



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Bava Kamma, Daf פה – Daf לב

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H  
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf פה---86-----

- **Q: Rabbah** asked, what is the halacha regarding an injury that causes unemployment and a temporary depreciation in value? Is the mazik chauv for such a temporary loss? For example, if he injured the person's arm and it is temporarily disabled, but will fully heal. **A:** A Mishna says, if a child hits a parent but does not cause a wound, or a person who causes a wound to another person on Yom Kippur, he is chayuv in all 5 payments. Now, presumably, hitting them without making a wound is referring to a case where he temporarily disabled their arm, and we see that he is still chayuv to pay.
  - The Gemara says, this is no proof. The Mishna may be talking about a case where the child made his parent deaf, without causing a wound.
    - **Q: Rabbah** has said that a child who makes his parent deaf is chayuv misah, because deafness is caused by the creation of a wound in the ear!? **A:** The case of the Mishna is where the son shaved the father's head, thereby decreasing his value, without causing a wound.
    - **Q:** The hair will grow back, so if that is the case of the Mishna, we still see that a person must pay for a temporary decrease in value!? **A:** The case is that he removed his father's hair with a cream, which removes the hair *permanently*.
      - He would have to pay for pain, because the case is that the father had open skin on his head, and the cream caused him pain. He must then spend money to treat those irritations, which is why the son must pay for healing. The case is that the father's profession was being a clown, and he cannot effectively do that with the open wounds on his head, so the son must pay for unemployment as well. Clearly, there is embarrassment associated with this as well, and the son must pay for this as well.
  - With regard to **Rabbah's** question, we find that **Abaye** says the mazik must pay for the temporary damage, and **Rava** says that he does not need to do so.
- If a person cuts off the hand of someone else's eved ivri, **Abaye** says he must pay the value of the hand to the slave, and the value of the unemployment to the master. **Rava** says both payments go to the slave, he is to buy a piece of land with that money, and the master has the rights to the produce of that land.
  - The machlokes is only where the loss in value of the slave affects the master. However, if the loss in value did not affect the master, for example, a person cut off the tip of the ear or the nose of the slave, all would agree that the entire payment would go to the slave.

#### BOSHES HAKOL LEFI HAMIVAYESH VIHAMISBAYESH

- The Mishna follows the view of **R' Shimon** of a Braisa. The Braisa says, **R' Meir** says, when assessing embarrassment, we view the victim as if he was once wealthy and has lost his wealth (which results in a middle of the road valuation), since all Yidden come from Avrohom, Yitzchak, and Yaakov. **R' Yehuda** says, a greater person is assessed according to his level, and a lesser person according to his level. **R' Shimon** says, with regard to wealthy people, we view them as if they have lost their wealth. With regard to poor people, we view them as the least among them. Now, our Mishna says we assess based on who did the embarrassing and who was embarrassed. That clearly doesn't follow **R' Meir**. It also can't follow **R' Yehuda**, because the Mishna later says that one is chayuv for embarrassing a blind person, but according to **R' Yehuda** he would not be chayuv. Therefore, the Mishna must follow **R' Shimon**.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can say that the Mishna even follows **R' Yehuda**, and **R' Yehuda** meant that if a blind person embarrasses someone he does not have to pay, but would agree with the Mishna, that if someone embarrasses a blind person, he would have to pay? **A:** The Mishna later makes a difference between a sleeping person that is embarrassed, and a sleeping person that embarrasses someone else. Since it doesn't make that same difference regarding a blind person, it suggests that the Mishna holds

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

that in both cases the one who embarrasses would be patur. Therefore, the Mishna can't be said to follow **R' Yehuda**, and must be following **R' Shimon**.

- **Q:** A Braisa says, if a person intended to embarrass a small person and instead embarrassed a large person, he must give to the large person the money for embarrassing a small person. If he intended to embarrass a slave and instead embarrassed a free man, he gives the free man the money he would be chayuv for embarrassing a slave. Now, this Braisa seems not to follow **R' Meir, R' Yehuda, or R' Shimon!**? [The Gemara understood the Braisa as referring to a poor person as a "small person" and to a rich person as a "large person". Based on this, it can't follow **R' Meir** because he says all people are looked at as being of equal financial wealth. It can't follow **R' Yehuda**, because he says there is no embarrassment for a slave, and it can't follow **R' Shimon**, because he says that if one intends to embarrass one person and instead embarrasses another, he is patur!?] **A:** The Braisa can follow **R' Yehuda**. Although he says we would never pay a slave for embarrassment, he would agree that in this case we would assess the embarrassment of a slave so that we can pay that amount to the free man. **A2:** We can say the Braisa follows **R' Meir**. When the Braisa says small and large, it is referring to a katan and an adult, which are assessed differently. We find that **R' Pappa** says that a katan is capable of being embarrassed.

### MISHNA

- If a person embarrasses a naked person, or embarrasses a blind person, or a person who is sleeping, he is chayuv. However, if a sleeping person embarrasses someone, he is patur.
- If a person fell from a roof and injured and embarrassed a person through the fall, he is chayuv for the damage, but patur for the embarrassment. A person is only chayuv for embarrassment if he intended to embarrass.

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, if a person embarrasses someone who is naked, he is chayuv for the embarrassment, but the level of embarrassment is much less than if he would have embarrassed a person with clothing. If a person embarrasses someone in a bathhouse, he is chayuv for the embarrassment, but the level of embarrassment is much less than if he would have embarrassed a person in the market.
  - **Q:** Is a naked person capable of being embarrassed? **A: R' Pappa** said, the case is that the person was wearing clothing, and a wind came and lifted his robe, thereby exposing him. A person then came and lifted the robe even more, thereby embarrassing him.
  - **Q:** Is a person in a bathhouse capable of being embarrassed? **A:** The Mishna is actually referring to one who is bathing at a river, without totally undressing, and a person came and exposed the bather, thereby embarrassing him.
- **Q: R' Abba bar Mamal** asked, what if a person embarrassed a sleeping person, who died in that sleep, thus never realizing that he was embarrassed? **R' Zvid** explains, do we say that payment is made for the feeling of embarrassment, and this person never had that feeling, or do we say that the payment is for degrading the person, and this person was degraded in front of other people, even though he himself never knew it. **A:** A Braisa says, **R' Meir** says, a cheireish and a katan are paid for being embarrassed, but a shoteh is not. Now, a katan is not capable of having feelings of embarrassment. It must be he is paid because he was degraded in front of others!
  - **Q:** If the reason is for degradation in front of others, why doesn't one pay when he embarrasses a shoteh? **A:** A shoteh is already fully degraded to people.
  - The Gemara says, the Braisa is no proof, because it may be talking about a katan that is capable of being embarrassed, as **R' Pappa** discusses elsewhere.
  - **R' Pappa** says that **R' Abba bar Mamal's** question was, do we pay for embarrassment because of the person's feeling of embarrassment, or do we pay for the feelings of embarrassment of the person's family (in which case even the sleeping person who died should get paid).

