



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

### Bava Metzia Daf Ayin Aleph

- A Braisa says, **R' Yose** said, look how blind the people who lend ribis are. If a person would call another person a rasha, the insulted person would be extremely upset. Yet, these same people lend with ribis and show the parties involved – the sofer and the witnesses – that they don't believe in Hashem!
- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says, the pasuk says that one who lends without ribis is rewarded tremendously in a financial way as well. We can learn from there, that someone who lends with ribis is punished by losing his money.
  - **Q:** We find people who lend without ribis and yet they lose their money? **A: R' Elazar** said, these people maybe temporarily lose money, but they will again rise up.
- A Braisa says, **Rebbi** said, a pasuk discusses an eved ivri being sold to a ger, and a Braisa says this refers to a "ger tzedek" (a convert), and a pasuk discusses ribis and also mentions a ger, and this is understood to refer to a ger toshav, but I have difficulty understanding the pesukim.
  - The Gemara explains, the pasuk regarding a Yid who sells himself into slavery says that he will even be sold to a "ger", which the Braisa says refers to a ger tzedek.
    - **Q:** Another Braisa says that a ger tzedek cannot be koneh an eved ivri, based on the fact that he can't be bought as an eved ivri (based on the drasha of a pasuk), and one who can't be sold as an eved ivri can't be koneh an eved ivri either, and a woman cannot be koneh an eved ivri (it is not proper for her to buy an eved, because it leads to problems of yichud and zenus)!? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, he can't be koneh an eved ivri like a Yid can (in which case if the master dies during the term, the eved ivri must serve his heirs), but he can be koneh an eved ivri like a goy can (in which case, if the master dies during the term the eved would not serve any further).
      - **Q:** The Braisa that says that a ger and a woman cannot be koneh an eved ivri seems not to follow **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**, because a Braisa says that **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** allows a woman to be koneh an eved!? **A:** That Braisa is talking about a non-Jewish slave. He allows that because a woman is afraid to be mezaneh with a non-Jewish slave, because she is afraid he will tell everyone what they did. She knows that a Yid would not divulge, and there is therefore a risk that she may be mezaneh with an eved ivri (which is why she may not be koneh an eved ivri).
      - **Q: R' Yosef** taught a Braisa that says that a widow may not have a dog (out of fear that she will be mezaneh with it) and may not host the talmidim (for fear of zenus with them). Now, based on what we just said, there should only be a concern with the talmidim, but with the dog, since if she is mezaneh with it, it will cling to her, people will find out, so she would not be mezaneh!? **A:** She is not concerned if the dog clings to her, because people will say it is clinging to her because she threw it a piece of meat.
  - **Q:** With regard to ribis the pasuk seems to include a ger toshav in the group of people that may not be lent with ribis. This contradicts our Mishna that clearly says that one may lend to and from a ger toshav with ribis!? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, the pasuk ends off with "ahl tikach mei'ito" (using the singular), which teaches that the prohibition only applies to lending to Yidden, not to a ger toshav.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk says "you shall not take from a Yid neshech or tarbis". This teaches that one may not lend with ribis, but he may become a guarantor on a loan that was given with ribis.

- This can't refer to where the lender is a Yid as well, because a Mishna says that it is even assur to guarantee or act as a witness on a loan with interest. Rather, the Braisa must be referring to where the lender is a goy.
  - **Q:** Since a goy goes directly to the guarantor to collect, which will mean that the guarantor will then go and collect the principal and interest from the Yid, it should be assur!? **A: R' Sheishes** said, the case is where the goy said "I will follow the Jewish law, and not go directly to the guarantor to collect, but will instead go to the borrower".
    - **Q:** If he is following Jewish law, how can he charge interest? **A: R' Sheishes** said, he is only following the law of who to collect from, not the laws of ribis.

#### MALVEH YISRAEL MA'OSAV SHEL NACHRI MIDAAS HANACHRI...

- A Braisa says, a Yid may lend out the money of a goy with his consent, but not with a Yid's consent. What does this mean? If a Yid borrowed money from a goy with interest and is about to return the money, and another Yid comes to him and says, "instead of giving it back, give it to me, and I will then pay you the interest that you will give to the goy", it is assur. However, if the goy is standing there and consents to this, it is mutar. Similarly, if a Yid lent money to a goy with interest and the goy is about to return the money, and another Yid comes to him and says, "instead of giving it back, give it to me, and I will then pay you the interest that you will give to the Yid", it is mutar. However, if the Yid is standing there and consents to this, it is assur.
  - **Q:** The second case is a chumra, and therefore understandable as to why that is the halacha. However, why is it mutar if the goy is standing there in the first case? This is no concept of shlichus for a goy, and therefore it is truly the Yid that is taking the interest on his own behalf and then giving it to the goy!? **A: R' Huna bar Manoach in the name of R' Acha the son of R' Ika** said, the case is where the goy told the Yid to put the money on the ground and be released from his obligations.
    - **Q:** If so, the halacha seems obvious!? **A: R' Pappa** therefore said, the case is where the goy took the money from the first Yid and gave it to the second Yid.
      - **Q:** That also seems obvious!? **A:** We would think that the goy is acting according to the will of the Yid, and it is therefore still considered to be from the Yid. The Braisa therefore teaches that the goy is acting on his own behalf.
    - **A: R' Ashi** said, we only say that shlichus doesn't apply to a goy with regard to separating terumah. In other areas there is the concept of shlichus for a goy.
      - The Gemara says that **R' Ashi** is mistaken. Just as a pasuk teaches us regarding terumah that there is no shlichus for a goy, we will learn out from there to all other places in the Torah.
    - **Others** say that **R' Ashi** said, we only say there is no shlichus for a goy with regard to a goy being a shliach for a Yid. However, a Yid may become a shliach for a goy.
      - The Gemara says that **R' Ashi** is mistaken. Just as a pasuk teaches us regarding terumah that a goy can't be a shliach for a Yid, we would also learn from there that a Yid cannot become a shliach for a goy either.
    - **Ravina** said, although it is true that there is no shlichus for a goy, the **Rabanan** instituted that a person can be koneh something for a goy, just as they did for a minor. A minor cannot have shlichus and yet someone can be koneh something for him. The same is with a goy.
      - The Gemara says, this is not so. A Jewish minor will eventually have shlichus, and that is why the **Rabanan** instituted that one can be koneh for the minor. A goy will never have shlichus, and therefore the **Rabanan** never instituted that someone can be koneh for him.