



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Bava Kamma Daf Kuf Aleph

- A Braisa says, if a person gave wood to a carpenter to make into a chair and he instead made it into a bench, or if he gave it to him to make a bench and he made it into a chair, **R' Meir** says the carpenter must pay for the value of the wood. **R' Yehuda** says, if the improvement is more valuable than what it cost to get it to that state, the owner of the wood pays for the expenses. If the expenses were more than the improvement to the wood, he must pay him for the improvement. **R' Meir** would agree that if he gave him wood to make a nice chair and he instead made an ugly chair, or he gave it to him to make a nice bench and he made an ugly bench, that if the improvement is more valuable than what it cost to get it to that state, the owner of the wood pays for the expenses. If the expenses were more than the improvement to the wood, he must pay him for the improvement.
- **Q:** Is the dye in the wool considered to be something material on the wool or not? The question is, if a gazlan stole liquid dye and dyed wool with it, is the dye considered to be something material and the owner can therefore demand the return of the dye ingredients, or can the gazlan say, there is nothing here of yours?
 - **Q:** How can he say "there is nothing here of yours"? He should have to pay for the value of the dye!? **A:** Rather, the question is, do we say that the dye is not considered to be something material on the wool, and therefore the gazlan must pay, or do we say that the dye is considered to be something material on the wool, and the gazlan can therefore tell the owner "your ingredients are here on the wool, so take them back"?
 - **Q:** How can he take the ingredients back? If he were to use soap to remove the dye from the wool it would wash it out and will not have it returned to him!? **A:** The case is where he stole wool and dye from one person and dyed the wool in that dye, and then returned the dyed wool, if we say the dye is something material on the wool, he is considered to have returned the wool and the dye. If not, he is only considered to have returned the wool.
 - **Q:** Even if he is not considered to have returned the dye, he has returned wool which is more valuable than the wool he stole, and therefore has in effect given back the value of the dye!? **A:** The case is where the dyed wool was worth less than the uncolored wool. Or we can say the case is where he colored a monkey (that he stole) with the dye, in which case the monkey is not worth more due to the color.
 - **Ravina** said, the case would be where a monkey went and took dye from one person and used it to color the wool of another person. If the dye is considered to be something material on the wool, the owner of the dye can demand its return. If it is not, he cannot do so.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can answer the original question from a Mishna which says that a garment that was colored with the dye from orlah fruit must be burned. We see that the appearance of the dye is considered to be something material on the wool!? **A:** **Rava** said, the case of orlah is different, because we darshen a pasuk to teach that even this form of hana'ah is assur.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from a Braisa that says that a garment that was colored with the dye from shmitta fruit must be burned. We see that the appearance of the dye is considered to be something material on the wool!? **A:** The case of shmitta is different, because we learn from the word "tihyeh" that it remains assur even when it only exists in appearance alone.
- **Q:** **Rava** asked a contradiction. The Mishna regarding orlah teaches that appearance is considered to be something of significance. Another Mishna says, if a revi'is of blood is absorbed

in a garment and can't be squeezed out (but can be seen), it doesn't make the house that it enters tamei. From here we see that appearance is not something of significance!? **R' Kahana** said, the case of the blood is referring to a type of blood that only gives off tumah in a house D'Rabanan. Therefore we are meikel in that case.

- **Q: Rava** asked a contradiction. One Mishna regarding shmitta says that dyes that come from wood are subject to shmitta, which means that wood is subject to shmitta. Another Mishna says that leaves of vineyards collected for wood (to use for fire) are not subject to shmitta!? **A: Rava** answered, the pasuk regarding shmitta says "l'achla", which teaches that something is only subject to shmitta if it is produce whose benefit comes about during its consumption. The benefit of using a dye happens as it is being cooked and consumed, and is therefore subject to shmitta. The benefit of firewood happens after the wood is consumed (after it has become coal) and therefore, it is not subject to shmitta.
 - **Q:** Oily wood can burn and be used as a light as it is being consumed, and so it should be subject to shmitta!? **A: Rava** said, in general, firewood is meant to be used after being reduced to coal, and that is why they are not subject to shmitta.