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- Based on this explanation, maybe we can answer from the Braisa quoted above regarding a katan. Now, if we say payment is for the feelings of the family, that is why we pay a katan. If not, why would we pay a katan, who is incapable of having feelings of embarrassment!
  - **Q:** If the reason is for embarrassment of the family, why doesn't one pay when he embarrasses a shoteh? **A:** A shoteh has already fully embarrassed his family.
  - **R' Pappa** says, the Braisa is no proof, because it may be talking about a katan that is capable of being embarrassed, as we find in a Braisa.

### HAMEVAYEISH ES HASUMAH...

- Our Mishna, which says that a blind person is chayuv if he embarrasses somebody, does not follow **R' Yehuda**, who says in a Braisa that a blind person is patur for embarrassment, from going into galus (for killing by accident), from malkus, and from being put to death by Beis Din.
  - He holds he is patur from embarrassment based on a gezeira shava from eidim zomemim – just as they are not included in those halachos, they are not included in the halachos of embarrassment either.
  - He holds a blind person is patur from galus. In a Braisa **R' Yehuda** says that the pasuk of “b'lo re'os” teaches that a blind person would not be subject to galus if he kills b'shogeg. **R' Meir** says that the pasuk comes to include a blind person in the galus obligation.
  - He says a blind person is patur from being put to death by Beis Din based on a gezeirah shava from galus.
  - He says a blind person is patur from malkus based on a gezeirah shava from one being put to death by Beis Din.
- A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** says, a blind person is not chayuv for embarrassment, and **R' Yehuda** would make patur a blind person from all monetary laws in the Torah. He learns this from a pasuk that mentions the death penalty, galus, and monetary laws. He darshens that this teaches that anyone who is subject to the laws of the death penalty and galus are subject to the monetary laws. A blind person, who is not, is not subject to monetary laws.
- A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** says, a blind person is not chayuv for embarrassment, and **R' Yehuda** would make patur a blind person from all mitzvos in the Torah.
  - **R' Shisha the son of R' Idi** said, this is based on a pasuk that says “v'zos hamitzvah hachukim v'hamishpatim (monetary laws)”. We darshen that whoever is included in the monetary laws is included in all mitzvos and chukim. A blind person is not, so he is patur from all mitzvos and chukim.
  - **R' Yosef** (who was blind) said, initially I said that if someone would tell me that the halacha is like **R' Yehuda**, who says a blind person is patur from doing the mitzvos, I would make a party, because I do the mitzvos even though I'm blind (and that is greater than doing the mitzvos based on an obligation). However, now that **R' Chanina** has said that one who is commanded to do a mitzvah and does it is greater than one who does it when not commanded, I will make a party if someone tells me that we do *not* pasken like **R' Yehuda**.

### -----Daf 87-----

#### MISHNA

- The chumros of a person who is mazik versus an ox that is mazik is that a person pays for nezek, tzaar, ripuy, sheves, and boshes, and would pay for the value of the fetus if he caused a miscarriage, whereas an ox that is mazik only pays for nezek and would not pay for the value of a fetus.
- A person who hits his parent but does not make a wound, or someone who causes a wound to another person on Yom Kippur, is chayuv for all 5 payments.
- A person who wounds an eved ivri is chayuv in all 5 payments, except if he is the master of the eved ivri, he is not chayuv to pay for sheves.
- A person who wounds an eved Knaani that belongs to someone else, is chayuv for all 5 payments. **R' Yehuda** says a slave does not get paid for boshes.
- With regard to a cheireish, shoteh, and katan, dealing with them is bad, because one who injures them is chayuv, but if they injure somebody else, they are patur.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- With regard to an eved Knaani and a woman, dealing with them is bad, because one who injures them is chayuv, but if they injure somebody else, they are patur, except that they do pay later on. Meaning, if the woman gets divorced or the slave is freed, they would be chayuv to pay then.
- A person who hits a parent and causes a wound, and one who causes a wound to another person on Shabbos, is patur from any payment, because he is chayuv misah.
  - A person who wounds his own eved Knaani is also patur from any payment.

### GEMARA

- **R' Elazar** asked **Rav**, what is the halacha if one injures the minor daughter of another man? Who would get the payment? Do we say that since the Torah gives all the gain of a naarah to her father, the payment for injury would go to him as well, since the injury depreciates her value, which belongs to him, or do we say that he gets her gains because he has the right to marry her off to a disgusting man. However, since he does not have the right to injure her, he does not get the money from her injury? **Rav** said, the Torah only gave him rights to her gains, not her money for injury.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna said that if the owner of the eved ivri damaged him, he does not pay for sheves, because that belongs to him anyway. Now, based on this, since the father has rights to his daughter's wages he should get the payment for her sheves!? **A: Abaye** said, **Rav** would agree that with regard to sheves the father would get the payment.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, if one injures his adult son, he must give him the money immediately. If he injures his minor son, he must put the money in a trust for him. If one injures his minor daughter he is patur. Not only that, but if others injure her they are chayuv to pay the money to the father!? **A:** This too is referring to the payment for sheves.
    - **Q:** A Braisa says, if someone injures someone else's adult son or daughter, he must pay them immediately. If they are minors, he must put the money in a trust. If one injures his own son or daughter, he is patur. This contradicts the last Braisa!? **A:** The second Braisa is discussing where the children are financially dependent on the father, and the first Braisa is discussing where they are not.
      - **Q:** If the first Braisa is discussing where the children are not dependent on the father, why is it that if someone else injures the minor daughter he gives the money to the father? She needs the money for her own support and should therefore be entitled to the money!? **A:** The money that goes to the father is money in excess of what she needs to support herself, as **Rava the son of Ulla** says elsewhere.
      - **Q:** If the second Braisa is discussing where they are dependent on the father, why is it that when one injures an adult son he gives the money to the son, and when he injures a minor son he puts it in a trust? In both these cases he should give the money to the boy's father!? **A:** The father allows his son to take these financial windfalls that don't cause the father any financial loss.
        - **Q:** We find that a father minds if his son were to keep a find that he found, although that did not cause the father any loss!? **A:** The father doesn't mind if the payment is a windfall and it comes because of pain suffered by the child. However, when it comes without pain to the child, he does not want the child to keep it.
        - **Q:** Why is it that he doesn't want his daughter to keep the money that comes to her as a windfall and came to her through pain? **A:** In that case we are dealing with a father who does not even support his children. Such a father doesn't want his children to keep anything, even if it came to them through pain. In the other Braisa we are dealing with a more generous father, who supports his children. Such a father doesn't mind for his children to keep money that came to them through pain.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** What is meant when the Braisa says to put the money “in a trust”? **A:** **R’ Chisda** said, it means the money should be used to buy a Sefer Torah for the child to learn from. **Rabbah bar R’ Huna** said, the money is used to buy a palm tree from which the child can eat the fruit.
- **Reish Lakish** also said that the Torah only gave a father the right to his daughter’s gains, not payment for her injury. **R’ Yochanan** said the father even gets payment for her wound.
  - **Q:** Can it be that **R’ Yochanan** gives him the money for her *wound*? Even **R’ Elazar** only asked about his getting the money for her injury which depreciates her value, not for a simple wound!? **A:** **R’ Yose bar Chanina** said, **R’ Yochanan** refers to where she got a wound to her face, which depreciates her value.

