



OVERVIEW BAVA KAMA DAF 20

Section 1: Food Fit for Animals

The Goat Case:

A goat saw food on a barrel, climbed up, ate the food and broke the barrel.

Rava: Full damage for both. Since it's normal to eat the food, it's normal to climb.

Ilfa's Teaching:

Ilfa: If an animal in Reshus ha'Rabim extended its neck and ate from a load on another animal → Liable.

Reason: The back of another animal is like the victim's premises.

R. Oshiya's Teaching:

R. Oshiya: If an animal walked and ate in Reshus ha'Rabim → Exempt. If it stopped and ate → Liable.

Question: Both are normal!

Answer (Rava): The case of standing is, it JUMPED to eat (this is Keren).

Food Rolling:

Question (R. Zeira): If food was rolling (from one domain to another)?

Answer (R. Chiya): If animal eats food inside → Liable. If outside → Exempt.

Section 2: Abnormal Behavior

The Mishnah:

If it ate clothing... In Reshus ha'Rabim → Exempt.

Answer #1 (Rav and Reish Lakish): Applies to ALL cases.

Reason: If one party does something abnormal, and another acts abnormally and damages the first → The second is exempt.

Answer #2 (Shmuel and R. Yochanan): The exemption is for fruits and vegetables, but not for clothing.

Reish Lakish's Consistency:

Reish Lakish: If a cow was crouching in Reshus ha'Rabim, and another cow kicked the crouching cow → Exempt.

If the crouching cow kicked the walking cow → Liable.

R. Yochanan agrees about cows. He argues about clothing (common to leave in Reshus ha'Rabim while resting).

"If It Benefited, It Pays the Benefit":

Answer #1 (Rabah): The price of hay (what it would have eaten instead).

Answer #2 (Rava): The price of cheap barley (two thirds of usual price).

Section 3: Benefiting Without Causing Loss

Rav Chisda's Question:

Question: Reuven lived in Shimon's yard without Shimon's knowledge. Must he pay rent?

The yard is NOT normally rented. Reuven normally rents a place.

Can Reuven claim "you didn't lose due to me!"?

Or can Shimon say "you benefited (and must pay me)!?"

Attempted Answers:

Answer #2 (Mishnah): If Reuven's property surrounds Shimon's on three sides, and Reuven built walls on one, two, then three sides → Shimon doesn't share cost.

Inference: If surrounded on all FOUR sides → Shimon WOULD share the cost!

Rejection: Reuven DOES lose - he needed to build more because Shimon's property is in the middle.

Answer #3 (Beraiisa - R. Yosi): If Shimon built his fourth wall himself → He must share expense of first three.

Inference: Had Reuven done it → Shimon would be exempt!

Conclusion: When Shimon benefits and Reuven doesn't lose → Exempt!

Rejection: Shimon doesn't benefit - he can say cheap thorns would have sufficed.

Section 4: The Final Ruling

Various Rulings:

Answer #6 (Bei R. Ami): Since Reuven caused no loss → Exempt!

Answer #7 (Rav Kahana citing R. Yochanan): He need NOT pay rent.

Answer #8 (R. Avahu citing R. Yochanan): He MUST pay rent.

Rav Papa's Explanation:

R. Avahu inferred from a Hekdesh case. R. Yochanan was silent, but really held like Rabah:

Rabah: Matters of Hekdesh without awareness are like a commoner's dealings WITH awareness (since God is aware). Therefore, benefit without owner's awareness doesn't apply.