



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

Bava Metzia Daf Nun Daled

- **Q:** Is the additional payment of 1/5 calculated on the principal payment, or is it calculated based on the principal plus the additional payment? **A:** A Mishna regarding the payment of "eiruchin", which also requires an additional payment of 1/5, gives an example of a principal of 20 and an additional payment of 5. We clearly see that the 1/5 is calculated on the combined payment, and not just on the principal payment. **SHEMAH MINAH.**
 - We find a Braisa where this is actually a machlokes among Tanna'im, where **R' Yoshiya** says it is 1/5 of the total combined payment, and **R' Yonason** says it is only of the principal.
- **Q:** If one does not add the additional 1/5 when he redeems his maaser, does that prevent the redemption from taking effect or not? Do we say the redemption takes effect for a payment equal to the value of the produce, and the fifth is then added on, or do we say that redemption of maaser requires a payment equal to 125% of the value, and without that there is no redemption? **A:** **Ravina** said, a Mishna says that maaser of demai is redeemed with principal value alone. Now, the reason would presumably be, that since maaser of demai is only D'Rabanan, they only required a payment that is absolutely necessary for the redemption to take effect. We see from here that the fifth would not prevent the effect of redemption D'Oraisa.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that this is a machlokes between Tanna'im in a Braisa. The Braisa says, if one gave the principal value for the maaser, but not the fifth, **R' Eliezer** says it may be eaten outside Yerushalayim, and **R' Yehoshua** says it may not. **Rebbi** said, I would agree with **R' Eliezer** if it is Shabbos (nothing can be separated on Shabbos) and with **R' Yehoshua** on a weekday. Now, from the fact that **Rebbi** paskens like one on Shabbos and the other for during the week, it must be that they argue regarding Shabbos and during the week. Presumably we would say that the basis for the argument is that **R' Eliezer** holds the fifth does not prevent the redemption from taking effect, and **R' Yehoshua** says that it does! **A:** **R' Pappa** said, it may be that all hold that it does not prevent the redemption from taking effect. The machlokes is whether we are concerned that people will just not add the fifth. **R' Yehoshua** is concerned for that, and therefore says that the **Rabanan** required the fifth to be paid before the produce can be eaten outside Yerushalayim, and **R' Eliezer** does not have that concern.
 - **R' Yochanan** said, with regard to the redemption of hekdes, all would agree that the redemption takes effect even without having paid the fifth, because the gizbar will surely make certain to collect it from him.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that there is a machlokes regarding hekdes as well, where **R' Eliezer** says the hekdes is redeemed without the fifth and the **Rabanan** say it is not, and **Rebbi** said, I follow **R' Eliezer** regarding hekdes and the **Rabanan** regarding maaser, which means that they argue regarding hekdes and regarding maaser!? **A:** Rather, it must be that **R' Yochanan** said that all agree that for purposes of hekdes on Shabbos, lack of payment of the fifth will not prevent the redemption from taking effect, for two reasons – one, the Torah says that one should enjoy eating and drinking on Shabbos, and two, the gizbar will make certain that the fifth is eventually paid.
- **Rami bar Chama** said, they have said that one cannot use land to redeem hekdes, because the pasuk says "v'nossan hakesef v'kam lo". Can the additional fifth be paid with land? Also, if terumah was eaten b'shogeg, it must be paid back with produce that is fit to be terumah. Can the additional fifth be paid with something other than such produce? Also, maaser sheini cannot

be redeemed with an unminted coin. Can the additional fifth be paid with an unminted coin? The matter made it to **Rava**, who said that the pasuk regarding the fifth says “alav”, which teaches that the fifth is treated like the principal payment and can be paid only with things that can be used to pay the principal payment.

