



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Bava Metzia, Daf נב – Daf נה

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
vl'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf נב---52-----

MISHNA

- How much can a selah coin be missing, and still have its use as a full selah not to be considered as fraudulent? **R' Meir** says 4 issurs per selah, which is an issur per dinar (which is equal to 1/24 of its value). **R' Yehuda** says 4 pundyons per selah, which is a pundyon per dinar (which is equal to 1/12 of its value). **R' Shimon** says 8 pundyons per selah, which is 2 pundyons per dinar (which is 1/6 of its value).
- Until when can the receiver of a bad coin make a claim for exchange of the coin? In big cities he may do so for as much time as it takes to show the coin to a moneychanger. In villages he has until Shabbos (when he goes shopping and tries to use the coin to buy food).
- If the person who gave the coin realized the coin was compromised, then he should take it back even after 12 months, and he has no legal remedy against him, only a reason to complain.
- This compromised coin can be used to redeem maaser sheini, because only stingy people don't accept such coins.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna seems to say that if the coin is eroded to exactly the allowable amount, it would not be considered fraudulent. A Braisa words it differently and seems to say that at that exact amount it *is* considered to be fraudulent!? **A: R' Pappa** said, both are saying that at exactly that amount the coin would be fraudulent. The Mishna is counting up (as it is missing more and more) and means to say that it remains valid until it hits that exact amount. The Braisa is counting down, and is saying that any erosion less than the given amount would be valid.
- **Q:** Why is it that when it comes to coins there are so many views as to what the amount of ona'ah would be, but when it came to other items virtually all agree that it is 1/6? **A: Rava** said, the earlier Mishna that says it is 1/6 actually only follows **R' Shimon** (who says 1/6 in our Mishna as well). **Abaye** said, when it comes to other items, people are mochel up the point of 1/6. With regard to a coin, since it is not readily acceptable, people are not mochel even when it is less than 1/6.
- The Braisa referenced above says, how much must be missing from a selah for it to be considered ona'ah? **R' Meir** says 4 issurs per selah, which is an issur per dinar (which is equal to 1/24 of its value). **R' Yehuda** says 4 pundyons per selah, which is a pundyon per dinar (which is equal to 1/12 of its value). **R' Shimon** says 8 pundyons per selah, which is 2 pundyons per dinar (which is 1/6 of its value). If the coin is more than this (it is not missing those amounts), it may be used at its full stated worth. How much can a coin erode and the owner can still keep it (at a certain point it becomes assur to keep, because it can be used to cheat people)? A selah may be kept until its value is like a shekel, a dinar may be kept until it is "a quarter". If it is worth an issur less, it may not be kept. The coin that has decreased beyond these levels may not be sold either (even for its true value), not to a merchant, not to a person who forces people's assets away, and not to a murderer, because these people are likely to deceive other people. Rather, the person should make a hole in the coin and give it to his son or daughter to wear as a necklace.
 - **Q:** Why is it that the dinar is allowed to diminish until a shekel (which is equal to half its value), whereas as dinar is allowed to diminish until a quarter of its value? **A: Abaye** said, when the Braisa says a dinar can diminish until "a quarter", it means until a quarter of a shekel, which is half the value of a dinar.
 - **Rava** says the words of the Braisa suggest this as well.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Why does the Braisa refer to the diminishment of the dinar relative to a fraction of a shekel?
A: It did so to teach that a shekel that lost half its value and is now worth a dinar, may be used as a dinar.
 - **R' Ami** says this as well.
- **Q:** What does the Braisa mean when it says “if it is worth an issur less, it may not be kept”? **A: Abaye** said, it is referring back to the allowable limits of erosion and is now saying, if it drops to an issur below that limit, it may not be used.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, if it is referring to the allowable limit, even a drop below the limit should be assur to keep, not only if it goes an issur beyond that limit!? **A: Rava** said, rather the Braisa means to say that if there was erosion of a selah in the amount of an issur per dinar, it may not be kept. That part of the Braisa is following **R' Meir**.
 - A Mishna said, if a coin becomes disqualified and a person therefore began using it as a weight for a scale, it is susceptible to becoming tamei. How much could the coin have eroded and it is still mutar to keep it? For a selah, up to two dinars. If it is worth less than that, he must destroy it.
 - **Q:** What if the eroded selah is worth more than 2 dinars? **A: R' Huna** said, whether it is worth more than 2 dinars or less than 2 dinars, it must be destroyed. **R' Ami** said, it only must be destroyed if it is worth less than 2 dinars.
 - **Q:** The Braisa above said “if the coin is more than this, it may be used at its full stated worth”. Presumably this means that it is worth less than the allowable amount for ona'ah, and still it says that it may be kept, and this refutes **R' Huna**!? **A:** The Braisa means, if the coin has eroded, but not enough to make an ona'ah problem, it may be sold for its full face value.
 - **Q:** The Braisa said that a selah may be kept as long as it is still worth a shekel. Presumably, it slowly deteriorated from a selah to a shekel, which means that it may be kept when it is worth more than a shekel, which refutes **R' Huna**!? **A:** The case is that it fell into a fire and jumped from being worth a selah to being worth a shekel.
 - **Q:** The Braisa said the bad coins should be made into necklaces. However, another Braisa says he must fully destroy it, and not use it as a necklace!? **A: R' Elazar** (or **R' Huna in the name of R' Elazar**) said, it may be used as a necklace if the hole is made in the middle. It may not be used if the hole is made on the side.