### -----Daf פד--88-----

HACHOVEL B’EVED KNAANI SHEL ACHEIREM CHAYUV...

- **Q:** Why does **R’ Yehuda** hold that slaves do not get paid for embarrassment? **A:** The pasuk regarding boshes says “ish v’achiv”, which refers to Yidden. The **Rabanan** hold that an eved Knaani is also referred to as a “brother”, because he is also chayuv in mitzvos.
  - **Q:** According to **R’ Yehuda** we should say that the eidim zomemim who wanted to put a slave to death should not be put to death, because the pasuk says “kasher zamam laasos l’achiv”!? **A:** **Rava in the name of R’ Sheishes** said, we would put them to death to fulfil the pasuk that tells us “uvi’arta harah mikirbecha”.
  - **Q:** According to the **Rabanan**, a slave should be fit to be a king (which the pasuk says must be “from your brothers”)!? **A:** If the pasuk is to be understood simply, there is even a question on **R’ Yehuda**, because a ger should surely be fit, and yet he is not. Rather, when the pasuk says “mikerev achecha”, it refers to the “choicest of your brothers”.
  - **Q:** The pasuk regarding witnesses also uses the word “brother”, and therefore according to the **Rabanan** a slave should be a valid witness!? **A:** **Ulla** said, we can’t say that he should be a valid witness, because we can darshen a kal v’chomer from a woman, that he is not valid. If a woman, who may marry into Klal Yisrael, is not a valid witness, then surely a slave, who may not marry into Klal Yisrael, is not a valid witness.
    - **Q:** Maybe a woman is invalid because she is not fit to have a bris milah, but a slave, who is, can be a valid witness? **A:** A minor is fit for bris milah, and is still not a valid witness.
    - **Q:** Maybe a minor is not valid because he is not chayuv in mitzvos, but a slave who is, should be a valid witness? **A:** A woman is chayuv in mitzvos and is still not a valid witness. The common characteristics between a woman and a minor are that they are not chayuv in all mitzvos (only some) and they are passul to be a witness. I can also say that a slave, who is also not chayuv in all mitzvos (only some) is also passul to be a witness.
      - **Q:** Maybe the commonality of a woman and a minor is that they lack the status of being a man, whereas a slave is a man, and therefore can be a valid witness? **A:** We will learn that a slave is passul from a gazlan, who is passul even though he is a man.
      - **Q:** Maybe a gazlan is passul because of his actions, but a slave did not do anything wrong and is therefore different than a gazlan? **Q:** We will learn it from a combination of a gazlan and either a woman or a minor.
  - **Mar the son of Ravina** darshens the pasuk of “lo yumsu avos ahl banim”, to teach that a person can’t be put to death based on the testimony of someone who doesn’t have a yichus relationship with his son (which is the case for a slave).
    - **Q:** Based on this drasha, we should darshen the next words of the pasuk in a similar fashion, and should say “ubanim lo yumsu ahl avos” means that a son who has no yichus to his father is also a passul witness, which would mean that a ger is a passul witness!? **A:** A slave has no yichus to his father or to his children. A ger has yichus to his children, and that is why he would be valid. We can prove this, because if a ger was passul, the

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

pasuk should be written in a way to teach that a ger is passul, and we can then learn that a slave is passul from a kal v'chomer.

