



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

Bava Basra Daf Pey Daled

SHICHAMTIS V'NIMTZEIS LIVANAH...

- From the fact that the Mishna says that the buyer received “white” instead of the “sun (red) wheat”, it must be that the sun is red. This makes sense, as we see that the sun is red at sunrise and sunset. The reason we don't see the redness all day is because our eyesight is not sharp enough to see it.
 - **Q:** A Braisa explains the different types of tzaraas and explains that when the pasuk says it is “Amok” (deeper) it means that in the sense that it appears deeper, as how the sun appears deeper than the shade. Now, this suggests that other than a difference in depth, the sun and the tzaraas are the same. The tzaraas is white, which would suggest that the sun is also white!? **A:** The Braisa just means that it is like the sun in one sense – in that it appears deeper – but not in the color.
 - **Q:** How could the Gemara have even thought that the sun is white, when we see it is reddish in the morning and the evening? **A:** Even if it is white, it may appear reddish in the morning as it passes through the rose garden of Gan Eden, and in the evening it appears reddish because it passes through the entrance to Gehenom. Some say that the order is reversed.

YAYIN V'NIMTZA CHOMETZ SHNEYHEM YECHOLIN LACHZOR BAHEN

- **Q:** The Mishna seems to follow the view of **Rebbi**, and not the **Rabanan**, in a Braisa where the **Rabanan** say that wine and vinegar are considered to be one and the same species, and **Rebbi** says they are separate and distinct species? **A:** The Mishna may even follow the **Rabanan**. The **Rabanan** only say that they are considered to be one species regarding terumah and maaser, but regarding commercial transactions they are considered to be separate and distinct, and can therefore be the basis of voiding a sale.

MISHNA

- If one sells produce at an agreed price, and the buyer does meshicha but did not measure the produce, he is koneh. If he measured but did not do meshicha, he is not koneh. If he is smart, he should rent the place where the produce sits.
- If one buys flax, he is not koneh until he does hagbaha and moves the flax from one place to another. If the flax was still attached to the ground and he detached even a small amount of it, he is koneh.

GEMARA

- **R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan** said, if the seller measured the produce in his keili and put it on the ground in a simta (the side of the reshus harabim, where people don't typically go), the buyer is koneh even without meshicha. **R' Zeira** said to **R' Assi**, maybe you heard this halacha (that he is koneh) when he put the produce into a keili of the buyer, but not when it was put directly onto the ground? **R' Assi** said, if he is only koneh when he puts it into the keili of the buyer, **R' Yochanan** would not have had to say this halacha (it would be obvious).
 - **Q:** Did **R' Zeira** accept this answer and agree with **R' Assi's** understanding of **R' Yochanan**, or not? **A:** We find that **R' Yannai** (who was the rebbi of **R' Yochanan**) in the name of **Rebbi** said that a jointly owned chatzer can be used to make a kinyan by one from the other. Presumably, this is referring to where the seller put the items on the ground, and would prove **R' Assi's** understanding.
 - It may be that **R' Yannai** was referring to where it was put into the buyer's keili, which would be as **R' Zeira** explained. In fact, it makes sense that this is the case, because we find that **R' Yaakov in the name of R' Yochanan** said that if a

seller measures and puts the produce down in a simta, the buyer is not koneh. Now, this would seem to be a contradiction with the other statement said in the name of **R' Yochanan**. Rather, we can say that it is not a contradiction, because **R' Assi's** case was where the produce was placed into the buyer's keili and **R' Yaakov's** case was where it was placed onto the ground. **SHEMA MINAH.**

- **Q:** Our Mishna said that if the produce was measured but the buyer did not do meshicha he is not koneh. Presumably this is even referring to where it was measured in a simta, and we see that putting it down in a simta does not make him koneh!? **A:** The Mishna is referring to where this was done in the reshus harabim.
 - **Q:** The earlier part of the Mishna says, that if meshicha was done he is koneh. Now, if it is talking about where this took place in the reshus harabim, meshicha would not make him koneh, as **Abaye and Rava** both say!? **A:** When the Mishna says he did meshicha, it means that he took it from the reshus harabim into the simta, and that is the reason that meshicha works.
 - **Q:** The next part of the Mishna says, if the buyer is smart he should rent the place where the produce sits. Now, if the Mishna is discussing where this takes place in the reshus harabim, who can he rent this from!? **A:** The Mishna should be understood as saying, that if the produce was in the reshus of the seller (and not in the reshus harabim), then if the buyer is smart, he should rent the place where the produce is sitting.