AHD MASAI MUTAR L'HACHZIR...

- **Q:** Why is it that for coins there are different time limits in the cities and the villages, but for other items the time limit is the same for both places? **A: Abaye** said, the Mishna that gives the time limit for the other items (for as long as it takes to show to a merchant or relative) is only discussing the big cities. **Rava** said, with other items many people are knowledgeable, and therefore even in the villages he can find someone to show it to. With regard to coins, there are few experts. Therefore, in the big cities, where there are moneychangers, he can go and show them. In the villages, we give him until Shabbos so that he can show it when goes shopping.

V'IHM HAYA MAKIRA AFILU L'ACHAR SHNEYM ASSAR CHODESH...

- **Q:** Where is this talking about? We have given time limits for the big cities and for the villages!? **A: R' Chisda** said, the Mishna here is teaching the way of someone who wants to go beyond the letter of the law.
 - **Q:** If so, what does the Mishna mean that “he” (presumably the one accepting the coin back) only has a complaint? If it is referring to a person who went beyond the letter of the law, and in truth he didn't want to accept it, then he simply should not have taken it back!? If the “he” is the person who is returning the coin, what complaint can he have after he was allowed to return the coin!? **A:** The Mishna means, that if someone tries to return a bad coin, but the person he tries to return it to is not looking to go beyond the letter of the law, and therefore doesn't accept it back, the person trying to make the return has a complaint against him, but no legal claim.

V'NOSNA L'MMASER SHEINI V'EINO CHOSHEISH...

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Pappa** said, we see from the Mishna that someone who refuses to take slightly eroded coins is considered to be stingy. This is so, as long as the coins can be used in circulation, although with some difficulty.
- The Mishna supports **Chizkiya**, who said that even though when an eroded coin is given to someone to change for smaller coins, he only needs to give smaller coins based on the value as eroded, if someone uses an eroded coin for maaser sheini redemption, he may treat its value as the face value of the coin.
 - **Q:** We find that **Chizkiya** says that one must overestimate, and use money which is higher than the value of the maaser being redeemed, so how does he say here that he can use eroded coins at their face value!? **A:** **Chizkiya** meant that the eroded coin can be used to redeem only at the coins *current* value.

-----Daf ל"ג---53-----

- 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.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **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

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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**.

-----Daf 71---54-----

- **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**.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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

MISHNA

- The amount to be over ona'ah is 4 silver ma'os out of 24. To be obligated to swear for a partial admission, the claim must be for at least the value of 2 silver ma'os, and the admission must be for at least the value of a perutah.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- There are 5 halachos that require a minimum value of a perutah: the partial admission to make one chayuv to swear must be for at least a perutah; a woman could be miskadeshes with a perutah of value; one is chayuv me'ilah if he benefits the value of a perutah from hekdesch; if one finds the value of a perutah he must call it out to return it; and, if someone steals a perutah value and then swears falsely that he did not, he must follow the owner even to a faraway land to return what he stole.

GEMARA

- **Q:** We have already learned that the amount for ona'ah is 4 out of 24 silver ma'os, so why repeat it here!? **A:** It was stated only as an introduction for the halachos of the claim being 2 silver ma'os and the admission being a perutah.
 - **Q:** These halachos were also stated in a Mishna elsewhere, so why the need to state them here!? **A:** All this was necessary to serve as an introduction for the end of the Mishna, which discusses the 5 halachos which require the value of a perutah.

CHAMEISH PERUTOS HEIN...