CHEIREISH SHOTEH V'KATAN PIGI'ASAN RA'AH

- The mother of **R' Shmuel bar Abba** remarried to **R' Abba** (different than the father of **Shmuel**). She wrote over all of her property to her son (so that her husband should not inherit her). After she died, **R' Yirmiya bar Abba** said the property belongs to **R' Shmuel bar Abba**. **R' Abba** (the husband) went and told **R' Hoshaya** what happened, who then told **R' Yehuda**, who said, **Shmuel** said, if a wife sells her melog property and then dies, the husband may take the property back from the buyers (and therefore this property can be taken back from the son). When **R' Yirmiya bar Abba** heard this he said, I have paskened based on a Mishna. The Mishna says, if a father writes over his properties for his son to acquire them after his (the father's) death, the son cannot sell the property during the father's lifetime, because they are still in the father's possession, and the father cannot sell it, because they have been written over to the son. If the father does sell it, the buyer only has rights in it until the father dies. If the son sold it, the buyer only gets rights in it once the father dies. Now, the Mishna seems to say that when the son sold it, the buyer will get rights to the property after the father dies, even if the son ultimately died before the father. This follows the view of **Reish Lakish**, who argues on **R' Yochanan**, who says that if the son never took possession, his buyer would get no rights to the property. **R' Yirmiya bar Abba** explained, since we hold like **Reish Lakish**, whose view is based on the principle that ownership of the produce is not tantamount to ownership of the property, if so, a husband's rights to his wife's melog cannot stop her from giving that property away, and that is why the son, **R' Shmuel bar Abba** gets the property. **R' Yehuda** responded, that **Shmuel** said, the case of the mother and son is not like the case of this Mishna. **R' Yosef** explained, if the Mishna was trying to prove this point, it would have given the case of a son who wrote his property to his father. However, as written, the Mishna doesn't prove anything, because since the son stands to inherit the father, it may be that is why his sale is valid even before he takes possession, and the reason is not because ownership of rights to produce is not tantamount to ownership of the property. **Abaye** said, a father inherits a son just as a son inherits a father. You must mean that if the Mishna said the case of the son who wrote his property to his father, the son did so to prevent his own son from inheriting, and if the father's sale of the property would be valid, that would prove that the son's ownership of the produce is not tantamount to ownership of the property. Now, the Mishna, as written, can be understood in a similar way. The case can be where the father gave the property to his son to prevent his other sons from inheriting the property. Therefore, that property does not come with inheritance rights, and therefore by saying that the sale of the son is valid, it proves that the father's ownership of the produce is not tantamount to ownership of the property.
  - **Q:** If so, what did **Shmuel** mean when he said that the case of the mother and son is not like the case of the Mishna? **A:** The case of a wife selling her melog property is a special enactment done in Usha, which said that if a woman sells her melog property during her husband's lifetime, the husband may take the property from the buyers. Therefore, **R' Abba** would be able to prevent **R' Shmuel bar Abba** from getting the property.
    - **R' Idi bar Avin** said, we can prove this from a Braisa. The Braisa says, if witnesses say they saw a woman get divorced and receive her kesubah, and they are found to be zomemim, we don't make them pay the entire amount of the kesubah to the woman, only the discounted value of her kesubah. A kesubah has a discounted value because it is only collectible upon divorce or if the husband dies first. If the wife were to die first it would be uncollectible. Therefore, it would trade at a discount. Now, why can't the woman sell her kesubah while she is alive and the buyer can then collect even if she were to die first? It must be because of the enactment in Usha, that does not allow her to do so.
      - **Abaye** said, this is no proof. The Braisa is discussing the kesubah payments, to which a husband has a much stronger claim (as "tzon barzel") than to her melog property. Therefore, just because she can't sell rights to her kesubah if she were to die first, would not mean that she could not sell rights to her melog if she were to die first.

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 89-----

- **Abaye** said, once we have mentioned the concept of the kesubah being sold at a discount, let us say something about it – the halacha is that if a woman sells her kesubah for the discounted amount, the money goes to her. We can prove this, because if it goes to her husband, then in the previous case, where eidem zomemim said she is not entitled to her kesubah, why are they even chayuv to give her the discounted amount? Since it goes to the husband, they should not have to give her anything at all!? **R' Salman** said, this is no proof. It may be that even though the husband gets the money, since it increases the money in the home, which would benefit the wife, they therefore must pay something to the wife.
  - **Rava** paskened, the discounted price from the sale of a kesubah goes to the woman, and we do not even let the husband have the profits from that money (i.e. we don't make her use the money for a piece of land and then allow the husband to eat the produce).
- When **R' Pappa and R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** came from the Yeshiva of **Rav**, they said we can see the enactment of Usha in our Mishna. The Mishna said, dealing with a slave and a married woman is bad, because if one injures them he would be chayuv, but if they injure someone they are patur. Now, without the enactment of Usha, why can't we make the woman sell her melug property and pay for her damage? It must be that we have the enactment of Usha.
  - The Gemara says this is no proof, because even if the enactment of Usha exists, we should make her sell the melug property for a discounted price, and pay with that money!? Rather, the case must be where there is no melug property, and therefore there is no proof.
  - **Q:** Why don't we make her sell her kesubah for a discounted price and pay for her damage with that? **A:** The Mishna follows **R' Meir**, who holds that a couple may not live together without a kesubah (so if she sells it, she could no longer live with her husband).
    - **Q:** The reason **R' Meir** holds that way is that the husband has no deterrent and will easily divorce her if he has no kesubah obligation. However, in this case he would still have to pay the kesubah, only to the buyers rather than the wife, so the deterrent still exists!? **A:** Rather, the reason we don't make her sell her kesubah to pay for her damage is that a kesubah is mere "words" and words are not subject to a lien for damages.
      - **Q:** These are "words" that can be sold for money, so why are they not subject to a lien? **A:** They reason we don't force the woman to sell her kesubah is that, as **Shmuel** says, she would be able to be mochel the kesubah obligation even after the sale, with the effect that the buyer of the kesubah will suffer a financial loss.
      - **Q:** Why is the chance that she will be mochel enough to prevent us from making her sell her kesubah? **A:** Given her relationship and affinity for her husband, she will *definitely* be mochel the obligation, and by forcing her to sell, we are essentially directly causing a loss to the buyer.
      - **Q:** Why don't we just make her give the kesubah to the damaged party, and the chance that she will be mochel will put him in no less advantageous of a position than if he got nothing at all? **A:** Since she will definitely be mochel it, making Beis Din oversee the giving of the kesubah to the damaged party would be wasting their time.
    - **Q:** A Braisa says, if a wife damages her husband, we do not make her give up her kesubah as payment. Why don't we make her give the kesubah rights to him, because if she is mochel in that case, there is no loss for anybody? **A:** The Braisa follows **R' Meir**, who holds that a couple may not live together without a kesubah (so if she sells it, she could no longer live with her husband).
      - **Q:** In this case, if he divorces her he would then collect her kesubah as payment, so there is anyway no deterrent to divorce her!? **A:** The case of the Braisa is that the kesubah is worth a lot of money, so he would not divorce her just to collect for the damages (which are less than the kesubah).

