

This month's Daf Digest is dedicated in memory of  
Mrs Yenta Weiss, Rivke Yenta bas Asher Anshel & Yosef ben Chaim Hacoheh Weiss  
By Mr. and Mrs. Manny Weiss

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) An aging slave (cont.)

The comparison that Rav made between a slave and land is challenged from another ruling of Rav.

The conflicting rulings of Rav are explained in a way that resolves the contradiction.

This resolution is unsuccessfully challenged.

The Gemara relates that in the household of R' Yosef bar Chama they would take slaves from people who owed them money and would have the slave work for them as well.

Rava, R' Yosef bar Chama's son, successfully challenged his father's practice and decided he would not take slaves from debtors in the future.

### 2) Doing work with a stolen boat

Rav and Shmuel issue different statements whether the owner of a boat that was stolen collects rent or depreciation.

R' Pappa asserts that there is no dispute between them.

### 3) Cracked and disqualified coins

R' Huna asserts that cracked refers to cracked coins and disqualified refers to where the government disqualifies a coin.

R' Yehudah maintains that a coin disqualified by the government is also categorized as cracked and a disqualified coin is one that is disqualified in one province but could be used in another.

R' Huna's position is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Yehudah's position is unsuccessfully challenged.

Rav and Shmuel disagree what a borrower may do when the coin he borrowed becomes disqualified.

R' Nachman asserts that Shmuel's ruling that the borrower can tell the lender to take the coin and use it in Meishan refers to where the lender already had plans to travel to Meishan.

Rava unsuccessfully challenges this interpretation.

Shmuel's position is unsuccessfully challenged.

Tangentially, the Gemara questions the earlier assertion that one cannot deconsecrate ma'aser sheni on Babylonian coins that are in Eretz Yisroel.

R' Zeira answers the challenge.

A Beraisa is cited that discusses coins of Yerushalayim and the coin of Avrohom Avinu.

Rava asked about the law in a case where a person lent a

*(Overview...Continued on page 2)*

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### *The coin of Avraham Avinu*

בחור ובתולה מצד אחר

The Midrash (Bereshis Rabba 39:11) on the verse "And I will make your name great" teaches that Hashem promised Avraham that a coin would be issued which would publicize his illustrious name and his life's mission. The Beraisa on our daf teaches us that the coin which was minted for this purpose featured the words זקן וזקינה (An old man and an old woman) on one side, and the words בחור ובתולה (A young man and maiden") on the reverse. The older man and woman referred to Avraham and Sarah, and, as Rashi explains, the words "young man and maiden" referred to Yitzchok and Rivka. אמרי יושר explains that although it was, and is still, common for many kings to mint coins with their image upon them, this was nevertheless a great honor for Avraham and Sarah, because a coin was minted in their honor even though they were not royal government figures.

Ben Yehoyada notes that the reference to the young man was a reference to Yitzchok, thus indicating that even in his youth, Yitzchok was complete and righteous just as was Avraham in his old age. Similarly, even as a young girl, Rivka was wholly righteous, just as was Sarah in her later years.

Toras Chaim points out that at the time Yitzchok was introduced to Rivka, Sarah had already passed away. We would assume that it was only honorable for Sarah if her name appeared on a coin during her lifetime, but not after her death. How, then, could the names of Sarah and Rivka appear on a coin together? Furthermore, on the coin of Dovid HaMelech and Shlomo the actual names of these people were written on the coin. Why was this not the case with the coin of Avraham? Why did they write only references to their stages of life (old man, young man) on the two sides of the coin, and not simply write the names of the people directly (Avraham, Sarah, Yitzchok, Rivka)?

Toras Chaim therefore explains that both sides of the coin refer to Avraham and Sarah, and the descriptions highlight the tremendous miracle of their youth returning to them even in their old age.

Tosafos (ד"ה מטבע) explains that the image on the coin could not have been actual raised images in the form of a person, as the Gemara (Avodah Zara 43a) prohibits creating such forms of people. Pri Megadim (cited in עץ יוסף on Midrash) explains that perhaps an actual image was molded on the coins, but it was only a profile of their face, or at most a partial form of the face which included only one eye. In this manner, it would not have been in violation of the guidelines of the Gemara in Avodah Zara. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
In loving memory of  
מרת איטא בת חיים וחנה ע"ה  
Mrs. Edith Levee

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Drawing human images

איזהו מטבע של ירושלים דוד ושלמה מצד אחד וכ"ו

What is the coin of Yerushalayim? Dovid and Shlomo are on one side etc.

