



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

Bava Metzia Daf Samach Aleph

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “es kaspicha lo sitein lo b’neshech u’vimarbis lo sitein achlecha”. From here we would only know that neshech applies to lending money and tarbis applies to lending food. How do we know that neshech applies to food? Another pasuk says “neshech ochel”. How do we know that tarbis applies to money? Another pasuk says “neshech kesef”, which can’t be referring to neshech of money, because that pasuk already says “lo sashich l’achicha”. Therefore, it must be referring to tarbis of money. How do we know that the issur of tarbis applies to the lender as well (the pasuk speaks in terms of the borrower)? The word neshech is written with respect to a borrower and with respect to a lender. We learn a gezeira shava which teaches that just as the neshech written in regard to the borrower applies the issur regarding money and food, and applies neshech and tarbis, the same would apply to the lender as well. How do we know that these laws apply to lending of all other items as well? The pasuk says “neshech kol davar asher yishach”.
 - **Ravina** said, the issur of neshech for loans of food and the issur of tarbis for loans of money don’t have to be taught by a gezeirah shava. From the fact that the pasuk of “es kaspicha lo sitein lo b’neshech u’vimarbis lo sitein achlecha” writes “b’neshech u’vimarbis” together in between “money” and “food”, the pasuk can be read as applying money to both and as applying food to both.
 - **Q:** The Braisa said this is learned from the gezeirah shava, so how can **Ravina** argue on a Braisa? **A:** He would say that the Braisa means, if the pasuk wasn’t written in this way we would have needed a gezeirah shava. However, since it was, the gezeirah shava is not needed to teach this.
 - **Q:** So what is the gezeirah shava used for? **A:** It is needed to teach that the pasuk of “neshech kol davar asher yishach” applies to the lender as well.
 - **Rava** asked, why did the Torah have to write a lav for ribis, a separate one for gezel, and yet another one for ona’ah? Why couldn’t they be learned out from each other? **Rava** said, they are all necessary. If we would only have a lav of ribis, we would say ribis is a chiddush, because the lav even applies to the borrower! If we would have only had a lav by gezel we would say gezel is different, because it was forcibly taken from the person, but ona’ah was given willingly. If we would only have the lav by ona’ah, we would say it is because the deceived party doesn’t even realize that he has a claim to be mochel, but in the other cases he is aware.
 - **Q:** Although we cannot have learned any two from any single one, maybe we could have learned one from the other two? Which one can we learn from the other two? If ribis was not written we would say it can’t be learned from gezel and ona’ah, because those are done without the person’s consent. If ona’ah was not written we would say it can’t be learned from ribis and gezel, because those cases are not cases of money taken in a regular transaction, whereas ona’ah is (people at times are willing to pay more than market value for a particular item). However, gezel did not have to be written and we could learn it from ribis and ona’ah. If you would ask that ribis is a chiddush, we would say that ona’ah is not a chiddush and yet there is a lav. If you would ask that ona’ah is a case where he doesn’t even know to be mochel, we would say that by ribis he knows to be mochel and yet there is a lav. Based on this we could have learned out gezel, so why was the lav of gezel explicitly written? **A:** It teaches that there is a lav to withhold payment from an employee.
 - **Q:** The lav against withholding payment is learned from an explicit pasuk of “lo saashok sachir ani v’evyon”!? **A:** It was needed so that one who does withhold payment would violate two lavim.

person who lends with ribis must fear punishment from Hashem, but not the money being taken away from him. **Rava** said, the basis is the pasuk that says “mos yumas damav bo”, which compares a lender with ribis to a murderer – just as a murderer does not pay and receive a kaparah, so too the lender of ribis need not pay.

- **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, **R' Elazar's** view is based on the pasuk of ribis that says “v'chei achicha imach”, which he darshens to mean – return the money so that he can financially live.
 - **Q:** What would **R' Yochanan** darshen with this pasuk? **A:** He uses it as does a Braisa, which says that **R' Akiva** says, if 2 people are travelling and there is enough water for only one of them to drink and live long enough to make it to civilization, the owner of the water does not need to share the water with the other person. This is based on the pasuk of “v'chei achicha imach”.