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** If the case is that the kesubah was written for more than the required minimum, why don't we make her sell that excess and pay with that money, but retain the minimum, so that they can remain married? **A:** The case is that the kesubah was for the minimum amount, but the damage was less than that amount.
- **Q:** The end of the Braisa says, just as she cannot sell her kesubah while she is married to him, so too she does not forfeit the kesubah to him while she is married to him. Now, according to what we have said, there can be a case where she would forfeit the kesubah to him – namely, where the kesubah is for more than the minimum required kesubah!? **A: Rava** said, the end of the Braisa is talking about something totally different – it is talking about the “ksubas benin dichrin” (the concept that if a woman predeceases her husband, in which case he inherits her kesubah, when he dies, the amount of her kesubah is given to her sons before the remaining estate of the father is divided among his other sons as well), and is saying that just as when a woman sells her kesubah she does not lose the ksubas benin dichrin concept, because it was her finances that made her sell, the same is true if she sells her kesubah to her own husband.
- **Q:** Maybe we can say that the enactment of Usha is actually subject to a machlokes among Tanna'im. One Braisa says, a slave of melog property goes out free if the wife knocked out its tooth or eye, but not if the husband did so. Another Braisa says it does not go out free in either of these cases. The Gemara assumes that all hold that ownership of rights to produce is not considered ownership of the asset itself. If so, the machlokes between the Braisos must be that the first Braisa does not hold of the enactment of Usha and the second Braisa does? **A:** We can say that all hold of the enactment of Usha, but it may be that the first Braisa was discussing before the enactment was made, and the second Braisa is discussing after it was made. **A2:** Both Braisos hold of the enactment of Usha, and both are discussing after the enactment was made. The first Braisa holds like **Rava**, who said that freeing a slave removes it from any lien, and similarly, the wife knocking out its tooth will remove it from the lien of the husband. The second Braisa agrees with **Rava**, but holds that the Usha enactment made the husband's rights stronger than a typical lien, and even the freeing of the slave will not trump it. **A3:** Both Braisos do not hold of the enactment of Usha, and the machlokes is whether we hold that ownership of rights to the produce is considered to be full ownership of the asset.

### -----Daf ז'---90-----

- The Gemara had suggested that two Braisos argue regarding whether we say ownership of the rights to produce is considered to be ownership of the asset itself. The Gemara said, we find that this is the subject of a machlokes among Tanna'im. A Braisa says, if a person sells his slave with the agreement being that the slave should continue to work for the seller for another 30 days, **R' Meir** says the seller is considered the owner of the slave during those 30 days for purposes of “yom oy yomayim” (if a person kills a slave he is chayuv misah, however, if the owner hits the slave and the slave dies more than 24 hours later, the owner would not be chayuv misah), because the slave is still under his control. [The Gemara says, we see that **R' Meir** holds ownership of the “produce” is considered ownership of the asset (the slave) itself]. **R' Yehuda** says, the buyer is considered to be the owner for purposes of “yom oy yomayim”, because the slave is his property. [The Gemara says, we say that **R' Yehuda** holds that ownership of the produce is not considered ownership of the asset itself]. **R' Yose** says, they are both included in the halacha of “yom oy yomayim” – the seller, because he has the slave under his control, and the buyer, because the slave is his property. [The Gemara says, **R' Yose** is uncertain whether ownership of the produce is considered ownership of the asset, and because the result deals with putting someone to death, we must go l'kulah]. **R' Eliezer** says, neither of them are included in the halacha of “yom oy yomayim” – the seller is not, because the slave is not his property, and the buyer is not, because the slave is not under his control.
  - **Rava** said, **R' Eliezer's** view is based on the pasuk of yom oy yomayim, which says “ki kaspo hu” (it is *his* property), which teaches that the slave must belong *solely* to the master.



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Who does **Ameimar** follow when he says that if a husband or wife sell melog property they have accomplished nothing? **A:** That follows **R' Eliezer** of this Braisa.
- **Q:** Who is the Tanna of the Braisa that says that a slave that is half-freed, or a slave owned by partners, does not go out free if one of his limbs are knocked off by the master? **A:** **R' Mordechai** said to **R' Ashi**, that **Rava** said it follows **R' Eliezer**, who says in the Braisa that the slave must be “his property”, and would similarly say here that the slave must be “his slave” to go out free in such a way.

### MISHNA

- If a person hits another in the ear, he must give him a sela for boshes. **R' Yehuda in the name of R' Yose Haglili** says he must give him a maneh (25 sela). If he slapped him across the face he must give him 200 zuz. If he slapped him with the back of his hand, he must give him 400 zuz. If he pulled his ear, pulled his hair, spat at him and it reached him, removed his cloak from him, or uncovered the hair of a woman in the marketplace, he must pay 400 zuz.
  - The general rule is that the amount depends on the victim's status (the higher his status, the more embarrassing one of these things is). **R' Akiva** said, even the poor of Klal Yisrael are treated as people of high status who have lost their money, because all Yidden are the children of Avrohom, Yitzchak, and Yaakov.
  - It once happened that a person uncovered the hair of a woman in the marketplace. She went to **R' Akiva** and he said the man must pay her 400 zuz. The man asked for time to pay and was granted the time. He then waited outside her chatzer, and when she came out he broke a jug containing oil in the value of an issur. When she saw this, she uncovered her hair and took the oil and rubbed it into her hair. The man had people witness this event. He then went to **R' Akiva** and said, how can you make me pay this large sum of money to this woman for uncovering her head in public, when she did it to herself for a small amount of oil!? **R' Akiva** said, that is no argument. Although a person may not wound himself, if he does he is patur. Yet, if he is wounded by someone else, the mazik is chayuv. Also, although a person may not cut down his trees, if he does he is patur. Yet, if someone else cuts down his trees, the mazik would be chayuv.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** When **R' Yose Haglili** said he must pay a maneh, was he referring to the more expensive maneh of Tzuri, or the less expensive regular maneh? **A:** It once happened that a person hit another in the ear and **R' Yehuda Nesiah** said, “Here I am and here is **R' Yose Haglili**, so go give a maneh of Tzuri”. We see that he meant a maneh of Tzuri. **SHEMA MINA.**
  - **Q:** What did he mean by “here am I and here is **R' Yose Haglili**”? If it meant “here I am who saw you hit the person and here is **R' Yose** who holds that you are chayuv a maneh of Tzuri”, that would mean that he was a witness who was then acting as a judge, and a Braisa says that a witness may not also be the judge!? **A:** The Braisa doesn't allow it when they saw an incident at night (when a case may not be held) and then wanted to judge the next day. The case of **R' Yehuda Nesiah** was where he saw it and judged on the same day, which would be allowed. **A2:** **R' Yehuda Nesiah** meant to say, “here am I, who holds like **R' Yosef Haglili** that you are chayuv to pay a maneh of Tzuri, and here are witnesses who saw the act, so go and pay”.
    - **Q:** The Braisa just quoted, says that **R' Akiva** holds that a witness cannot act as a judge. A Braisa says, **Shimon Hateimani** says that the weapon of a murder has to be presented to Beis Din for inspection (to see if they find that it could have caused the death), and if it is not, the murderer will not be put to death. **R' Akiva** said, did the murderer hit the victim in front of Beis Din so that they can know how many times he was hit, and on what part of the body? If the murder was done by pushing someone off a building, do we make Beis Din travel to look at it? Do we bring it to Beis Din? If it was destroyed, do we make them rebuild it to see it? Rather, just as we rely on the witnesses for everything else, as long as the witnesses saw the weapon and determined that it was capable of killing, we rely on them for that as well. Now, **R' Akiva** said, “did the murder

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

happen in front of Beis Din?”), which suggests that if it did take place in front of them, they would be able to act as witnesses and judges!? **A:** He was answering according to the logic of **Shimon Hateimani**, but he himself did not truly hold that way.

