holds that the machlokes is even regarding redeeming actual produce onto gold coins.
  - **Q:** According to the first explanation, why does the Mishna speak about transferring kedusha from silver coins to gold coins? Why not discuss transferring kedusha from silver coins to other silver coins? **A:** If that case was given, we would think that **B" H** only argue in that case, but would agree that it cannot be transferred from silver to gold, because gold relative to silver is considered to be "produce".
  - **Q:** A Mishna says, that **B" S** say one may take his silver coins of maaser sheini in Yerushalayim and transfer the kedusha onto copper coins. Now, if he can transfer from silver onto copper, surely he can transfer from silver onto gold!? This is problematic according to the first explanation!? **A:** **Rava** said, in Yerushalayim is different than outside Yerushalayim, because since in Yerushalayim the money can be spent on any type of food, it is necessary to transfer onto copper coins so that the inexpensive food items can be bought.
  - **Q:** A Mishna says, if someone wants to transfer the kedushas maaser sheini from copper coins to silver outside of Yerushalayim, **B" S** say he may do so for all his copper coins. This is problematic according to the first explanation!? **A:** Rather, we must say that all agree that the double use of the word "money" teaches that kedusha may be transferred from money onto other money. The machlokes between **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish** must be as follows. One holds that the machlokes between **B" S and B" H** is regarding transferring kedusha from silver coins onto gold coins. **B" S** hold that if we allow kedushas maaser to be moved from silver coins to gold coins, a person may delay bringing his maaser money to Yerushalayim until he has enough silver coins to transfer into gold coins (and it is assur to delay in bringing the maaser until after 3 Yomim Tovim). **B" H** hold we are not concerned that a person would wait and delay in this manner. However, all would agree that actual maaser produce could be redeemed onto gold coins, because a person would not delay until he has enough produce to redeem with a gold coin, because the produce would begin to rot. The other one holds that **B" S** is even concerned for delay when redeeming actual produce, and therefore would not even allow the redemption of actual produce onto gold coins.
  - The Gemara says, this last explanation of the machlokes fits best into the words of the Mishna, because the Mishna's verbiage seems to say that it is a machlokes regarding a Rabbinic concern, not a D'Oraisa.
- We have learned a machlokes between **Rav and Levi** – one says a coin can be used as an item to make chalipin and the other says that it cannot.
  - **R' Pappa** said, the reason one would hold that it cannot be used for chalipin would be, that the person accepting the coin takes it for its minted value, not its intrinsic value. Since its minted value can become worthless, it is considered to be less than a full item, and the pasuk teaches that a full and complete item must be used for chalipin.

- **Q:** Our Mishna said that by the person making a kinyan on the gold coins, the other person is koneh the silver coins. Presumably this happens through chalipin!? **A:** The case is where the silver is used as money, and is not a case of chalipin.
  - **Q:** If that is true, the Mishna should say that by being koneh the gold it creates an *obligation* to pay the silver, not that the other person is *koneh* the silver!? **A:** The Mishna should be read as if it says “obligates”.
  - In fact, this must be correct, because if not, why does the Mishna then say that a kinyan on the silver coin will not create a kinyan for the gold coin? If it is chalipin it should be a kinyan!? Rather, it must be that the gold is viewed as an item being purchased and the silver is viewed as money. Also, a Braisa on our Mishna says, the silver is not koneh the gold. The Braisa explains, if one sold 25 silver dinars for one gold dinar, even if a kinyan was made on the silver dinars, the other person is not koneh the gold until he makes a kinyan on it. Now, if it is done with chalipin, why wouldn't he be koneh when the other person is koneh the silver? It must be that we view the silver as payment, not as chalipin.
    - **Q:** That Braisa has an earlier case which says, if someone sells a gold coin to another for 25 silver coins, as soon as a kinyan is made on the gold, the other person is koneh the silver coins wherever they may be. Now, that makes sense if chalipin is being used. However, if it is viewed as payment, an obligation to pay the silver has been created, but the person should not be koneh the silver wherever it may be!? **A: R' Ashi** said, the case is where the silver is used as money for payment. When the Braisa says he is koneh it “wherever it is”, it means to say that he must pay the silver coins however he said he will pay it – meaning, if he said he will give new coins he must give new coins.
- **R' Pappa** said, even according to the view that a coin cannot be used to make chalipin, a coin can be *acquired* through chalipin, in the same way that **R' Nachman** holds that fruit can't be used to create chalipin but can be acquired through chalipin.
  - **Q:** A person who redeems his own maaser sheini must add a fifth of the value over what the true value of the produce is. To circumvent that, he can have someone else redeem it for him in one of two ways – he can give someone money to do so, or he can give the produce to someone and then he himself can redeem it (since he no longer owns the produce). The preferred method is to give someone the money (or have him use his own money) rather than to gift him the produce. A Mishna says, if someone is at the granary and wants to have his maaser sheini produce redeemed, but has no coins on him (to give to someone else to redeem for him to avoid the 1/5 surcharge), he should gift the produce to someone else and then say that the produce should be redeemed on coins he has in his house. Now, if coins can be acquired through chalipin, why can't he use chalipin to have the other person be koneh the coins in his house and then have him redeem the produce in the preferred manner? **A:** The case is that he has nothing available to use for chalipin.
    - **Q:** Why doesn't he give the person a piece of land and have him be koneh the coins along with the land? **A:** He doesn't have any land to do so.
    - **Q:** The Mishna says he is standing on the threshing floor – which is land – so why can't he use that!? **A:** He doesn't own the threshing floor.
    - **Q:** Would the Tanna teach us a case where the person has nothing at all to use as a kinyan for chalipin? **A:** Rather, it must be that we see from here that a coin cannot be acquired through chalipin. **SHEMA MINAH.**
      - We find that **R' Pappa** himself retracted his view, and held that coins cannot be acquired through chalipin.