

Explanation Sheet · 21a

Bava Metzia 21a · 21 entries · pages 1–11

EXPLANATION SHEET

Page 1

1 Statement

► Adas Torah · Mar 9, 2014 · 24:42

The Mishnah begins by saying:

① *Sometimes, a finder of a lost object may keep it.*

② *And sometimes, he must announce it, and try to return it.*

2 Statement

► LINK · Jul 29, 2013 · 10:26

The Mishnah now lists 10 lost objects which can be kept by the finder and need not be returned.

① *Scattered fruit*

② *Scattered money*

③ *Small bundles of wheat in a public place*

④ *Round pressed fig cakes*

⑤ *Loaves of a baker*

⑥ *Strings of fish*

⑦ *Cut pieces of meat*

⑧ *Shearings of wool as they are taken from the place from where they are cut*

⑨ *Bundles of flax*

⑩ *Tongues of purple dyed wool*

The Mishnah says that these are the words of Rabbi Meir.

Same step, other groups: Encino · Mar 20, 2012 ► 18:04 · JLE · Mar 12, 2015 ► 14:54

3 Statement

► LINK · Aug 1, 2013 · 39:27

The Mishnah now brings that Rabbi Yehuda says: if a person finds something that contains something which is not usual to be there, the finder must announce it.

Same step, other groups: Encino · Mar 27, 2012 ► 5:53 · JLE · Mar 15, 2015 ► 49:28

4 Question

► LINK · Aug 1, 2013 · 41:22

How is it?

Same step, other groups: Encino · Mar 27, 2012 ► 7:43 · JLE · Mar 19, 2015 ► 8:52

5 Answer

► LINK · Aug 1, 2013 · 41:52

Rabbi Yehuda brings two examples:

A person found:

① *A round fig cake with a pottery shard inside.*

② *Or: a baker's loaf with money inside.*

Same step, other groups: Encino · Mar 27, 2012 ► 8:44 · JLE · Mar 22, 2015 ► 2:58

6 Statement

► LINK · Aug 5, 2013 · 37:45

Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says: if a person finds anpuria vessels, he need not announce them.

Same step, other groups: Encino · Mar 27, 2012 ► 37:24 · JLE · Mar 26, 2015 ► 12:58

7 Statement

► LINK · Aug 26, 2013 · 27:14

The Gemara now brings the first case of our Mishnah: if someone finds scattered fruits, he may keep them.

Same step, other groups: Encino · Mar 27, 2012 ► 43:34 · JLE · Mar 26, 2015 ► 22:00

8 Question

► LINK · Aug 26, 2013 · 40:27

The Gemara now asks: how much fruit over how much area is called scattered?

Same step, other groups: Encino · Mar 27, 2012 ► 48:12 · JLE · Mar 26, 2015 ► 27:40

9 Answer

► LINK · Aug 29, 2013 · 19:11

Rabbi Yitzchak answered:

Scattered means: one kav or less of fruit scattered over four amos or more.

Same step, other groups: Encino · Mar 27, 2012 ► 54:04 · JLE · Mar 26, 2015 ► 51:24

10 Question

► LINK · Aug 29, 2013 · 30:12

The Gemara now asks: what exactly were the details of how the fruits became scattered, so we can better understand why the measure of scattered is one kav over four amos?

Same step, other groups: Encino · Apr 3, 2012 ► 36:47 · JLE · Mar 29, 2015 ► 14:05

11 Answer

► LINK · Aug 29, 2013 · 49:27

The Gemara suggests that perhaps we should say that the fruits in the Mishnah became scattered as a result of having fallen from their owner.

