



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Tzur currency (cont.)

R' Yochanan identifies how much of the currency available in his day was needed for pidyon haben.

This calculation is challenged and revised.

Rava presents a different calculation for the money needed for pidyon haben.

This opinion is unsuccessfully challenged.

A related incident is presented.

2) Kessef

R' Chanina explains the meaning of the term כסף as it appears in Torah, Nevi'im and Kesuvim.

R' Oshaya relates that Chazal thought that all gold and silver should be prohibited because of the stolen consecrated gold and silver that was taken from the Beis HaMikdash until they found a reason to permit it.

This statement is challenged and consequently revised by Abaye.

R' Yehudah in the name of R' Assi states that the term כסף in the Torah refers to Tzur currency and when mentioned in the context of Rabbinic enactments it refers to כסף מדינה.

On the fourth attempt the Gemara succeeds at refuting R' Assi forcing a revision of his original statement.

The novelty of this statement is identified.

The Gemara recounts an incident that supports R' Assi's interpretation. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the source that sages could add to the weight of the shekel?
2. What is the meaning of the כסף that appears in the Torah, Nevi'im and Kesuvim?
3. What is כסף מדינה?
4. What is the penalty for striking a friend in the ear?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 לז"נ ר' משה דוד בן נוריאל
 R' Moshe Dovid Aryeh z"l

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 בהודאה על כל החסד שעשה ה' עמנו
 משפחת מעייל

Distinctive INSIGHT

They entered the holy and profaned it

ובאו בה פריצים וחללו

R' Oshaya tells us that after the destruction of the Beis HaMikdash the gold and silver found in the treasury of the Mikdash was taken by plunderers. These consecrated treasures became mixed with the gold and silver of the world, and the sages sought to prohibit all gold and silver of the world from benefit due to the presence of the consecrated items now mixed in the world's supply. The sages found a verse in Yechezkel (7:22) which they relied upon to permit the money supply of the world. The verse states, "and lawless people will come into it and profane it." This indicates that when the Mikdash was breached and its property was stolen, the sanctity of that property ceased as it was profaned. Therefore, the sages ruled that the money of the world is permitted.

The Gemara in Avoda Zara (52b) cites a discussion regarding the status of the stones of the Altar which were contaminated by the Greeks when they occupied Eretz Yisroel and Yerushalayim during the era of the Second Beis HaMikdash. Rav Sheishes says that the Greeks did not have the ability to desecrate that which did not belong to them. The stones of the Altar which were defiled were declared to be ruined only from a rabbinic perspective, but Torah law considered the stones as remaining holy. Rav Pappa holds that the verse from Yechezkel which we cited proves that the invaders who defiled the stones of the Altar also succeeded in causing the stones to lose their sanctity. Rav Pappa understands that the ones who "came into it" refers to our enemies who entered into the Sanctuary of the Mikdash.

Ba'al HaMaor (Avoda Zara) explains that the ones "who came into it" cannot refer to non-Jews, because they are not capable of violating the laws of trespass of the Mikdash (me'ilah). Rather, it refers to evildoers from among the Jews who entered the Mikdash and defiled the Altar. Ramban

Continued on page 2)

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 By Mr. and Mrs. Ronny Shabat
 In loving memory of their father
 ר' שאול בן הרב מנחם מנדל, ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 The Muskat and Lindner families
 In loving memory of their father, grandfather and great grandfather
 ר' יונה בן ר' חיים דוד ע"ה
 Dr. Joseph Weiss

HALACHAH Highlight

Sending the redemption money with an agent

ר' אשי שדר ליה שבסר זוזי לר' אחא בריה דרבינא וכו'

R' Ashi sent seventeen zuz to R' Acha the son of Ravina etc.

The Gemara recounts an incident in which R' Ashi sent money to R' Acha the son of Ravina for the redemption of his bechor. With the money R' Ashi sent a message asking R' Acha to refund him one-third of a zuz that he overpaid when he sent seventeen zuzim. R' Acha responded that R' Ashi should send him an additional three zuzim for the redemption of his son since the Rabbis added on to the sum of required zuzim for pidyon haben. Maharit Algazi¹ derived from this incident that a father could send the redemption money to the kohen with an agent. This is in contrast with Rema's position² that a father cannot send the redemption money to a kohen with an agent.

