

21.4.2

45a (לישנא אחרינא) → 45b (קשיא)

7. וְנִתְּתָה הַקֶּסֶף בְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר תִּאָּמַר נִפְשָׁךְ בְּבִקְרָה וּבְצִאָן וּבְיִינוּן וּבְשֹׁכֵר וּבְכֹל אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁאַלְךָ נִפְשָׁךְ וְאִכְלֶתָ שָׁם לִפְנֵי ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ וְשִׁמַּחְתָּ אֹתָהּ וּבִיתְךָ: דברים פרק יד פסוק כז

- I Alternate version of the dispute between ר"ר/ר"ל re: extent of dispute ב"ה/ב"ש regarding making change with מעות מע"ש
- a *1 of them*: dispute is only gold <->silver
 - i **ב"ש**: v. 1 stipulates **הכסף**, implying the 1st money used for חילול must be brought (may not be transferred)
 - ii **ב"ה**: v. 1 expands to include even **כסף שני**
 - 1 All agree: silver may be exchanged for פירות – it's still **כסף ראשון** – it's still ראשון
 - iii *Challenge*: why not express מחלוקת as silver <->silver, which is more surprising?
 - 1 *Answer*: if that were presented, סד"א that ב"ה agrees with ב"ש about silver → gold (as gold is פירא to silver)
 - b *Other*: dispute extends to fruit, and ב"ב's reason is that gold is פירא
 - c *Challenge*: dispute re: changing מעות מע"ש in ירושלים
 - i **ב"ש**: may change entire סלע (of silver) into copper coins
 - ii **ב"ה**: may only change ½ of the סלע into copper
 - 1 *Explanation*: how could ב"ש rule כסף ראשון about changing to (the more valuable) gold and not copper?
 - 2 *Block (רנא)*: cannot challenge from expenditures/changing in ירושלים, where v. 1 applies (use for food as well)
 - d *Challenge*: dispute ב"ש/ב"ה re: changing מעות מע"ש outside of ירושלים (מע"ש ב:ח)
 - i **ב"ש**: may change entire סלע (of silver) into copper coins
 - ii **ב"ה**: may only change ½ of the סלע into copper
 - e *agreement*: all agree that הכסף extends to כסף שני (earlier analysis rejected)
- II *rather*: dispute ר"ר/ר"ל:
- a *1 of them*: dispute is only gold <->silver,
 - i **ב"ש**: גזרה against waiting to redeem silver coins until the next year, when the sum reaches the value of a gold coin;
 - ii **ב"ה**: no need for precaution; he'll come to ירושלים with silver coins in any case
 - 1 All agree: silver may be exchanged for פירות, since the fruit will rot and he won't wait
 - b *Other*: dispute extends even to silver <->fruit (he may withhold them and not bring them up in time)
 - c *Analysis*: language יעשה/לא יעשה (in מע"ש ב:ז) implies a rabbinic stricture, not an inherent invalidity מה"ת
 - i *Therefore*: approach that ב"ש's opposition to buying gold coins with מע"ש is a decree (as above) is supported,
 - ii *But*: approach that it's inherently invalid since gold is פירא relative to silver is difficult
 - 1 *Should read*: רש"י (see אין סלעי מע"ש מתחללין על דינרי זהב)