



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

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

The Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: If pieces of wood were given to a carpenter to make a chair and he made a bench out of them, or to make a bench and he made a chair out of them, Rabbi Meir says that he will have to refund to the owner the value of his wood, whereas Rabbi Yehudah says that if the increase in value exceeds his expenses the owner would pay the carpenter his expenses, whereas if the expenses exceeds the increase in value he would have to pay him no more than the increase. Rabbi Meir, however, agrees that where pieces of wood were given to a carpenter to make a nice chair out of them and he made an ugly chair out of them, or to make a nice bench and he made an ugly one, if the increased value would exceed the expenses the owner would pay the carpenter the amount of his expenses, whereas if the expenses exceeded the increase in value he would have to pay him no more than the amount of the increase.

They inquired: Is the improvement effected by dye-ingredients a [separate] item independent of the wool, or is the improvement effected by dye-ingredients not a [separate] item independent of the wool? How can such a question arise in practice? The case can hardly be one where a man robbed dye-ingredients and after having crushed and dissolved them he dyed wool with them, for would he not have acquired title to them through the change which they underwent? — No; the query could have application only where he robbed dye-ingredients already dissolved and used them for

dyeing, so that if the improvement effected by the dye-ingredients is a [separate] item independent of the wool the plaintiff might plead, “Give me back the dyes which you have taken from me,” but if on the other hand the improvement effected by the dye-ingredients is not a [separate] item independent of the wool the defendant might say to him, “I have nothing of yours with me.”

They said: [Even] if the improvement effected by dye-ingredients is not a [separate] item independent of the wool, why should the robber be able to say to him, “I have nothing of yours with me,” seeing that the owner can say to him, “Give me back the dye-ingredients of which you have deprived me”? — We must therefore take the other alternative: Are we to say that the improvement effected by the dye-ingredients is not a [separate] item independent of the wool and the robber would have to pay him, or is the improvement effected by the dye-ingredients a [separate] item independent of the wool and the robber can say to him, “Here are your dyes before you and you can take them away.” - But how can he take them away? By means of detergent? But detergent would surely remove them (the dye from the wool) without making any restitution! — We must therefore be dealing here [in the query] with a case were e.g., a robber stole wool and dye-ingredients belonging to the same owner, and dyed that wool with those dyes and was returning to him that wool. Now, if the improvement effected by

dye-ingredients is a [separate] item independent of the wool, the robber would thus be returning both the dyes and the wool, but if the improvement effected by dye-ingredients is not a [separate] item independent of the wool, it was only the wool which he was returning, whereas the dyes he was not returning.

They said: But I would still say: Why should it not be sufficient [for the robber to do this] seeing that he caused the wool to increase in value? — No: the query might have application where dyed-wool had meanwhile depreciated in price. Or if you wish I may say that it refers to where e.g., he painted with them a monkey [in which case there was thereby no increase in value].

Ravina said: We were dealing here [in the query] with a case where e.g., the wool belonged to one person and the dye-ingredients to another, and as a monkey came along and dyed that wool of the one with those dyes of the other; now, is the improvement effected by the dye-ingredients a [separate] item independent of the wool so that the owner of the dyes is entitled to say to the owner of the wool: "Give me my dyes which are with you," or is the improvement effected by dye-ingredients not a [separate] item apart from the wool, so that he might retort to him: "I have nothing belonging to you"? — Come and hear (from the following Mishnah): A garment which was dyed with the peels of the fruits of orlah has to be destroyed by fire. This proves that appearance is a distinct item [in valuation]! — Said Rava: [It is different in this case where] any benefit visible to the eye was forbidden by the Torah as taught in a Baraisa: forbidden [to you]; they shall not be eaten; this gives me only its prohibition as food. From where do I learn that no other benefit should be derived from it, that it should not be used for dyeing with, that a candle should not

be lit with it? It was therefore stated further: You shall treat its fruit as forbidden . . . they shall be forbidden to you, they shall not be eaten - for the purpose of including all of these.

Come and hear (from the following Baraisa): A garment which was dyed with the peels [of the fruits] of Shemittah has to be destroyed by fire! — It is different there, as Scripture stated: It shall be, implying that it must always be as it was. (101a1 – 101a4)

Rava pointed out a contradiction. We have learned in a Mishnah: A garment which was dyed with the peels [of the fruits] of orlah has to be destroyed by fire, thus proving that appearance is a distinct item; but a contradiction could be pointed out (from the following Mishnah): If a quarter [of a log] of [the] blood [of a dead person] has been absorbed in the floor of a house, [the utensils in] the house would become tamei, or as others say, [the utensils in] the house would not be tamei; these two statements, however, do not differ, as the former refers to utensils which were there at the beginning, whereas the latter refers to the utensils which were brought there subsequently [after the blood was already absorbed in the ground]. [The Mishnah continues:] If the blood was absorbed in a garment, we have to see: if on the garment being washed a quarter [of a log] of blood would come out of it, the house would be tamei, but if not, the house is tahor [proving that appearance is not significant]. — Rav Kahana said: The ruling stated in this Mishnah is one of leniencies made in respect of quarters [of a log], applicable in the case of tevusah-blood, which causes



tumah [via a roof] by [mere] Rabbinic enactment.¹ (101b1)

Rava again pointed out a contradiction: We have learned in a Mishnah: [Among] the species of dyes, the aftergrowths of safflower and woad are subject to the law of shemittah, and so also is any value received for them subject to the law of Shemittah; they are subject to the law of removal and any value received for them is similarly subject to the law of removal, thus proving that wood is subject to the sanctity of Shemittah. But a contradiction could be pointed out (from the following Baraisa): Leaves of cane-reeds and leaves of grapevines which have been heaped up from across a field to be put in storage, if they were gathered to be eaten, they would be subject to the sanctity of Shemittah, but if they were gathered for firewood, they would not be subject to the sanctity of Shemittah. — But he himself answered: Scripture stated: to eat, implying that the law applies only to produce from which a benefit is derived at the time of its consumption, so that the wood for fuel is excluded as the benefit derived from it is after its consumption. - But isn't there oily wood from which a benefit is derived at the time of its consumption? — Rava said: Wood as a rule is meant for fueling a fire. (101b1 – 102a1)

DAILY MASHAL

One time two merchants travelled overseas to a country where wool was common and could be procured cheaply. They both purchased an equal amount of fine wool for the same price and both hired a wagon to take their fine wool to the nearest port. When they arrived, they hired passage on a ship that

had space for their wool. One of the merchants owed a large sum of money and decided to obtain more wool from his friend's share. When he was sure the victim was fast asleep he crept over to where they kept the wool and stole a significant quantity from his friend. As they were getting off the boat the thief noticed that his bale of wool felt quite a bit lighter. He immediately realized what had occurred; instead of lightening his friend's load of wool he had actually taken from his own share and added it to his companion's bale! He had no choice but to confess to his companion that he had attempted to steal some wool to repay his crushing debts but that his plan had backfired. He was very surprised at the other merchant's reaction. "I don't believe it for a minute. I know you for many years and I don't believe you would actually steal. I think this is just a way to get me to loan you the wool with the good intention of repaying me when you are able. Well, I am very sorry, but I refuse to lend you the wool." This case eventually went before the Malbim, zt"l. He answered, "Since you feel that this merchant is too honest to be a thief, you would believe him if he swore to you. He can swear that he stole the wool and take it back!"

Courtesy of Daf Digest

¹ Since it was doubtful whether the quarter of the log of blood oozed out while the person was still alive and tahir, or afterwards and tamei.