- **Q:** Why doesn't the Mishna also list the halacha that the value of ona'ah must be a perutah? **A: R' Kahana** said, we see from here that ona'ah only applies if the base amount was the value of an issur (the smallest silver coin), and therefore, ona'ah will always have to be more than a perutah.
 - **Levi** argues and says that ona'ah applies even when the amount of ona'ah is a perutah. **Levi** taught this in a Braisa as well, where he said there are 5 halachos that require a minimum of a perutah: ona'ah; a partial admission; kiddushin; stealing; and Beis Din only sits for a case that involves a minimum of a perutah.
 - **Q:** Why didn't our Mishna mention that Beis Din only sits for a case that involves a minimum of a perutah? **A:** By saying that one is chayuv to return a stolen item only when its value is a perutah, it thereby also teaches that only this amount is significant, and therefore Beis Din would only hold court for this amount.
 - **Q:** If this is true, why did the Mishna have to teach the halacha of stealing and of a lost item? Teaching one would teach that anything less is not significant for any purpose!? **A:** It was necessary to teach both of these. The case of stealing teaches that one must follow the owner even to a faraway land in order to return a stolen item, and the case of the lost item teaches that even if the value of the item drops to below a perutah, it still must be returned.
 - **Q:** Why didn't **Levi** list the case of the lost item? **A:** By saying that one is chayuv to return a stolen item only when its value is a perutah, it thereby also teaches that only this amount is significant, and therefore we would know that the same applies for a lost item.
 - **Q:** If this is true, why did the Mishna have to teach the halacha of stealing and that Beis Din would only hold court for this amount? We should learn it from the case of stealing!? **A:** He needed to teach the halacha regarding Beis Din to exclude **R' Katina**, who says that Beis Din must sit to hear a case that involves even less than a perutah.
 - **Q:** Why didn't **Levi** teach the case of one who benefits from hekdesch? **A:** He was only discussing chullin, not hekdesch.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna, which does discuss hekdesch, should also discuss the halacha that maaser sheini cannot be redeemed unless it is worth at least a perutah!? **A:** The Mishna follows the view (taught previously) that the additional fifth must even be worth a perutah (which means that the maaser itself must be worth at least 4 perutos).
 - **Q:** Why doesn't the Mishna list that the fifth of the maaser sheini must be worth at least a perutah!? **A:** The Mishna is only discussing principal amounts, not additional fifths.
 - We mentioned that **R' Katina** said that Beis Din must hear a case even if it involves less than a perutah.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, we learn from a pasuk that one would be chayuv for me'ilah for using less than a perutah of value. This suggests that it is only regarding hekdesch that this is so, but for other cases only a perutah is considered to be significant!? **A:** We must say that **R' Katina** meant that

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

although Beis Din only sits to hear a case that is worth at least a perutah, once it is sitting, it will hear additional claims even if they are for less than a perutah.

MISHNA

- There are five cases of where one must pay an additional fifth: one who b'shogeg eats terumah, terumas maaser, terumas maaser of demai, challah, or bikkurim must add a fifth; one who redeems fruit of the fourth year produce of a tree, or his own maaser sheini must add a fifth; one who redeems his own hekdesch must add a fifth; one who has a perutah's worth of benefit from hekdesch must add a fifth; and one who steals and then swears falsely that he did not steal must add a fifth.

GEMARA

- **Q: Rava** said, **R' Elazar** (ben Pedas) asked, why would the **Rabanan** require that a fifth be paid for the eating of terumas maaser of demai b'shogeg? The **Rabanan** don't strengthen their own gezeiros like those of the Torah!
A: R' Nachman in the name of Shmuel said, the Mishna follows **R' Meir**, who says that the **Rabanan** do enact things to strengthen their gezeiros like that of the Torah.
 - This can be seen in a Braisa. The Braisa says that if a woman is given a get without the shaliach having said BBNB, and she remarried based on that get, **R' Meir** says that she must get divorced and any child born from her second husband is a mamzer. The **Chachomim** say that the child is not a mamzer. Rather, the shaliach should take the get back from her and give it to her again in front of 2 people and say BBNB. Now, why would **R' Meir** say that the failure to say BBNB makes the children into mamzeirem? This is based on his statement elsewhere which was said by **R' Hamnuna in the name of Ulla**, that whoever deviates from the exact formulation enacted by the **Rabanan** for gittin must get divorced (if she remarried) and any child she had (from the second marriage) is a mamzer. We see that **R' Meir** holds that the **Rabanan** do enact things to strengthen their gezeiros like that of the Torah.
 - **Q: R' Sheishes** asked, a Mishna says that maaser sheini of demai that was redeemed onto silver coins may then have the kedusha moved to copper coins. Another Mishna regarding regular maaser sheini says that transferring kedushas maaser from silver coins to copper coins may only be done at a time of desperate need. We see that the **Rabanan** do not enact things to strengthen their gezeiros like that of the Torah (they treated demai more leniently)!? **A: R' Yosef** said, although **R' Meir** says they were lenient regarding the redemption of demai, he also says that they were stringent with regard to the eating of demai (and therefore he will hold they were stringent regarding the eating of terumas maaser of demai as well). We see this in a Braisa. The Braisa says, **R' Meir** says the **Rabanan** only allow a chaver who is a wholesaler to sell demai without giving maaser first, but a chaver who is a retailer would have to give demai before selling, even if he decided to sell in large volume. The **Chachomim** say that even a retailer who sells in large volume need not take off maaser from the demai first. We see from here that **R' Meir** says the **Rabanan** were machmir with regard to the eating of demai.