- A Braisa says, if an ox that is a tam killed someone and then did damage to someone else, it is judged for the capital case and not judged for the monetary case. If a muad killed someone and then did damage to someone else, it is judged for the monetary case first and then judged for the capital case. If they first judged the muad for the capital case, they do not go back and then judge it for the monetary case.
  - **Q:** Why can't they go back and judge the muad for the monetary case? **A:** **Rava** said, I found the **Rabanan** of the yeshiva of **Rav** who said this Braisa follows **Shimon Hateimani**, who says the weapon of the killing or the damage must be inspected by Beis Din. In this case, since the ox (which is the “weapon”) was sentenced to death, we will not delay the killing of the ox so that Beis Din can inspect it for the monetary case. **Rava** said, I told the **Rabanan** that the Braisa can even follow **R' Akiva** (who does not require beis Din to examine the weapon), and the case is that the owner ran away, preventing a monetary case from taking place (because the defendant must be present to conduct a case).
    - **Q:** If the owner ran away, then even if the monetary case was to be done first, it could not be held!? **A:** The case is that Beis Din accepted testimony of the witnesses and the owner then ran away, leaving no assets from which to pay for the damage. Therefore, if the capital case was not yet held, the ox can be given to the damaged party as payment.
    - **Q:** What good will giving him the ox do? As soon as the capital case is held, the ox will be taken away and killed!? **A:** We allow the damaged party to rent out the animal and thereby collect money for his damages. After he has done so, we then hold the capital case.
    - **Q:** Why don't we do the same thing if the ox was a tam? **A:** **R' Mari in the name of R' Kahana** said, the money from renting out the animal is considered an asset of the owner (it is not considered to be the body of the animal itself), and a tam only pays from the body of the animal.

### -----Daf נ"ט-----91-----

- **Q:** They asked, do we need to assess the item that caused the damage before awarding damages or not? Do we say that for a capital case we must do so, to determine if the item is capable of causing death, but any item can cause damage, and therefore we don't need to assess, or do we say that we must assess in the case of damage as well?
  - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from a Mishna. The Mishna said that a bor must be 10 tefachim deep in order to be capable of causing death. Therefore, if it was less than 10 and an animal fell into it and died, the digger would be patur, but if the animal was only injured, he would be chayuv. Presumably, the Mishna means to count up, and to say that from 1-10 tefachim it cannot cause death, but it can cause damage. We see that damages must be paid for any depth and we don't need to assess! **A:** The Mishna is discussing a bor in a descending order – 10 tefachim can cause death, and a drop less can cause damage. For anything even less deep, we would have to assess each damage to see whether it could have been caused by that depth.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from a Braisa. The Braisa says, if the master hit the slave in the eye and blinded him, or on the ear and made him deaf, the slave would go out free. However, if he hit a wall near the slave's eye and that caused him to become blind, or if he hit a wall near his ear and caused him to become deaf, he would not go out free. Presumably he would not go out free, because we must assess the cause of damage, and hitting a wall is not thought of as a true cause of damage. We see that

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

we do assess for damage! **A:** The reason he is patur is because we say that the slave caused the damage to himself, by allowing himself to get scared in that way.

- **Q:** Maybe we can answer from a Braisa. The Braisa says, with regard to the 5 types of payment, the mazik must pay these amount immediately. With regard to nezek, tzaar, and boshes, they are simply given immediately. With regard to ripuy and sheves, we must determine how long it will take the victim to recover. If they assessed an amount and the recovery took longer than expected, he only needs to give the amount that was assessed. If they assessed and the recovery time was shorter than expected, he still must pay the full amount of the assessment. We see that we do need to assess for the damage!  
**A:** The Braisa is discussing assessing the *person*, and that is no question and clearly must be done. The question was whether we must assess the *item* that caused the damage, to determine whether it was capable of doing that damage.
- **A:** The Braisa quoted earlier in the Gemara said, **Shimon Hateimani** said, the item in question must be brought to Beis Din for inspection. We clearly see that an assessment of the item must be made. **SHEMA MINAH.**
- The Braisa quoted above said that if they assessed and the recovery time was shorter than expected, he still must pay the full amount of the assessment. This supports **Rava**, who says that if they assessed a recovery time of a day, and in middle of the day the victim was able to get up and went to work, he is still given the amount for the full day.

RAKAK V'HIGIYA BO HAROK V'HE'EVIR...

- **R' Pappa** said, this is only if the spit actually touched his body. However, if it landed on his clothing, the spitter would be patur.
  - **Q:** Why should it be any less that one who was embarrassed with words? **A:** In EY they said in the name of **R' Yose bar Avin**, we see from here that one would not be chayuv a monetary payment for embarrassing another with words.

HAKOL LEFI K'VODO...

- **Q:** Is the **T"K** coming to be lenient, and saying that there may be a poor person who would get less if he was embarrassed, or is he coming to be machmir and saying that a wealthier person would get a larger amount than stated in the Mishna if he were embarrassed? **A:** Since **R' Akiva** said in the Mishna that even poor Yidden are viewed as aristocrats who have lost their money, it must be that the **T"K** was coming to be meikel, and to say that these people would not be viewed in that manner. **SHEMA MINAH.**

UMAASEH B'ECHAD SHEPARAH ROSH HA'ISHA...

- **Q:** How could **R' Akiva** have allowed him time to pay? We find that **R' Chanina** says we do not give someone time to pay for an injury he caused!? **A:** We don't give time when the injury caused actual loss. Embarrassment does not cause actual loss, so for that we do allow time to pay.

SHAMRA OMEDES AHL PESACH CHATZEIRAH...

