



Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
 In loving memory of **שרגא פייוול דוד בן קמואל**  
 The Abramowitz family

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) צרורות (cont.)

Another unsuccessful attempt is made to resolve Rava's inquiry whether the halacha is determined by the stepping on the utensil or where it broke.

Rava inquires whether **נזק צרורות** is paid from the body of the animal or only from the damager's best property.

Two unsuccessful attempts are made to resolve this inquiry.

Rava inquires whether an animal can become **מועד** for **צרורות** is it similar to the case of **קרן** or **רגל**?

Two unsuccessful attempts are made to resolve this inquiry.

The Gemara begins a third attempt to resolve this inquiry. ■

## HALACHAH Highlight

### *Blowing a feather off of one's wife who is a niddah*

תרנגול שהושיט ראשו לאויר כלי זכוכית ותקע בו ושברו משלם נזק שלם

*A rooster that extended its head into a glass utensil and screamed, breaking the utensil—[the owner] must pay full damages*

**S**efer Minchas Yaakov<sup>1</sup> discusses whether it is permitted for a man to blow a feather or dirt off of his wife's

(Continued on page 2)

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Explain the two sides of the inquiry whether **נזק צחי** is paid from the body or from choice property
2. Explain **צד תמות המקוצה עומדת**.
3. Is it possible to become **מועד** for **צרורות**?
4. What is the dispute between R' Yhudah and R' Elazar?

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### *A fowl pecking at a rope and severing it*

והא חבל משונה

**R**ava proposed a question regarding how to apply the law of **צרורות**. An animal steps on a vessel, but it did not immediately break. The vessel rolls down a path and then breaks. Rava asks that on the one hand we might consider the damage to have been done due to the original contact with the animal (**בתר מעיקרא אזלינן**), whereby this would be a case of **רגל**, and the animal's owner would have to pay full payment. On the other hand, we can view the damage as being due to the later development (**בתר תבר מנא אזלינן**), and its breakage is due to indirect contact with the animal. This results in its being a case of **צרורות** and payment would be only half.

In order to resolve this question, the Gemara cites a Baraisa where a fowl was pecking at a cord connected to a pail. The cord snapped, and the pail fell and broke. The Baraisa rules that full payment must be made. We see, therefore, that we view the damage as being direct, and this would resolve our issue regarding Rava's inquiry as well, as the animal's owner would have to pay full payment for the bucket which was trampled.

The Gemara answers that the ruling of the Baraisa to pay full payment is referring to payment for damage to the cord, which is certainly a direct damage. We have no indication, however, what payment would be due for the pail, and no solution to the question of Rava. To this, the Gemara asks that if the payment is for the cord, the damage is highly unusual, as a fowl does not peck at a rope, which is not a food. We would therefore expect the payment to be half, as an application of **קרן (משונה)**. The Gemara notes that this is not a problem, and the case is where there was some dough smeared on the rope. In any case, Tosafos (**והא ד"ה**) asks why is it that the Gemara

(Continued on page 2)

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
 By Embassy BankCard Solutions and Mr. & Mrs. Barry Bass  
 in memory of their mother  
**Mrs. Toby Bass O'BM**  
**מרת טובה בת ר' משה ע"ה**

(Highlight...Continued from page 1)

clothing when she is a niddah. Initially, he adopts the approach that it should be prohibited since our Gemara teaches that the force of one's body is like his body - כוחו כגופו. Our Gemara relates that one is obligated for damages caused when a rooster puts his head into a glass, screams and breaks the glass. This principle is cited by Maharil regarding the prohibition against eating food cooked by a gentile. Maharil<sup>2</sup> writes that if a Jew blows on a fire that was lit by a non-Jew the food is no longer prohibited as food cooked by a gentile since the Jew participated in the cooking process by blowing on the fire.

Minchas Yaakov subsequently expresses uncertainty about this analysis since it is possible that although the force of one's body is the same as his body, nevertheless, it is not the same as actually touching. Proof to this approach is found in the Gemara Pesachim (92b) that teaches that a person is allowed to blow on a בית הפרס—a field containing a grave that was plowed over - in order to pass over that field without becoming tamei. If blowing was considered the same as touching why would it be permitted to blow on a בית הפרס in order to pass through the field since blowing on a bone would be the same as touching it?

(Insight. Continued from page 1)

only points out that the damage is unusual once the Gemara claims that the payment is for the cord? Even when the Gemara thought that the Baraisa was dealing with payment for the pail, it should have immediately pointed out that the damage is unusual, as a bird would not peck at a dry cord.

Tosafos answers that originally, when we thought the payment was for the pail, we thought that the cord was frayed and worthless, with a drop of water on it. A minimal amount of pecking would result in its becoming snapped, but payment for the cord is irrelevant, as it was basically worthless. However, when we shift and say that payment is for the cord, it is obviously a strong and valuable rope. Severing such a cord is definitely unusual. ■

This proves that blowing is not the same as physical contact and thus it should be permitted for a man to blow off a feather or dirt from his wife's clothing while she is a niddah. Nevertheless, he advises that someone who is pious (בעל נפש) should avoid this activity since it is similar to other acts of affection that are prohibited for a couple when the wife is a niddah. ■

1. מנחת יעקב בתשובה בסוף הספר סי' י"ג ■

## STORIES Off the Daf

### Collateral damage

תרנגול שהושיט ראשו

A certain individual decided that he needed a partition between his and his neighbor's properties. The fact that the wall he planned to build would block the sunlight from his neighbor's windows did not trouble him in the slightest. When his neighbor heard about the plan, he was frantic. He immediately approached his friends in the neighborhood and begged them to convince the wealthy man to abort his plans for a wall. But all of his neighbors' efforts were of no avail.

Unfortunately, this caused the neighbor so much anguish that shortly after the divider was constructed he had a heart attack and died. When the

man heard about this he was devastated. He was especially troubled because his inflexibility had caused a man to die. He wondered if he was required to atone for having committed murder, but no one he spoke to could tell him a clear answer.

Finally he approached the Mishnah Halachos, who explained that he was definitely not responsible for killing his neighbor. The posek replied, "He did this to himself. Why are you responsible for his low tolerance for the stress you caused him? We see this clearly from Bava Kama 18 and Kiddushin 24. In Bava Kama we find that Rami Bar Chama says that the owner of a rooster that sticks its head in the air space of a glass jar, crows, and breaks the jar must pay for the jar. In Kiddushin the Gemara explains that this statement is not a contradiction to the halachah that one who scares his friend is only liable in

the heavenly court. In the first case, the secondary damage is on an inanimate object and there is a direct link of cause and effect between the crowing and the breakage. In the second case, the man who frightened his friend is not responsible for the damage since it is the victim who actually frightens himself. Rashi explains that since a person has understanding, he can only be harmed if he allows himself to be so highly strung. Therefore, the one who scares him is only liable in the heavenly court which also collects for indirect damages.

Rav Klein concluded, "But you definitely need an atonement for having pained your fellow Jew. You must at least take a minyan and ask forgiveness at his grave and support this man's orphans if they need it. In addition, you should accept upon yourself to never knowingly pain another Jew!"<sup>1</sup> ■

1. שו"ת משנה הלכות חלק ה' סימן שט"ו