-----Daf ך-----56-----

- The Gemara continues its conversation. The Gemara had just brought **R' Yosef**, who said that although **R' Meir** says the **Rabanan** were lenient with regard to the redemption of demai, they were stringent with regard to the eating of demai.
 - **Q: Ravina** asked, a Mishna says that if one buys bread from a baker who is an ahm haaretz (in which case anything bought from him is demai, and maaser must be separated), **R' Meir** says he may separate maaser from one loaf for another even if the loaves are of different shapes. Now, one is not allowed to separate maaser from one batch of demai for another, because it is possible that one batch in truth did not need maaser separated and the other did, which would mean that maaser was separated from a chiyuv to a petur, or visa-versa, which is assur to do. When the loaves are of different shapes, there is a concern that they came from different batches, and yet **R' Meir** is meikel, *even though* this is a case of *eating* demai!? **A: Abaye** answered by giving his thoughts on the entire back and forth of the Gemara

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

since the Mishna. He said, **R' Elazar's** initial question was valid, because he asked that the Mishna was machmir regarding terumas maaser of demai, and even regular terumas maaser only carries a penalty of "misah bidei Shamayim" (which is not the most severe form of punishment). **Shmuel** did not answer him well, because he said the Mishna follows **R' Meir**, who we see is machmir regarding the halachos of get. That is not a good answer, because get carries the death penalty, and may be a reason why **R' Meir** is machmir there, even if he would not be machmir regarding demai. **R' Sheishes**, who then asked from a case of maaser sheini, did not ask well, because maaser sheini is a simple lav, which may be why **R' Meir** is lenient there. However, based on **R' Sheishes's** question, **R' Yosef** answered well, that it may be that **R' Meir** was meikel regarding redemption, but was machmir regarding eating of demai. Now, **Ravina's** question was not good one. Instead of asking from the case of the baker, he could have instead brought a proof to **R' Yosef** from another Mishna which says that **R' Meir** says, that one who buys from a wholesale bread seller must give maaser from each shaped bread separately. This shows that **R' Meir** is machmir with regard to the eating of demai. **Ravina** would say that the reason he did not bring a proof from there is that in that case we must assume that the wholesaler bought the bread from many different bakers, and that is why each shape (which presumably came from different bakers) must have maaser given from it separately. Based, on that logic, we can answer **Ravina's** question and say that the reason **R' Meir** allows taking maaser from one shaped loaf for another when they are bought from the same baker (as opposed to a wholesaler) is because we assume that he got all his merchandise from a single source, in which case we may give maaser from one loaf for the other, even if they are of different shapes.

- **Rava** said, although **Abaye** felt that **Shmuel** didn't answer **R' Elazar** well, **Shmuel** actually did answer well. The fact that terumas maaser and get both are subject to *some sort* of death penalty, that is enough of a commonality for them to be compared.

MISHNA

- The following things are not subject to the laws of ona'ah: the sale of slaves, of promissory notes, of land, and of hekdesch. These items are also not subject to the paying of keifel if they are stolen, or to the paying of daled v'hey. Also, if these items are given to a shomer chinam, he would not have to swear that he was not negligent if something happened to the item. Also, a shomer sachar would not have to pay if he was given one of these items and it was stolen.
 - **R' Shimon** says, items of hekdesch for which one is responsible, the laws of ona'ah do apply to them, and if he is not responsible there is no ona'ah.
 - **R' Yehuda** says, also when one sells a Sefer Torah, an animal or a diamond, the laws of ona'ah don't apply. The **Chachomim** told him, only the previous list is not subject to ona'ah.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that these items are not subject to ona'ah? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding ona'ah says "v'chi simkiru mimkar la'amisecha oy kano miyad amisecha", which teaches that it is referring to moveable objects. This excludes land from the laws of ona'ah, because land is not moveable, and excludes slaves, which are compared to land. It also excludes the sale of promissory notes, because the words "v'chi simkiru mimkar" teaches that the item itself is being sold, and documents are just a written proof to the underlying loan that is being sold (the paper is not the item being sold). Based on this, if someone sold a document for the paper – e.g. he sold it to be used for wrapping spices – it would be subject ona'ah. [The Gemara asks, this seems obvious!? The Gemara answers, this comes to exclude **R' Kahana**, who says that ona'ah doesn't apply when the value of the ona'ah is only a perutah.] The Braisa continues, ona'ah doesn't apply to hekdesch, because the pasuk of ona'ah says "achiv", which comes to exclude items of hekdesch.
 - **Q: Rabbah bar Mamal** asked, the Braisa said that the word "miyad" refers only to a moveable item, because it refers to something that can be held in a hand. However, a pasuk regarding Sichon says "vayikach es kol artzo miyado", which can't mean that he held the land in his hand, and must mean he had it in his possession. If so, in the pasuk of ona'ah it can also mean "possession", and therefore include