Minchas Pitim³ responds on behalf of Rema based on a comment of Chasam Sofer. Chasam Sofer⁴ writes that Rema does not mean that the redemption money cannot be sent to a kohen with an agent since it is obvious that if a father sent the redemption money with even a monkey the bechor would be redeemed. The intent of Rema is that when an agent gives his own money to a kohen to redeem his friend's bechor and does not convey ownership of that money to the father before he gives it to the kohen the child is not redeemed. Even though there is a principle שלוחו של אדם כמותו – a person's agent is like himself – in the case of pidyon haben an agent cannot redeem another man's bechor. Accordingly, there is no proof from our Gemara that Rema's ruling is incorrect since the Ge-

(Insight...continued from page 1)

says that the prophet clearly was referring to non-Jews entering the Mikdash to destroy it, and their actions are described as resulting in the Altar's becoming profaned. Ramban responds to the question of Ba'al HaMaor by saying that the posuk declares that this was an exception where the actions of the non-Jews resulted in the profaning of the stones. Ramban proves his contention by noting that the structure of the Beis HaMikdash itself had its sanctity removed, although the law of trespass against the holy does not apply to land.

Ramban also proves his point that the verse is referring to non-Jews who entered the Sanctuary, based upon our Gemara, where the gold and silver of the Mikdash was pillaged by non-Jews, and the verse is cited to show that the actions of these non-Jews caused that money to be profaned. ■

mara refers to a case in which the father was sending his own money with an agent and Rema agrees that the redemption is valid in that case. Sefer Amtachas Binyomin⁵ has another understanding of the Gemara that also deflects Maharit Algazi's challenge. Based on a number of hints he explains that R' Acha was the father of the bechor in this incident and was poor and could not afford to redeem his son. R' Ashi was in charge of the distribution of money to the poor and their debate related to whether R' Ashi had sent too much or not enough money for R' Acha to be able to redeem his son. Accordingly, the Gemara is not related to Rema's ruling. ■

1. מהרי"ט אלגזי אות ע"ט הראשון.

2. רמ"א יו"ד סי' ש"ה סעי' י"י.

3. מנחת פתים יו"ד שם.

4. שו"ת חת"ס יו"ד סי' רצ"ז.

5. ספר אמתחת בנימין (חשין) לסוגייתנו ד"ה ר' אשי. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Negotiable Currency

"התוקע..."

Going to kivrei tzaddikim in Eastern Europe is like travelling backwards in time. Especially in the many rural areas, the locales of most of the kivrei tzaddikim, while pictorially scenic, are also extremely backward. Even in more developed cities there, one comes across strange rules that can be difficult to bear.

One such constraint regards American dollars. If the bill is not new-looking, the locals—even money changers—will not take it. Groups of tourists find this

extremely annoying, especially bochorim who sometimes bring just enough money for their basic needs.

When one bochor travelled with a group to kivrei tzaddikim he borrowed money from a friend on the trip. When they got back to where they were staying he paid in full but with older dollars that could not be used. These were all that he had left. His friend protested. "But I can't do anything with this money here. Giving me these bills is completely unacceptable."

But when they consulted with the Rosh Yeshiva who was with the bochorim on the trip, he ruled that the bochor could pay in less new bills. "This is clear from the Gemara about Chanan

Bisha in Bava Kama 37 and Bechoros 50. There we find that when Chanan Bisha harmed his friend, Rav Huna ruled that he had to pay half a dinar in damages. Chanan Bisha had a rubbed-out dinar that no one would accept, so he did the same act again and gave his friend the rubbed-out dinar.

"The Yam Shel Shlomo explains, that the Nemukey Yosef learns from here that one who was damaged must accept even money which is not passable in the market. The Yam Shel Shlomo adds that the same is true regarding one who has a debt to his friend."¹ ■

1. ים של שלמה, ב"ק, פ"ד, סי' ב' ■