The Beraisa reports that the coins of Yerushalayim had Dovid and Shlomo on one side of the coin and the coins of Avrohom Avinu had an old man and woman on one side and a young man and woman on the second side. Tosafos<sup>1</sup> explains that the coins had the words **אברהם** and **שרה** written on the coins and the Gemara should not be understood to mean that there were images of people minted onto the coins. What leads Tosafos to offer this explanation, rather than explain that there were images of people on the coins, is the concern for the prohibition against making images of people. Rav Yaakov Emden<sup>2</sup> writes that since Tosafos did not answer that it was permitted to have the image of a person since it was only an image of a face on the coin, we may conclude that the prohibition against human images is violated even if there is no more than the image of a face.

Shulchan Aruch<sup>3</sup> rules that the prohibition against making human images is limited to where the image protrudes but if the image does not protrude, e.g. an image that is drawn on a wall, it is permitted. Taz<sup>4</sup> notes that Tur cites the opinion of Ramban who maintains that a human image is prohibited regardless of whether it protrudes, therefore, one should not even make images that do not protrude.

Shach<sup>5</sup> asserts that the prohibition against making a human image is limited to where one makes the complete image of a person, meaning the image includes two eyes, a nose and a

# REVIEW and Remember

1. Does a robber have to pay the slave's owner for the work the slave did for him?

---

2. What is the point of dispute between R' Huna and R' Yehudah concerning a disqualified coin?

---

3. What is the point of dispute between Rav and Shmuel concerning a loan fixed on a particular coin that is disqualified?

---

4. What did the coin of Avraham Avinu look like?

---

body. If, however, one makes an image of a person from his side it is permitted, although he adds that one who is strict even for side portraits will be blessed. There is a disagreement regarding the exact intent of Shach. According to one opinion<sup>6</sup>, Shach permits drawing the entire body of a person as long as it is drawn from the side so that all of his features are not included. Others<sup>7</sup> maintain that Shach only permits a side portrait when the portrait is limited to the head but not if the entire body is drawn. ■

1. תוס' ד"ה מטבע של אברהם
2. שאילת יעב"ץ ח"א סי' ק"ע
3. שו"ע יו"ד סי' קמ"א סע' ד'
4. ט"ז שם ס"ק י"ב
5. ש"ך שם ס"ק כ"ה
6. שו"ת נהרי אפרסמון סי' קי"ח
7. שו"ת זרע אמת ח"ג סי' ק"ה ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## A graven image?

דוד ושלמה מצד אחד

In earlier times people knew how to respect rabbanim. When Rav Eliezer, ז"ל, was appointed Rav of Amsterdam, the joy was so great that someone actually fashioned a silver medallion with the Rav's visage engraved on it. Although this definitely increased the celebration of the Rav's assumption of his position, not everyone was thrilled with this innovation.

When word of this reached the Ya'avetz, ז"ל, he ruled that this is not halachically permitted. "It is true that some

permit this since we find on Bava Kamma 97 that they minted coins in honor of Avraham and Sarah with the image of an old couple on one side and a young couple on the other. In addition, they minted coins with the image of Dovid Hamelech on one side and Shlomo Hamelech on the other. Yet Tosafos learns that this cannot be literal because it is prohibited. He explains that they merely wrote the words 'zekein and zekeina,' and so on, and not an actual image.

"Although the Shulchan Aruch rules that only the image of a full person is prohibited and not merely his visage, yet the Sma"g and other Rishonim argue with the Rosh about this and prohibit making a

coin with a recognizable face. And the Taz, ז"ל, follows this approach."

To the great joy of the Ya'avetz, ז"ל, when the king of Holland heard about this medallion he immediately outlawed it since he felt that this was a subtle insult to the king!<sup>1</sup> ■

1. שו"ת שאילת יעב"ץ ח"א סי' ק"ע

(Overview...continued from page 1)

coin to his friend and the government added content to the coin thus disqualifying the old coin.

R' Chisda responded that the borrower should repay the loan with the new coins.

This ruling is challenged.

R' Ashi answers this challenge ■