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

land as well!? **A:** We find a Braisa regarding stealing that needs a drasha to teach that although the pasuk says “b’yado”, it refers to anywhere in the possession of the ganav. This suggests, that if not for this drasha, the word “b’yado” would only mean in his actual hand! A Braisa regarding get also uses a drasha to teach that although the pasuk says “b’yada”, the get may be put anywhere in her possession. Again, we see that if not for this drasha, the word “b’yada” would only mean in her actual hand! We see that the use of the word “hand” refers to an actual hand. In the case of the pasuk of Sichon, it is impossible to understand it literally, and therefore, it must mean “possession”.

- **Q: R’ Zeira** asked, is the rental of items subject to ona’ah? Maybe the pasuk’s use of the word “mimkar” teaches that it must be a sale, or maybe we should not understand it in this way? **A: Abaye** said, the pasuk doesn’t say it must be a permanent sale, rather that it is a sale. A rental is also a “sale” for the term of the rental period.
- **Q: Rava** asked, what is the halacha if someone had wheat seeds and planted them in the ground, and sold them before they took root? Would they be subject to ona’ah? Maybe we view them as if they are moveable items thrown into a keili, and they are therefore subject to ona’ah, or maybe we say the seeds become batel to the ground and are not subject to ona’ah?
 - **Q:** What is the case? It can’t be that the case is where the seller told the buyer that he put 6 se’ah of seeds into the field and in fact he had only put 5, because **Rava** has said that anything that is sold when measured, weighed, or counted may be returned if misrepresented, even if the amount is less than 1/6!? **A:** The case must be that the seller told the buyer that he put in an amount of seeds that the field needs to produce a proper yield, when in fact, we find out that he put in less. The question is, is there ona’ah in that case or not? Do we view them as if they are moveable items thrown into a keili, and they are therefore subject to ona’ah, or maybe we say the seeds become batel to the ground and are not subject to ona’ah?
 - **Q:** Would one have to swear regarding these seeds which have not yet taken root, or not? Do we view them as if they are moveable items thrown into a keili, and they are therefore subject to an oath, or maybe we say the seeds become batel to the ground and are not subject to an oath?
 - **Q:** The bringing of the Omer allowed the eating of all the new grain. Does the Omer permit these seeds as well?
 - **Q:** What is the case? If it is talking about where it rooted before the Omer was brought, a Mishna already teaches that the Omer permits eating this grain!? If the case is that it did not yet root, the Mishna teaches that the Omer does not permit it (and it does not become mutar until the Omer of the following year)!? **A:** The case must be where the seller harvested grain kernels (which can be eaten or used for planting) and planted them in the ground before the Omer was brought, and the Omer was brought before they took root. The question is, can the kernels be taken out of the ground and eaten based on the Omer that was brought, or not? Do we view them as if they are moveable items thrown into a keili, and they therefore become mutar based on the Omer that was brought, or maybe we say the seeds become batel to the ground and do not become mutar based on the Omer? To that, the Gemara leaves with a **TEIKU**.