- **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Akiva** told the man "you don't have an argument, because a person is *allowed* to wound himself". In our Mishna he said that a person is *not* allowed to do so!? **A:** **Rava** said, the Mishna is discussing actual wounding, which a person may not do. The Braisa is discussing embarrassing oneself, which a person may do.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna is discussing embarrassing oneself!? **A:** **R' Akiva** was saying, not only would you be wrong regarding boshes, which a person has a right to do to himself, rather even wounding, which a person may not do to themselves, if they would do it they would be patur..."
  - **Q:** A Braisa regarding nedarim says that a person may make a neder to harm himself!? **A:** That is referring to a neder to observe a fast.
    - **Q:** Based on this, how would we explain the parallel case of where he makes a neder to harm others? That he will make them observe a fast? How can he do that? **A:** He does that locking them in a room without food.
    - **Q:** A Braisa says, the case of making a neder to harm other people is where a neder is made to hit someone else!? **A:** We must say that it is a machlokes among Tanna'im – one Tanna holds

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

that **R' Akiva** holds that a person may not wound himself, and the other holds that **R' Akiva** holds that a person may wound himself.

- **Q:** Who is the Tanna that holds it is assur? You can't say that it is **R' Elazar**, who darshens a pasuk in a Braisa to teach that a person who commits suicide will be punished, because suicide is different than wounding. **A:** It is **R' Elazar** in another Braisa who says that one is chayuv for "baal tashchis" if he rips his clothing more than necessary for a meis. Now, if he holds one is chayuv for ripping clothing, certainly he would hold one is chayuv for actually wounding himself.
  - **Q:** Maybe ripping clothing is worse, because it will not "heal" itself, whereas skin will? In fact, we find that **R' Chisda** preferred to allow his skin, rather than his clothing, to touch the thorns, because his skin would heal!? **A:** The Tanna who holds it is assur is **R' Elazar Hakapar Beribi**, who says a person who pains himself with fasting is considered to be a sinner. Certainly then, a person who wounds himself will be considered a sinner.

HAKOTZETZ NETI'OSAV...

- **Rabbah bar bar Chana** taught a Braisa in front of **Rav**, if someone says to another "you killed my ox" or "you cut down my tree", and the other person responds "you told me to kill it" or "you told me to cut it down", the mazik is patur. **Rav** asked, if that is true, people will do damage and just claim that they were told to do so!? **Rabbah bar bar Chana** asked, should I delete the Braisa? **Rav** said, no. We can say that the Braisa is talking about an ox that was chayuv misah and a tree that had to be cut down (it was used for avodah zarah or was dangerous to people). It is only then that the person is believed, because this ox must be killed, and this tree must be cut down.
  - **Q:** If that is the case of the Braisa, what is the plaintiff claiming? **A:** He claims that he wanted to do the mitzvah (of killing the ox or cutting down the tree) himself, and that opportunity was now taken away from him. We find that **R' Gamliel** required one person to pay 10 golden dinars to a second person when the first person did the mitzvah of "kisuy hadam" before the second person had a chance to, in a case where it was the second person's mitzvah to do (because he shechted the bird and was therefore entitled to do the mitzvah of kisuy hadam).
  - **Rav** said, a palm tree that produces a kav of fruit may not be cut down.
    - **Q:** A Mishna says that an olive tree may not be cut down if it produces even a quarter of a kav!? **A:** Olives are more valuable.
  - **R' Chanina** said, his son died prematurely only because he cut down a fig tree prematurely.
  - **Ravina** said, if the wood is worth more than the fruit, the tree may be cut down. A Braisa says this as well.
  - **Shmuel's** sharecroppers brought him dates that tasted like wine. They explained that the tree grows near the grapevines. **Shmuel** said, if so, the tree is causing the wine in the grapes to be weak, so chop it down.
  - **R' Chisda** saw a palm tree growing near the grapevines. He told his sharecropper to chop it down, because the value of the vines exceeded the value of the tree.

-----Daf כ"ט-----92-----

MISHNA

- Even though the mazik pays the 5 payments to the victim, he is not forgiven for the aveirah until the victim is mochel him. We learn this from the pasuk where Hashem told Avimelech to ask Avrohom to daven for him after he wronged and took Sarah away from Avrohom. How do we know that if the victim is not mochel he is considered to be cruel? We see in the pasuk that Avrohom was mochel Avimelech and even davened for him to be healed.
- If a person tells someone "blind my eye" or "cut off my arm" or "break my leg", and the other person does so, he is still chayuv for doing so. Even if the first person told him "do so on the condition that you will be patur", the person who did it will still be chayuv.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- If a person tells someone “rip my clothing” or “break my keili”, and the other person does so, he is still chayuv for doing so. However, if the first person told him “do so on the condition that you will be patur”, the person who did it will be patur.
- If a person tells someone “do this to so-and-so on the condition that you will be patur” and the person does so, he is chayuv whether he damaged the victim’s body or his property.

