20.9.7

98b (משנה ג') →99b (משנה ג')

## ַ לא תַעֲשׁק אֶת רֵעֲךּ וְלא תִגְזֹל **לא תַלִין פָּעַלַת שָׂכִיר אָתְּךּ עַד בּקַר**: ויקרא יט, יג

- I משנה ג': liability of artisans who fail to produce as directed
  - a *if*: a carpenter was given a carriage or a box to fix and he broke it liable
  - b if: a contractor was hired to take a wall down and he destroyed the stones liable
    - i if: he was knocking it down on one side and it fell to the other
      - 1 *if*: it fell due to his work, liable; if it fell for some other reason, exempt
- II discussion re: אומן קונה בשבח כלי
  - a משנה our משנה refers only to case where carpenter was given box to repair and broke it but if he was given wood to build a box, built it and broke it exempt (just pays for wood) since he acquired the כלי when he improved it (built it)
    - i challenge: our משנה implies that even if he gave him wood liable
      - 1 proof: from separate clauses "if they damaged", then example of the box
      - 2 rejection: 2<sup>nd</sup> clause may be explaining opening line
      - 3 support: if 1st line meant that even when he gave wood the carpenter is liable, "box" example isn't needed
        - (a) block: example was taught to show that even עצים generates liability (איפא taught to illuminate רישא taught to illuminate אינישא
    - ii support: 'משנה dyer only pays value of wool, not wool and improvement
      - 1 Rejection: שבח explained that case as being where it was destroyed as it fell into the vat no שבח
        - (a) Suggestion: שמואל disagrees with ר' אסי (maintaining that אין אומן קונה בשבח כלי)
        - (b) Rejection: case may be where dye and wool both belonged to בע"ה dyer was only providing labor
          - (i) Challenge: if so, he should pay for the wool and the (lost) dye שמואל) was just deflecting challenge)
  - b ברייתא if an artisan finished work on garment & informed owner, he doesn't violate בל תלין (v. 1) even for several days
    - i However: the day that the artisan hands it over to the owner, בל חלין is in effect (as of sunset on that day)
    - ii Explanation: if אומן קונה בשבח כלי, it isn't "hiring" at all (no violation), as the artisan "bought it" via improvement
    - iii Defense: case is where he was hired to clean it out and soften it
      - 1 Challenge: isn't it an improvement when he softens it?
      - 2 *Answer*: he hired him at a rate per "stamping" only labor costs
        - (a) Note: according to original assumption (hired for improving garment) supports יר' ששת:
          - (i) בל תלין for contracted work
          - (ii) Question: does ר"ש disagree with ר' אסי?
          - (iii) Response: אויש referred to (e.g.) a messenger (hired to deliver letter no intrinsic improvement)
  - c Suggestion: אומן קונה בשבח is the subject of a מחלוקת תנאים:
    - i If: a woman tells a man to fashion jewelry and she will accept it as קידושין:
      - 1 א"מ. as soon as he is finished מקודשת
      - 2 קידושין until she receives the money (jewelry)
        - (a) assumption: all agree that שכירות is collectable at any point and that מקדש במלוה is invalid
        - (b) and: the dispute is whether the ש"ם אומן קונה בשבח כלי he is, therefore, she owes him ש"ם immediately)
          - (i) rejection: all agree אין אומן קונה בש"כ (contra שכירות is collectible at any point שכירות is collectible at any point
          - (ii) OR: all agree that שכירות is collectible at any point; מקדש במלוה maintains that מקדש במלוה is valid
          - (iii) אין אומן קונה בשבח כלי שכירות is invalid שכירות all agree that מכיל שכירות is collectible at any point and המקדש במלוה is invalid מנוטה. at dispute: case where he added his own material; if someone is מקדש במלוה and מקדשת and פרוטה, is the intent of the מתקדשת to the מלוה חכמים; פרוטה added מרום מלוה חכמים; פרוטה (מלוה חכמים; פרוטה מלוה חכמים)
            - 2. parallels: dispute as to validity of קידושין for "value of what I will do for you"
              - a. חכמים: valid (unlike "value of what I already did for you")
              - b. ר"ג: neither is valid
              - c. רבי: neither is valid, but if he added his own material, valid
                - i. dispute between שכירות is שכירות collectible at each point (ז"ז it isn't)
                - ii. dispute between ה"נ/רבי if he is מקדש במלוה מקדש if the intent is ר"נ/רבי or (ר"נ) מלוה (ר"נ)