-----Daf 57-----

- **Rava in the name of R’ Chisda** said, **R’ Ami** asked, with regard to the items listed in the Mishna to which ona’ah does not apply, what if the amount of the overcharge was for more than 1/6 – would the deceived party be allowed to back out of the deal? **R’ Nachman** said that **R’ Chasa** later said that **R’ Ami** decided that although these items are not subject to ona’ah, they are subject to the laws if the amount of the overcharge was for more than 1/6.
 - **R’ Yonah and R’ Yirmiya** both said that **R’ Yochanan** said that although there is no law of ona’ah, there is the law of more than 1/6, however **R’ Yona** said that this was said regarding hekdes and **R’ Yirmiya** said it was said regarding land.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yona** would certainly agree that it was said regarding land as well. **R' Yirmiya** would say that it applies to land, but with regard to hekdeshe it would not apply, as **Shmuel** has said, that if someone redeems a maneh's worth of hekdeshe onto a perutah, it is considered to be redeemed.
- **Q:** A Mishna says, if an animal of hekdeshe got a mum and was redeemed onto a cheaper animal, the kedusha of the first animal has been removed, but the redeemer must make up the shortfall of the value to hekdeshe. On this Mishna **R' Yochanan** said that the kedusha is removed D'Oraisa, and he must pay the difference only D'Rabanan, whereas **Reish Lakish** says that he must pay the difference even D'Oraisa. Now, what is the case being discussed? If hekdeshe was "underpaid" by exactly 1/6, **Reish Lakish** wouldn't say the difference has to be paid D'Oraisa, because our Mishna said there is no ona'ah when dealing with hekdeshe!? Rather, it must be that the case is where it was more than 1/6. If so, according to **R' Yona**, he says that **R' Yochanan** holds that for an amount above 1/6 the transaction could be voided, even when dealing with hekdeshe, so how could **R' Yochanan** have said that D'Oraisa the redemption is valid!? **A:** The case is where the difference is more than 1/6, and we must reverse the shitos of **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish**.
 - **Q:** What is the point of machlokes between **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish**? **A:** They argue in the halacha of **Shmuel**, who says that if someone redeems a maneh's worth of hekdeshe onto a perutah, it is considered to be redeemed. **A2:** They both hold of **Shmuel**, but they argue in whether one may do so l'chatchila, or only b'di'eved.
 - **A:** We can also say that the case of the machlokes is where the second animal was worth exactly 1/6 less than the first, and we do not need to reverse the shitos. The machlokes is whether they hold like **R' Chisda**, who says that when the Mishna says there is no ona'ah when dealing with hekdeshe, it means that there is no ona'ah, but rather the rules are *stricter* than the rules of ona'ah, and even if it is less than 1/6 the transaction can be cancelled.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, the halachos of ribis and ona'ah apply to dealings with private people, but not to dealings with hekdeshe. This refutes **R' Chisda**!? **A:** The same way we explained the Mishna to mean that they are not subject to ona'ah, rather they are subject to stricter rules, we would explain the Braisa in the same way!
 - **Q:** The Braisa ends off by saying that this is a chumra of a private person over hekdeshe. This clearly means that hekdeshe is not treated more stringently than ona'ah!? **A:** That statement was made regarding ribis, not ona'ah.
 - **Q:** Based on **R' Chisda**, the Braisa should say that hekdeshe is more stringent than a private person regarding the concept of ona'ah!? **A:** The Braisa gives the chumra of a private person over hekdeshe, because that is a rare occurrence. The Braisa will not name a chumra of hekdeshe over a private person, because that would be only one item of a long list.
 - **Q:** What is the case of ribis with hekdeshe? It can't be that the gizbar lent money to a private individual and charged interest, because by lending to a private individual, the gizbar has committed me'ilah, which causes the money to lose its kedusha, and becomes a case of an individual lending with ribis!? **A:** **R' Hoshaya** said, the case would be where someone agreed to supply flour to hekdeshe for 4 se'ah per selah, and the price then increased to 3 se'ah per selah, in which case the person must continue to provide it for 4 se'ah per selah. Although a private person could not make this transaction (because it seems like ribis), hekdeshe can. **A2:** **R' Pappa** said, the case would be where someone gave stones to the gizbar to hold for him until they would be used for the Beis Hamikdash complex, in which case he doesn't make them hekdeshe until they are being put into the structure. If, before this time the gizbar lent the stones to a private individual, he may do so with ribis.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** How do we know this? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding keifel says “ahl kol dvar peshah”, which is a klal, “ahl shor ahl chamor ahl seh ahl salma” is a prat, “ahl kol aveidah” is another klal. We have a klal, prat, uklal, which teaches to include items like the prat. Just as the prat are moveable items that have intrinsic value, so too all items that are moveable and have intrinsic value are subject to keifel payment. This excludes land, which is not moveable, it excludes servants, which are compared in the pasuk to land, and excludes documents, which have no intrinsic value. The pasuk also says that keifel is paid “l’rei’eihu”, which therefore also excludes hekdesh from being paid keifel.

V’LO TASHLUMEI DALED V’HEY

- **Q:** Why is this so? **A:** Keifel is one payment of the 4 or 5 times payment. Since there is no keifel paid, there can’t be daled v’hey either, because it would be 3 or 4 times, not 4 or 5 times.

SHOMER CHINAM EINO NISHBA

- **Q:** How do we know this? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding a shomer chinam says “ki yitein ish ehl rei’eihu”, which is a klal, “kesef oy keilim” is a prat, “lishmor” is another klal. We have a klal, prat, uklal, which teaches to include items like the prat. Just as the prat are moveable items that have intrinsic value, so too all items that are moveable and have intrinsic value are subject to a shomer chinam having to swear regarding them. This excludes land, which is not moveable, it excludes servants, which are compared in the pasuk to land, and excludes documents, which have no intrinsic value. The pasuk also says “rei’eihu”, which therefore also excludes hekdesh from being included in the halacha of making the shomer chinam swear.

