

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

**Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h**  
**Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

***Dinarin***

The *braisa* had stated: If it was written, “Gold in *dinarim*,” it signifies that he has a claim of gold for no less than two silver *dinarin*.

The *Gemora* asks: Might it not signify pieces of gold valued at two gold *dinarin*?

Abaye replied: The holder of the document must always be at a disadvantage (*for the other fellow has the money in his possession; it is for this reason that we determine dinarin in the document to mean silver dinarin*).

The *Gemora* asks: If so, the same principle should apply in the former cases as well (e.g., if it was written, “Silver in *dinarin*” it signifies a claim of silver for no less than two gold *dinarin*; why don’t we say that it means “two silver *dinarin*”)?

Rav Ashi answered: In the first cases *dinrei* was mentioned (*referring to gold*); in the last case, *dinarin* were written (*referring to silver*).

The *Gemora* asks: And from where may it be deduced that there is a difference between *dinrei* and *dinarin*?

It may be inferred from the following *Mishna*: A woman who had five doubtful childbirths (*if she miscarried five times and in each case, it was unknown whether the miscarriage was a human fetus or some other object; in the former case the woman would be obligated to bring two offerings (an olah and a chatas) after becoming tahor; in the latter case, she would not*), or five doubtful *zivahs* (*a woman who sees blood during*

*the eleven days which followed her seven days of niddah; if she sees for three days in a row, she is a major zavah and she must count seven clean days and becomes tahor after immersing in a mikvah; in this case, she bled three consecutive days for five months, but she is uncertain whether the discharge occurred during her seven days of niddah or during the eleven days following that; in the latter case, she is obligated to bring two offerings – two birds, one an olah and the other a chatas*); she brings one set of offerings and may subsequently eat of sacrificial meat. She is not obligated, however, to bring the other four offerings. If, however, she had five definite childbirths or five definite *zivahs*, she brings one offering (*to become tahor*) and may subsequently eat of sacrificial meat, but she is obligated to bring the other four offerings. There once was an incident where the price of a pair of birds in Yerushalayim had risen to *dinrei* gold. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel exclaimed, “By this House (*referring to the Temple; this is a type of oath*), I shall not go to sleep this night until the price of these birds will go down to *dinarim*.” He entered the *Beis Din* and taught the following : A woman who had five definite childbirths or five definite *zivahs*, she brings one offering (*to become tahor*) and may subsequently eat of sacrificial meat, and she is not obligated to bring the other four offerings. The price of birds fell that day to one-quarter of a (*silver*) *dinar* (*which is one hundredth of the original price, for there are twenty-five silver dinarin in one gold dinar; it emerges that dinrei refers to gold and dinarim refers to silver*). (166a – 166b)

***Uncertainties in a Document***

The *Mishna* had stated: Regarding a document, we follow that which was written at the end.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: The lower section (*that which is written at the end*) may be corrected from the upper one where one letter is missing, but not where two letters are missing; the *Gemora* cites an example: Chanan from Chanani (*where the letter “yud” was missing*) or Anan from Anani (*but not if two of those letters were missing*).

The *Gemora* explains the rationale for this: What is the reason why we may not correct two letters? It is because a name of four letters might occur (*and it will appear at the end of the document with two letters missing*), and these (*the remaining two letters*) would represent only half of the name! If so, in the case of one letter as well, perhaps a name of two letters will occur, and (*if at the end there is only one letter written*), this would represent only half of the name! Rather, the reason why two letters cannot be corrected is because a name of three letters might occur, and (*if two letters are missing*), these would represent the majority of the name (*but one letter missing can never be the majority of a name*).

Rav Pappa said: It is obvious to me that if “*sefel*” (*a type of bowl*) appears in the upper section and “*kefel*” (*a tallis which can be folded*) in the lower portion, we follow that which is written at the end (*and we rule that it was a tallis that was deposited*). What would be the *halachah*, however, if “*kefel*” appears above and “*sefel*” below? May this be attributed to a fly (that there really was the letter “*kuf*” (*meaning “kefel”*) there, and a fly caused it to look like a “*samech*”) or not? [A fly cannot cause a “*samech*” to look like a “*kuf*.”] The *Gemora* leaves this question unresolved.

There was written in a certain document, “six hundred and a *zuz*.” Rav Sheravya sent this question to Abaye: Do we interpret this to mean ‘six hundred *istiras* (*each istira is a sela, which is four zuz*) and a *zuz*,’ or perhaps it means ‘six hundred *perutos* and a *zuz*’ (*which would be considerably less*)?