Same step, other groups: Encino · Apr 3, 2012 ► 43:18 · JLE · Mar 29, 2015 ► 29:44

12 Question

► LINK · Sep 2, 2013 · 51:19

① *The Gemara asks: if the fruits became scattered through having fallen from their owner, then the finder would be permitted to keep them, even if there were more than a kav of fruits in the four amos.*

② *The reason is because: since fruits do not have any siman, the owner would give up hope on them, making them ownerless and thereby permitting the fruits to the finder.*

bottom of page 4, a few extra lines on page 5

Same step, other groups: Encino · Apr 17, 2012 ► 10:08 · JLE · Mar 29, 2015 ► 49:33

13 Answer

► LINK · Sep 9, 2013 · 37:19

The Gemara now suggests maybe we should say that the fruits were found in a way that indicates that someone had placed them there.

first words faint on the recording; wording from the read-back at 38:36

Same step, other groups: Encino · Apr 17, 2012 ► 31:24

14 Question

► LINK · Oct 7, 2013 · 3:01

If so, the ruling in the Mishnah would have been that the finder may not keep them. And even if there was less than a kav of fruit in the four amos, since the owner placed his fruits there and will come back for them.

Same step, other groups: Encino · Apr 17, 2012 ► 43:56

Σ Summary

► LINK · Oct 7, 2013 · 16:23

① *Our Mishnah states that a person who finds scattered fruits may keep them.*

② *Rabbi Yitzchak said: The dimensions of scattered are, call in again, one kav of fruit or less. Scattered over four amos or more.*

③ *The Gemara suggests two possibilities as to what the case could be talking about... But neither case supports the measure of one kav over four amos.*

I In a way of falling:

The finder may keep the fruits even if there are more than a kav in four amos.

II In a way of having been placed down:

The finder cannot keep the fruits, even if there are less than a kav in four amos.

unclear 16:23 line ②: 'call in again' is garbled (possibly quote marks), and 'one kav of fruit or less' may be misheard; exact time within 983–1301 not known

15 Answer

► LINK · Oct 10, 2013 · 31:07

Rav Ukva bar Chama answers:

- ① *The Mishnah is not talking about a lost object.*
- ② *But rather, where someone found grain on the threshing floor. After most of the grain crop had been removed.*
- ③ *The Mishnah is saying: if you find the grain spread out, you may keep it.*
- ④ *Says Rabbi Yitzchak: "spread out," means one kav of wheat spread out over four amos.*
- ⑤ *A person might return for a kav over less than four amos.*
- ⑥ *But he would not bother to return for a kav in four amos or more.*
- ⑦ *The owner has willfully abandoned it, so the finder may keep it.*

Same step, other groups: Encino · May 1, 2012 ► 29:21 · JLE · Apr 30, 2015 ► 51:02

16 Question

► LINK · Nov 7, 2013 · 1:21

- ① *Rabbi Yitzchak said that if a person finds a kav of wheat on a threshing floor spread out over four amos he may keep it.*
- ② *This could be because of one of two possible reasons:*
 - (A) *a kav is of minimal importance.*
 - (B) *a kav, spread out over four amos, is too much bother to collect, even if the kav itself has some importance.*
- ③ *Rabbi Yirmiyah says, based on the accurate reason, regarding permission to keep a kav in four amos (either A or B above), he asks the following question: a half of a kav of wheat spread out over two amos: can the finder keep it or not?*
 - (A) *If the reason for the kav in four amos, which you may keep, is because a kav in four amos is too much bother (B above), then a half of a kav in two amos is not so much bother. Therefore, the owner will not abandon it, and the finder may not keep it.*
 - (B) *Or maybe the reason why one may keep a kav in 4 amos is because a kav is of minimal importance. And, if so, a half of a kav, which has no importance, the owner would abandon it. And the finder may keep it.*

Same step, other groups: Encino · May 8, 2012 ► 38:26 · JLE · May 14, 2015 ► 26:48

17 Question

► LINK · Nov 18, 2013 · 1:17

① Rabbi Yitzchak said that if a person finds a kav of wheat spread out over 4 amos on the threshing floor, he may keep it.

② This could be because of one of two reasons:

(a) that one kav is not important.

(b) that a kav of wheat spread out over four amos is too much bother.