NOSEI SACHAR EINO MISHALEM

- **Q:** How do we know this? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding a shomer sachar says “ki yitein ish ehl rei’eihu”, which is a klal, “chamor oy shor oy seh” is a prat, “v’chol beheimah lishmor” is another klal. We have a klal, prat, uklal, which teaches to include items like the prat. Just as the prat are moveable items that have intrinsic value, so too all items that are moveable and have intrinsic value are subject to a shomer sachar having to pay if the item is stolen or lost. This excludes land, which is not moveable, it excludes servants, which are compared in the pasuk to land, and excludes documents, which have no intrinsic value. The pasuk also says “rei’eihu”, which therefore also excludes hekdesh from being included in the halacha of making the shomer sachar pay if the item is stolen or lost.

-----Daf 71-----58-----

SHOMER CHINAM EINO NISHBA...

- **Q:** A Mishna says, if people of a city sent their machtzis hashekels with a shaliach (who is treated as a shomer), and the coins were lost or stolen, then if hekdesh had begun using coins on their behalf (by using other coins with the intent that these people be included), the shaliach would have to swear to the gizbar (that he was not negligent), and if hekdesh did not yet use coins with these people in mind, the shaliach must swear to the people that had sent him and they would then have to send new coins. We see from here that a shomer chinam *does* have to swear when he was watching property of hekdesh!? **A:** **Shmuel** said, the shaliach here was paid, and as such became a shomer sachar, and he is swearing to collect his fee (he swears that it is not in his reshus).
 - **Q:** If he is swearing to collect his fee, why does the Mishna say that he swears to the gizbar!? It is the people who sent him who must pay him!? **A:** **Rabbah** said, the Mishna means that he swears to the people that sent him, but in the presence of the gizbar. This is done so that the gizbar not suspect the shaliach of having stolen the money himself, or so that people not call this shaliach a negligent person.
 - **Q:** The Mishna says the coins were lost or stolen, for which a shomer sachar is normally chayuv. Even if we say that he is patur here because it is hekdesh, he still shouldn’t be deserving of his fee!? **A:** **Rabbah** said, the Mishna means it was stolen by armed robbers (which makes him an oneis) or was lost when a ship sank at sea (which is also an oneis). Therefore, these are cases in which a shomer sachar would not have to pay.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **A: R' Yochanan** said, this Mishna does argue with our Mishna, because it follows the view of **R' Shimon**, who says that when one is responsible for the hekdesch, a shomer would have to swear regarding that item of hekdesch.
 - **Q:** That makes sense in the second case of the Mishna, where the people would be chayuv to send new coins. However, in the first case of the Mishna, where the people do not have to send new coins, even **R' Shimon** should say that he does not have to swear!? **A: R' Elazar** said, the Mishna does not argue with our Mishna, and both agree that a person does not swear regarding an item of hekdesch. The oath in that Mishna is a Rabbinic oath, instituted so that people not treat the property of hekdesch trivially.

NOSEI SACHAR EINO MESHALEM

- **Q: R' Yosef bar Chama** asked **Rabbah**, the Mishna said that a shomer sachar does not pay for hekdesch that was lost or stolen. However, a Braisa says, if hekdesch hired a shomer to guard the parah adumah from becoming passul, or to guard a child from becoming tamei, or to guard the grain for the Omer, he is not paid for Shabbos, and therefore, if anything happens on Shabbos he is not responsible. However, if he was hired for the week, for the month, for the year, or for the shmitta cycle, he is paid for Shabbos and is therefore responsible for anything that may happen on Shabbos. Presumably, this means he is responsible to pay if there is a loss. This contradicts our Mishna!? **A:** It means he would lose his wages, but not that he would be responsible to pay for a loss.
 - **Q: R' Yosef bar Chama** asked, that would mean that the first part of the Mishna means to say that if something happens on Shabbos he would not get paid for Shabbos. Now, that can't be right, because the Mishna clearly says that he does not get paid for Shabbos!? **A: Rabbah** did not know what to answer, and asked **R' Yosef bar Chama** whether he knew of an answer. He said, **R' Sheishes** has said that the case is that this shomer made a kinyan to obligate himself to pay for any loss (even though he would otherwise not be chayuy). **R' Yochanan** gave the same answer.

R' SHIMON OMER KODOSHIM SHECHAYUV B'ACHRAYUSAN...

- A Braisa was taught in front of **R' Yitzchak bar Abba**, that said, if a shomer swears falsely about kodashim for which the owner is responsible, we learn from the pasuk of "baHashem v'kichesh" (which seems to teach that it belongs to Hashem) that the shomer would be chayuv to bring an asham, and if he swore about kodashim for which the owner is not responsible, he would not be chayuv to bring an asham, based on the pasuk of "ba'amiso v'kichesh" (which seems to teach that it belongs to the owner). **R' Yitzchak bar Abba** asked, that seems to be illogical!? The opposite would make more sense!? Rather, we must explain the Braisa to be saying that if he swore falsely about kodashim for which the owner is responsible he *would* be chayuv to bring an asham based on an inclusion learned from the words of "baHashem v'kichesh", and if he did so about kodashim for which the owner is not responsible, he would be patur, based on an exclusion from the words of "ba'amiso v'kichesh".