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, all the amounts listed in the previous Mishna are payment for boshes. However, for the psychological anguish associated with the boshes, even if the mazik brought all the animals in the world as korbanos he would not be forgiven until he asks the victim for forgiveness, as we see that Hashem told Avimelech “return the man’s wife because he is a navi, and he will daven for you”.
  - **Q:** Must he only return his wife because he is a navi? **A: R’ Shmuel bar Nachmeini in the name of R’ Yonason** said, the pasuk means “return his wife”, as would be the case for any man. Hashem then told Avimelech, with regard to your argument that you were innocent, because Avrohom told you that Sarah was his sister, know that he is a navi, and he saw your improper conduct by the way that as soon as he entered your country you asked who the woman with him was, instead of proper conduct which would have been to ask whether he had a place to eat and sleep.
  - The pasuk says that Avimelech and his household were punished with “ki atzor atzar Hashem”. **R’ Elazar** says, this double verbiage teaches that each man had his exit of zerah blocked, and each woman had the exit of her zerah blocked *and* her womb closed, preventing her from giving birth. A Braisa says that each man had his exit of zerah blocked and his path for urinating blocked, and each woman had the exit of her zerah blocked, her path for urination blocked, *and* her womb closed, preventing her from giving birth. **Ravina** said, each man had his exit of zerah blocked, his path of urination blocked, and his bowels blocked, and each woman had the exit of her zerah blocked, her path of urination blocked, her bowels blocked *and* her womb closed, preventing her from giving birth.
  - The pasuk says “b’ahd kol rechem”. **R’ Yannai** says the word “kol” teaches that even the chicken in Avimelech’s house could not lay eggs during this time.
- The Gemara now brings a number of conversations between **Rava and Rabbah bar Mari**.
  - **Rava** said to **Rabbah bar Mari**, what is the source for the saying of the **Rabanan** that one who davens for someone else, when he alone needs the thing that he is davening for, he will get answered first? **Rabbah** answered, it is a pasuk in *Iyuv*, where *Iyuv* davened for others and was answered first. **Rava** said, we have learned it from this story of Avrohom. He davened that Avimelech’s household should be able to give birth, and we see from the pasuk later of “VaHashem pakad es Sarah”, that Hashem remembered Sarah even before he allowed the women of Avimelech to give birth.
  - **Rava** said to **Rabbah bar Mari**, what is the source for the saying that along with the thorns the cabbage gets cut as well? **Rabbah** said it is from a pasuk where Hashem refers to “all the people”, which would include *Yirmiyah*, as rebels. **Rava** said we can learn it from the pasuk where Hashem asked Moshe “How long will you refuse to keep the mitzvos”.
  - **Rava** said to **Rabbah bar Mari**, the pasuk says that Yosef took 5 of his brothers to meet Paroh. Which 5 did he take? **Rabbah** said, **R’ Yochanan** has said he took the weaker ones, which were the ones whose names were doubled when Moshe blessed *Klal Yisrael*. **Rava** asked, Yehuda’s name was doubled there, and he was clearly not from the weaker brothers!? **Rabbah** said, his name was doubled for a different reason, as **R’ Shmuel bar Nachmeini in the name of R’ Yonason** taught, that in the *Midbar* the bones of Yehuda were shaking, and the double use of his name, along with the other words in that pasuk, were used as a *tefilla* by Moshe to stop Yehuda’s bones from shaking, to allow him into the *Yeshiva of Heaven*, to enable him to learn with the other *Rabanan* there, and to enable him to come out and learn like the *Halacha* should.
  - **Rava** said to **Rabbah bar Mari**, what is the source of the saying that poverty follows the poor people? **Rabbah** said, we see it in a Mishna, where the rich people bring *bikkurim* in baskets of silver and gold and keep the baskets after the fruit is taken from them. The poor people bring it in baskets of willow

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

branches, and must give the baskets to the Kohen as well. **Rava** said, we learned it from the fact that a metzorah must announce to all that he is tamei.

- **Rava** said to **Rabbah bar Mari**, what is the source of the saying of the **Rabanan** that one should get up early and eat, in the summer because of the heat and in the winter because of the cold, and people say that 60 runners cannot catch someone who eats breakfast? **Rabbah** said it is from a pasuk that says there shall be no hunger or thirst and the heat and sun will not harm them. **Rava** said, we can see it from the pasuk that says “you shall serve Hashem”, which refers to shachris, “uveirach es lachmicha v’es meimecha”, refers to eating bread with salt and water, “vahasirosi Machala mikirbecha”, then says there will be no sickness. This is shown in a Braisa as well, which says that eating bread with salt, and water, in the morning, prevents the sicknesses of the gallbladder.
- **Rava** said to **Rabbah bar Mari**, what is the source of the saying of the **Rabanan**, that if a friend embarrasses you, just accept it? **Rabbah** said, we learn it from Hagar, who was called a slave by the Malach, even though she had been expelled by Sarah, and Hagar accepted the label she was given.
- **Rava** said to **Rabbah bar Mari**, what is the source of the saying, if you have a fault bring it up before anyone else does? **Rabbah** said, we learn it from Eliezer, who admitted to being the slave of Avrohom before it was brought up by others.
- **Rava** said to **Rabbah bar Mari**, what is the source of the saying that a goose looks low (is humble) but always looks ahead? **Rabbah** said, we see this from Avigayil, who humbly asked Dovid to spare her husband’s life, but then asked Dovid to remember her after her husband would die.
- **Rava** said to **Rabbah bar Mari**, what is the source of the saying that 60 pains are suffered by a person who hears his friend eating but doesn’t eat along with him? **Rabbah** said, we learn it from the pasuk in which Nossan the Navi told Dovid that all the others were invited to the party of Adoniyahu, but I was not invited. **Rava** said we learned it from the pasuk that says that after Yitzchak got married, Avrohom went and remarried.
- **Rava** said to **Rabbah bar Mari**, what is the source for the saying that although the wine came from the owner, people thank the pourer? **Rabbah** said we learn it from the pasuk that attributes Yehoshua’s wisdom to Moshe’s placing his hands upon him, instead of attributing it to Hashem.
- **Rava** said to **Rabbah bar Mari**, what is the source for the saying that a hungry dog will swallow rocks? **Rabbah** said, we learn it from a pasuk that says, to a hungry person everything is sweet.
- **Rava** said to **Rabbah bar Mari**, what is the source for the saying that a bad palm tree grows next to barren trees? **Rabbah** said we find this in the Torah, where Esav went to Yishmael; we find this in the Navi, where Yiftach hung around lowly people; we find this in Ksuvim, where it says that similar people hang out together; we find this in the Mishna where it says that something connected to a tamei thing becomes tamei as well; we see it in a Braisa where **R’ Eliezer** says that a certain bird hangs out with non-kosher birds, which shows that it must be non-kosher as well.
- **Rava** said to **Rabbah bar Mari**, what is the source of the saying, if you call to someone to give mussar and he doesn’t answer you, throw a wall at him. **Rabbah** said it is the pasuk that says, because I have tried to be metaher you and you refused to do so, you will no longer become tahor.
- **Rava** said to **Rabbah bar Mari**, what is the source of the saying, do not throw dirt into the well that you drank from? **Rabbah** said, it is the pasuk that says you shall not hate a Mitzri because we lived in their land.
- **Rava** said to **Rabbah bar Mari**, what is the source of the saying, if you lift the package I will lift it too, if you do not, I will not? **Rabbah** said, it is the pasuk where Barak told Devorah, if you go with me I will go, and if you don’t, I will not.
- **Rava** said to **Rabbah bar Mari**, what is the source of the saying, when I was young, people respected me as old, and now that I am old we are not respected? **Rabbah** said, it is from the pasuk that says that at first Hashem led the Yidden Himself, and later He sent a Malach in His place.
- **Rava** said to **Rabbah bar Mari**, what is the source of the saying, if you follow a wealthy person you will get some of the fat (you will also get wealthy)? **Rabbah** said, we see this from the pasuk that says Lot became wealthy from hanging around Avrohom.