③ Rabbi Yirmiyah says: based on the reason regarding permission to keep a kav in four amos, we can ask the following question: two kav of wheat spread out over eight amos: may the finder keep it or not?

(a) If the reason behind the kav in four amos, which you may keep, is because one kav of wheat spread out over four amos is too much bother (2b above), then all the more so two kav in eight amos, which is even more bother, for sure the owner would make them ownerless, and the finder could keep them.

(b) Or maybe the reason why you can keep one kav in four amos is because that it is not important (2a above). And if so, 2 kav in 8 amos, which is valuable, the owner would not make them ownerless, and therefore the finder may not keep them.

Same step, other groups: Encino · May 15, 2012 ► 30:45 · JLE · May 17, 2015 ► 36:08

18 Question

► Westwood · Nov 16, 2011 · 18:29

1. Rabbi Yitzchak said that if a person finds one kav of wheat spread out over four amos, on the threshing floor, he may keep it.

2. As mentioned, this could be due to one of two reasons.

A. A kav is not an important amount.

B. A kav in four amos is too much bother to gather.

3. As before, Rabbi Yirmiyah teaches that based on the true reason regarding the permission to keep one kav in four amos, we can apply this to determine the status of other cases.

He now presents the following question:

One kav of sesame seeds, spread out over four amos, may the finder keep them or not.

4A. If the reason for one kav of wheat in 4 amos is because a kav of wheat is not important, by contrast, a kav of sesame seeds is important.

Therefore, the owner might not make them ownerless. And the finder may not keep them.

B. Or maybe the reason why a person may keep a kav of wheat in 4 amos is that four amos is too much bother to gather?

If so, all the more so. A kav of sesame seeds in four amos is a lot of bother to gather.

Therefore, the owner would make them ownerless, and the finder may keep them.

unclear 19:38 In item 2 the A/B lines were dictated with false starts ("A. A kav is not an important amount ... A. A kav in four amos is not an important amount ... is too much bother to gather"). Lines follow his recap: A = a kav is not an important amount; B = a kav in four amos is too much bother to gather.

Same step, other groups: LINK · Nov 21, 2013 ► 18:23 · Encino · May 22, 2012 ► 34:56 · JLE · May 28, 2015 ► 37:18

19 Question

► Westwood · Nov 21, 2011 · 10:45

Rabbi Yirmiyah now asks a fourth question.

If a person finds a kav of dates/pomegranates spread over four amos... can the finder keep it or not?

He explains this question, as he did by the others, by going back and trying to determine why a person may keep one kav of wheat in four amos.

If the reason is because one kav of wheat is too much bother, one kav of dates/pomegranates is not so much bother.

And, the owner might return for them.

And, therefore, the finder may not keep them.

Or, perhaps, the reason why the finder may keep one kav of wheat is because one kav is not important.

If so, one kav of dates/pomegranates is even less important.

And the owner will surely make them ownerless.

And the finder may keep them.

Amora concludes by asking: what is the law in all four of these questions?

unclear 20:00 "Amora concludes by asking": the first word is as transcribed and may be misheard.

Same step, other groups: JLE · Jun 11, 2015 ► 1:54

20 Answer

► Westwood · Nov 21, 2011 · 37:27

The Gemara answers: regarding the four questions of Rabbi Yirmiyah, we do not know the answer.

Now the word used in the Gemara to express this is teiku (תיקו).

This word is an acronym for the following:

תשבי – and that means Eliyahu ha-navi

יתרץ – and that means, he will answer

קושיות – and it means questions

ואבעיות – and it means and queries

Same step, other groups: Encino · Jun 26, 2012 ► 10:58 · LINK · Dec 2, 2013 ► 2:48 · JLE · Jun 11, 2015 ► 15:20

Step 21: explanation not found in the transcribed classes

Step numbers match the word sheet. He has them write the label next to the number and underline it, then dictates line by line. Σ = a summary he dictates. ► opens the class at that moment.