R' YEHUDA OMER AHF HAMOCHER SEFER TORAH...

- A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** says, one who sells a Sefer Torah is not subject to ona'ah, because there is no limit to the value of a Sefer Torah. The sale of an animal or diamond is also not subject to ona'ah, because a person buys these items to match items that he already has (and it is therefore worth more to him than the market price). The **Rabanan** said to him, based on that logic, every item should not be subject to ona'ah, because people want items that match.
 - **R' Yehuda** would say that is true, but when it comes to matching an animal or a diamond, people would be willing to overpay for that.
 - **Q:** How much would someone be willing to overpay for a matching item? **A: Ameimar** said, up to double its value.
- A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda ben Beseira** says, also someone who sells a horse, or a sword, or a shield during a war is not subject to ona'ah, because the buyer needs this to protect his life.

MISHNA

- Just as there is the concept of ona'ah in financial dealings, there is also a concept of ona'ah with words. A person should not ask a seller "how much is that item" if he has no intention of buying it. If someone is a baal teshuva, a person should not say to him "remember your past deeds". If someone is a ger, a person should not say to him

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

“remember the deeds of your ancestors”. This is learned from the pasuk that says “v’ger lo soneh v’lo silchatzenu”.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk of “lo sonu ish es amiso” refers to ona’ah of words. Maybe it refers to financial ona’ah? The other pasuk that says “v’chi simkiru...” refers to financial ona’ah, so the pasuk of “v’lo sonu” must refer to ona’ah of words. For example, if someone is a baal teshuva, a person should not say to him “remember your past deeds”. If someone is a ger, a person should not say to him “remember the deeds of your ancestors”. If a ger comes to learn Torah a person should not say to him “a mouth that ate assur foods is now coming to learn the Torah which was given to us by Hashem?” If someone suffered or had illness or had buried children in his lifetime, a person should not say to him like Iyuv’s friends said to him, that this amount of suffering must surely have come due to sin. If a donkey driver was looking for merchandise to transport, he should not tell him “go to so-and-so, who sells grain”, when he in fact knows that that person does not sell grain, and will not have merchandise that he needs to be transported. **R’ Yehuda** says, a person should also not even look at merchandise when he does not have the money to buy it. The Braisa continues, saying things like this can be construed as being said innocently, and therefore it is in the person’s heart to know whether he has said something wrong or not. Regarding anything that is given over to someone’s heart in this way, the pasuk says “v’yareisa mei’Elokecha”.
- **R’ Yochanan in the name of R’ Shimon ben Yochai** said, ona’ah of words is worse than ona’ah of money, because only regarding ona’ah of words is it written “v’yareisa mei’Elokecha”. **R’ Elazar** said, ona’ah of words is worse, because it effects the person himself, whereas ona’ah of money only effects the person’s money. **R’ Shmuel bar Nachmeini** said, ona’ah of words is worse, because it can never be reversed, whereas ona’ah of money can simply be returned.
- A Braisa was taught in front of **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** that said, someone who embarrasses another in public is as if he killed him. **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, that is correct, as we see that the embarrassed person loses the red color in his face and turns white (his blood is taken from him).
 - **Abaye** asked **R’ Dimi** “what are the people in EY careful about”? **R’ Dimi** answered, they are careful not to embarrass people, for **R’ Chanina** said, all people who go to Gehenom eventually come out, except for 3 people – someone who is mezaneh with a married woman, someone who embarrasses another in public, and someone who calls another by an embarrassing nickname.
 - **Q:** The last 2 seem to be the same!? **A:** Even if the person is used to being called by the name and doesn’t get embarrassed anymore, still it is a terrible aveirah to call him by that name.
 - **Rabbah bar Chana in the name of R’ Yochanan** said, it is better for a person to be mezaneh with a woman who may be married to another man rather than to embarrass someone in public. This is seen from the drasha of **Rava** on a pasuk in Tehillim, which he explains to mean that the people would come to Dovid Hamelech and embarrass him by asking him “what form of death do we use on someone who was mezaneh with a married woman” (referring to Dovid’s story with Batsheva). Dovid answered, “such a person gets chenek, but is allowed into Olam Habah, whereas a person who embarrasses another in public is not allowed into Olam Habah!”
 - **Mar Zutra bar Tuvia in the name of Rav** said (others quote this in the name of others), it is better for a person to throw himself into a burning fire, rather than to embarrass another person in public. We learn this from Tamar (who was ready to allow herself to be killed with sreifah rather than to embarrass Yehuda).