



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

Bava Metzia Daf Mem Vuv

- **Ulla, R' Assi, and Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** also hold that a coin cannot be used to make chalipin.
 - **R' Abba** asked **Ulla**, a Braisa says, if a person is in the market and needs money to pay his workers, if he has a dinar at home that he can use (but doesn't have it with him presently) he may ask the moneychanger to give him a dinar's worth of coins and promise to pay a dinar plus a fee at a later time. If he doesn't have this coin in his house, he may not do so (because it is essentially a loan and he is paying interest). Now, if coins cannot be used for chalipin, then the moneychanger is not koneh the money in the house when he gives the money to the person. If so, it is truly a loan, so how can he later pay an additional fee!? **Ulla** remained quiet. **R' Abba** said, perhaps we can say that the case is where the "coins" used were not minted coins (they were piece of copper, with no imprint) and therefore are both considered to be "produce", which is why chalipin works in that case. **Ulla** agreed that that is the case and added that the words of the Braisa suggest this approach as well. **R' Ashi** said the case can also be discussing where there is no chalipin taking place, but since the person has the coins in his house, it is like the case of where someone asks for a loan, because he currently doesn't have access to money that he owns. In that case it would be mutar to give back an item in return.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says, with regard to anything used as payment for something else, as soon as the payment is given to the seller, the buyer becomes responsible for the item that was paid for. Now, presumably this is referring to coins, and we see that coins can be used for chalipin!? **A:** **R' Yehuda** said, the Mishna means to say that if anything *other than* money is used for an exchange, once the seller takes possession of it, the buyer becomes responsible for the other item. This must be the proper understanding, because the example that the Mishna gives is the exchange of animals.
 - **Q:** According to the presumed meaning, that the Mishna refers to a coin, what was the understanding of the Mishna when it said "how is this so"? **A:** The Mishna was thought to be saying that produce can also be used for chalipin, and the Mishna then meant to give the example of where one exchanged the meat of an ox for a cow, or the meat of a donkey for an ox.
 - **Q:** This makes sense according to **R' Sheishes**, who says that produce can be used for chalipin. However, according to **R' Nachman** who says that it can't, how will he explain the Mishna? **A:** We will have to explain the Mishna to mean that there are types of monetary payments that are like chalipin. The Mishna then gives the example, if one exchanges money that is owed to him for an ox, for a cow (he is owed money for an ox and then instead takes a cow in the place of the money owed to him). As soon as the one who is now giving the cow says "take the cow instead of the money", the kinyan is effective.
 - The reason the kinyan is effective without meshicha is that the Mishna holds like **R' Yochanan**, who holds that D'Oraisa money can acquire moveable property. The **Rabanan** require meshicha as a gezeirah. However, in an unusual case (as in the one above) they were not goizer.
 - **Q:** How will **Reish Lakish**, who holds that even D'Oraisa only meshicha can be used to acquire moveable property, explain the Mishna? If he holds like **R' Sheishes**, he can answer that produce is being used. But, if he holds like **R' Nachman**, how will he explain the kinyan? **A:** He must hold like **R' Sheishes**

- **Q:** Our Mishna said, all moveable items are koneh each other. **Reish Lakish** explained, even if one is exchanging a purse full of coins for a purse full of coins. We see that coins can make chalipin and can be acquired through chalipin!? **A: R' Acha** explained, this is referring to coins that have been disqualified by the government, and coins that although still valid by the government, are not accepted in the place that he is.
 - Both these examples are needed. If we only had the example of where the coins were made batel by the government, we would think those are not considered as currency, but when they are only not accepted in a particular area, they are still called currency. If we only had the second case, we would say that is not currency because they are not accepted in open or in hiding, but when the government deemed something batel, where it is still acceptable in hiding, we would think it would still be considered as currency.