- **Ravina** said, a Mishna supports **Rava**. The Mishna discusses one who steals terumah and says that the principal payment and the additional fifth must be paid with produce that is fit to become terumah. We see that the fifth is treated just like the principal payment.
SHEMAH MINAH.
- **Q: Rava** said, regarding a gazlan who swears falsely (obligating him to pay an additional fifth) and who then swears falsely again regarding the fifth, he must pay a fifth on that fifth. Regarding terumah, if someone paid a fifth and then ate the fifth, he would also have to pay a fifth on the fifth. Regarding maaser sheini we don't find that the person would have to pay a fifth on the fifth (if he wanted to redeem the fifth). What is the halacha regarding hekdes? If one redeems the fifth that he gave to hekdes, would he have to pay a fifth on the fifth? Do we say that the pasuk regarding terumah says “v'yasaf” and the pasuk regarding hekdes says that as well, so maybe the same halacha should apply, or do we say that by terumah the pasuk says “chamishiso”, and if we take the “vav” from “v'yasaf” and put it onto “chamishiso” it would be read “chamishisav”, meaning multiple fifths. However, regarding hekdes the pasuk says “chamishis”, which can't be darshened in this way and therefore maybe there is no fifth on the fifth.
 - **Q: Rava** should be able to answer from **R' Yehoshua ben Levi**, who said that only original hekdes needs an additional fifth, but a fifth is secondary hekdes and therefore wouldn't need a fifth to be paid on it!? **A: R' Pappi** said to **Ravina**, **Rava** holds that the fifth is treated as if it is original hekdes.
 - **Q: What is the answer to Rava's question? A: R' Tavyumei in the name of Abaye** said, the pasuk regarding hekdes says “v'yasaf chamishis kesef erkicha”. This compares the fifth to principal (the kesef erkicha). Just as the principal requires an additional fifth, the fifth would also require an additional fifth.
- We said above that **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said that only original hekdes needs an additional fifth, but a secondary hekdes does not. **Rava** said, this is learned from the pasuk that says “v'ihm hamakdish yigal es beiso”, which teaches that the original person who made it hekdes must add a fifth for redemption, but not for a secondary hekdes.
 - Someone taught a Braisa before **R' Elazar** that seemed to say that me'ilah only applies to something that was of original hekdes, not secondary hekdes. **R' Elazar** asked, me'ilah applies to secondary hekdes as well!? Rather, it must be that it is referring to the requirement of paying the additional fifth, and the Braisa is teaching that it does not apply to something that is of secondary hekdes. The one who taught the Braisa said “that is what I had meant to say”.
 - The Braisa quoted the pasuk regarding the making hekdes of a tamei animal and said that a fifth must be added when it is redeemed. The Braisa said that just as a tamei animal can only be of initial hekdes, not secondary, additional payment of a fifth is only required for items of initial hekdes, not secondary.
 - **Q: R' Ashi** asked **Ravina**, why can't a tamei animal be of secondary hekdes? **A: Ravina** said, since it cannot have final kedusha (it cannot be brought on the Mizbe'ach) it also cannot have secondary hekdes.
 - **Q: R' Acha MiDifti** asked **Ravina**, why would that mean that it can't have secondary hekdes? **A: Ravina** said, secondary hekdes is like final hekdes. Just as final hekdes doesn't have an additional fifth, the same is for secondary hekdes.
 - **Q: R' Zutra the son of R' Mari** asked **Ravina**, why not instead compare secondary to initial hekdes? **A: Ravina** said, just as final hekdes can be used on the Mizbe'ach or for the building of the Beis Hamikdash itself, secondary hekdes items usually are the same.
 - **Q: Why don't we instead say that secondary hekdes is comparable to initial hekdes, because they both have levels of hekdes that follow it? A: It is like Rava** said, that the letter “hey” of “ha'olah” teaches that it

refers to the olah being first. Here too, the pasuk says “ha’tmei’ah”, which teaches that it refers to it as being first – initial hekdesch.

- A Braisa clearly says like **R’ Yehoshua ben Levi**.