



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

Bava Metzia Daf Nun Gimmel

- We have learned that **Chizkiya** said, if someone wants to redeem maaser sheini that is worth less than a perutah, he should say that it is being redeemed with money that was used for other maaser sheini redemption, because he surely overestimated when he used the money then, and there must be room within that money for additional maaser sheini redemption.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says, the laws of terumah and bikkurim are similar in that intentionally eating them improperly (a tamei Kohen or a non-Kohen) results in death at the Hands of Heaven, and doing so b'shogeg results in a penalty of an additional 1/5 that must be given to the Kohen, they are assur for non-Kohanim, they become batel if they are mixed in 100 times their amount, the Kohen must wash his hands before eating them, and must wait for sunset if he was tamei and went to the mikvah. All these laws do not apply to maaser sheini. Now, presumably this means that maaser sheini would become batel in a majority. However, according to **Chizkiya**, maaser sheini can always be redeemed and permitted, and as such should never become batul in any amount!? **A:** It may be that when the Mishna says "these laws do not apply to maaser sheini", it means to teach that maaser sheini does not become batul at all, and not that it becomes batul in a simple majority.
 - **Q:** This can't be what the Mishna means, because the Mishna is pointing out the chumros of terumah, not the kulos!? **A:** The Mishna mentions that terumah is considered to be the property of the Kohen, whereas maaser is not. This is a kulah as well, and we see that the Mishna mentions it.
 - **Q:** A Braisa clearly says that maaser sheini becomes batul in a simple majority, and says this is referring to maaser sheini that is less than the value of a perutah and maaser that was brought into Yerushalayim and then removed. According to **Chizkiya**, let him redeem it on the earlier redemption money, as he says, which would mean that according to **Chizkiya**, maaser sheini can always be redeemed and permitted, and as such should never become batul in any amount!? **A:** The case is where he did not redeem any other maaser sheini.
 - **Q:** Why can't he take another half perutah of maaser sheini and redeem it together with the half perutah of maaser sheini in the mixture, and in that way redeem the maaser from the mixture? **A:** The maaser in the mixture is only maaser D'Rabanan (because D'Oraisa it becomes batul) and the other maaser would be maaser D'Oraisa, so we can't combine the two.
 - **Q:** Why can't he bring maaser sheini from demai (which is only D'Rabanan) and combine it with the maaser in the mixture for redemption? **A:** He may not do so as a gezeira that it may lead him to do so with D'Oraisa maaser as well.
 - **Q:** Why can't he bring 2 perutos and redeem 1.5 perutos worth of D'Oraisa maaser on it, and then redeem the maaser in the mixture on the remaining half of the perutah? **A:** Maaser redemption can't take effect if it is less than a full perutah. Therefore, the redemption of the D'Oraisa maaser will only work on one complete perutah, and not on the half of the other one. That will leave a half perutah of D'Oraisa and a half perutah of D'Rabanan for the remaining perutah, and we have said that we can't have them combine.
 - **Q:** Why can't he use an issur coin (larger than a perutah) and redeem less than an issur's value of maaser onto it, leaving room to then also

redeem the maaser in the mixture? **A:** We don't allow that, as a gezeira that he may come to redeem with two perutos.

- **Q:** The Braisa said that maaser sheini that was in Yerushalayim and then left becomes batul in a mixture of simple majority. Why does it become batul? Why can't he just take the whole mixture back into Yerushalayim and eat it there? **A:** The case is where the maaser became tamei and therefore may no longer be eaten.
- **Q:** If it became tamei, let him redeem it!? **R' Elazar** has said that maaser that became tamei may be redeemed even in Yerushalayim!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to food that was purchased with money of maaser sheini (not produce that was separated as maaser sheini initially), and such food may not be redeemed.
- **Q:** A Mishna says that such food *may* be redeemed!? **A:** The Braisa follows **R' Yehuda**, who says that it may not be redeemed.
- **Q:** If it follows **R' Yehuda**, it can't be redeemed even if it never left Yerushalayim, so why does the Braisa specifically talk about maaser that left Yerushalayim? **A:** We must say that the Braisa is discussing maaser that is still tahor and may be eaten (all agree that such maaser may not be redeemed), and the reason the food cannot simply be returned to Yerushalayim is because the case is that the walls of Yerushalayim fell, which is what is meant that it "left" and why it can't be returned.
- **Q:** **Rava** has taught that the halacha that once maaser sheini enters Yerushalayim it can no longer be redeemed is only D'Rabanan. The **Rabanan** never made a gezeira for a case when the walls fell down, and if so, the maaser should be redeemed!? **A:** The **Rabanan** did not make a difference between when the walls fell down and when they did not. They were goizer in all cases.
- **R' Huna bar Yehuda in the name of R' Sheishes** said, the Braisa (that posed a question to **Chizkiya's** view when it said that maaser sheini becomes batul) is referring to the case where there was less than a perutah *and* it entered and then left Yerushalayim. So, the reason it can't be redeemed is not because it was less than a perutah, but rather because it entered and then left Yerushalayim.
 - **Q:** Why can't he take it back in and eat it there? **A:** The case is that the walls of Yerushalayim fell down.
 - **Q:** **Rava** has taught that the halacha that once maaser sheini enters Yerushalayim it can no longer be redeemed is only D'Rabanan. The **Rabanan** never made a gezeira for a case when the walls fell down, and if so, the maaser should be redeemed!? **A:** The **Rabanan** did not make a difference between when the walls fell down and when they did not. They were goizer in all cases.
 - **Q:** If this is the case, why does the Braisa even mention that the maaser was worth less than a perutah? It has nothing to do with the reasoning of the halacha!? **A:** The Braisa is saying, don't think that maaser that has entered and left may not be redeemed only if it is worth a perutah. Rather, this halacha applies to maaser worth less than a perutah as well.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding redeeming maaser sheini uses the word "*mi'maasro*", which teaches that not all maaser can be redeemed, and therefore excludes maaser sheini worth less than a perutah from redemption.
 - **R' Ami** said that the Braisa means the maaser itself is worth less than a perutah, and **R' Assi** said that it means that the additional that must be paid is less than a perutah (even if the maaser itself is worth a perutah, such maaser could not be redeemed). **R' Yochanan** said like **R' Ami** and **Reish Lakish** said like **R' Assi**.
 - **Q:** A Braisa, which gives the method of **Chizkiya** to redeem maaser worth less than a perutah, says that if the maaser is worth less than a perutah "it is sufficient" to redeem it on other money that was used for redemption of other maaser. Now, this makes sense according to **R' Assi**, but according to **R' Ami**,

that is the whole point of **Chizkiya's** method, so what is meant by the words "it is sufficient"? This remains a **KASHYEH**.