He replied to him: It certainly does not mean *perutos*, for they are not written in a document, since they are totaled up and converted into *zuzim*. It cannot either mean ‘six hundred *istiras* and a *zuz*,’ holder of the document must always be at a

disadvantage (*for the other fellow has the money in his possession; it is for this reason that we determine that it means ‘six hundred zuzim and a zuz’; this is the smallest amount that it can plausibly mean*). (166b – 167a)

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### **Minimum Number of Coins of Different Denominations**

The *braisa* teaches that when a *shtar* mentions that a person borrowed “gold *dinarin*” but it does not mention the number of *dinarin*, the creditor may claim only two gold *dinarin*, since the minimum possible amount to which the plural “*dinarin*” refers is two -- “*mi’ut rabim shenayim*.” The *braisa* earlier (165b) teaches the same with regard to a *shtar* that says “silver *dinarin*.” Similarly, the *Mishna* (165b) states that when a *shtar* mentions that a person borrowed “*zuzim*,” “*sela’im*,” or “*darkonos*,” and the number of those coins was erased, the creditor may claim only two, which is the minimum possible amount of the plural word used in the *shtar*.

Why does the *Mishna* and *braisa* need to repeat itself with regard to these different types of coins? The *Mishna* and *braisa* need only teach this in one case, and then we would know that whenever there is an unspecified amount of “coins” (*in the plural*) -- regardless of what type of coin -- the creditor may collect only two!?

The *Penei Shlomo* answers that the *Mishna* (*and braisa*) is teaching a novelty in each case. Since the subject of the *shtar* is coins, which are divisible entities, we might have thought that even though the word used is plural, it refers not to two coins but to one and a half coins. The *Mishna* is teaching that the creditor is entitled to more than one and a half coins -- he is entitled to take two full coins of the specified denomination, because if it is true that the borrower only borrowed one and a half coins (*such as a sela and half a sela*), then the value of the half-coin would have been expressed in terms of a smaller denomination (*a sela and two dinarin*).

The Penei Shlomo adds that this is also why the *Mishna* and *braisa* use the phrase, “It is not less than two...,” instead of saying, “He may only collect two.” “It is not less than two” excludes a “lesser” amount, and implies that we might have thought that the creditor is only allowed to collect an amount which is less than two (*such as one and a half*). “He may only collect two” excludes a “greater” amount, and implies that we might have thought that the creditor should collect more than two. Since the *Mishna* is teaching that he “may” collect more than just one and a half, it says, “It is not less than two.”

The *Mishna* and *braisa*, therefore, needed to teach this novelty with regard to each denomination of coins, since we would not have been able to learn one from the other. People might write “one and a half *zuzim*” without expressing the fractional *zuz* in terms of a smaller denomination. Therefore, the *Mishna* must teach us in each case that the plural word is not less than two.

The Tiferes *Yisroel* explains that each case in the *Mishna* is necessary for the following reasons. In the case of “*Kesef zuzim* which are...,” where the number of *zuzim* was erased, we might have thought that the creditor is entitled to collect four *zuzim*, since the words “*Kesef zuzim* which are...” imply that the author of the *shtar* is defining an equal value for “*Kesef zuzim*.” The lowest number of *zuzim* which are equivalent to a different coin is four, and the *shtar* originally said, “*Kesef zuzim* which are one *sela*.” Therefore, the *Mishna* needs to teach us that the creditor may only collect two *zuzim*, because perhaps the author of the *shtar* was giving a number of *zuzim*, and not an equivalent value in another denomination.

In the case of “*Kesef sela'im* which are...,” where the number of *sela'im* was erased, we might have thought that the author of the *shtar* was referring to two “inferior” *sela'im* (as mentioned earlier in the *Mishna*), which are equal to seven *zuzim* (or  $6\frac{2}{3}$  *zuzim*), and not 8 *zuzim*, and the *shtar* originally read, “*Kesef sela'im* which are seven *zuzim*.” Therefore, the *Mishna* teaches that the creditor may collect two standard *sela'im* and not inferior ones.

In the case of “*Kesef darkonos* which are...,” where the number of *darkonos* was erased, we might have thought that certainly the author of the *shtar* was referring to inferior *darkonos*, for the following reason. A *darkon* is a large, valuable gold coin, and people do not usually pay back debts with such coins. Accordingly, we might have thought that the author of the *shtar* meant inferior gold *darkonos*, and that is why he was writing the actual value of the *darkonos*, which was “less” than the value of two standard *darkonos*. Therefore, the *Mishna* needs to teach us that the creditor is indeed entitled to collect two normal *darkonos* and not inferior ones.

## DAILY MASHAL

### ***Why the Labor Cost More***

A simple tailor became close to Rebbe Noach of Lechovitz and the Rebbe persuaded him to refrain from the custom then common among tailors to demand clients to bring them extra cloth in order to benefit from the quantity remaining after their work. “This custom is outright thievery,” explained the Rebbe, “You may charge more for your labor but you mustn’t practice that foul custom.”

“And what should I tell my customers,” questioned the tailor, “if they ask me why I charge more yet need less cloth?”

“Tell them,” replied the Rebbe, “that you learnt to cut in a new way that doesn’t need a lot of cloth but that learning the method cost a great deal.”

The tailor obeyed the Rebbe’s instructions but after a while his customers remarked that he had already covered the expenses of learning the new method and asked why he continued to charge more.

“The new method,” he answered, “is a whole system to be learnt again every day and every week” (*Hizaharu Bemamon Chavreichem*, p. 366).