

Explanation Sheet · 22b

Bava Metzia 22b · 29 entries

	EXPLANATION SHEET 22b BM 22b.1 (אין כ"י יותן): no word-sheet dictation found in the transcribed classes
--	---

· ... שאני התם דכתיב... Answer

► Westwood · May 2, 2012 · 42:33

Gemara, daf chof beis: ושאני, line number 3

① The Gemara answers:

Rava could say that the reason why the Braisa holds in the end of the Braisa, that when the owner discovers the dew on his fruit after it was already dry, that it does not become vulnerable to accept Tumah, is not because the mindset of the owner at the end cannot count for before.

② But rather the reason is because the Torah writes that the liquid must be actively placed on the produce by the owner.

Even though the word written in the Torah for placing is pronounced in the passive form:

"when it will be put"

④ however, the word is written as:

"when he will put."

⑤ therefore, we go after the way it is written and we say that the Torah holds that liquid does not make the produce vulnerable to accept Tumah unless the owner actively places the liquid on the fruit.

unclear 48:26 no circled number stated for the 'Even though...' line (presumably ③)

BM 22b.2 (טעמא מאי לאו משום...): no word-sheet dictation found in the transcribed classes

· אי הכי רישא... Question

► Westwood · May 7, 2012 · 19:44

① The Braisa regarding the fall and dew on fruits. And they're becoming prepared to accept Tumah ... The Braisa says:

I The beginning of the Braisa:

The owner discovers the dew on the fruits while they are still wet ... and he is pleased ... The fruits are made into a ready state to accept Tumah.

II The end of the Braisa:

If the owner discovers the fruits after the dew already dried ... even if he is pleased ... The fruits do not become prepared to accept Tumah.

② In order that the end of the Braisa should not be a challenge to Rava, who holds, regarding giving up hope, that a later mindset can count for before ... The Gemara had said that the reason

for the end of the Braisa, as to why the fruits do not become ready for Tumah, is not because a later mindset cannot help for before.

③ But rather, because the word written in the Torah that governs this halacha is written:

יָתֵן – he will put”

④ Since dew falls passively, the fruits do not qualify to become prepared to accept Tumah.

⑤ On this the Gemara now asks:

If this reason is correct, dew should never prepare fruits for accepting Tumah, since it is always placed on the fruits passively.

⑥ Yet, in the first part of the Braisa, where the owner discovered the dew while it was still on the fruit, the fruits do become prepared to accept Tumah.

⑦ Therefore, the reason for the end of the Braisa can only be because we need a prior mindset of the owner being pleased with the dew being on the fruit.

⑧ And, a later mindset does not help for before.

⑨ Therefore, the question on Rava comes back.

unclear 19:44 'the fall and dew on fruits' — 'fall' unclear as transcribed

unclear 28:48 step ④ 'do, false, passively' — 'do' = dew (he spells D-E-W in 2012-05-16); 'false' is probably 'falls' but this is not confirmed

unclear 33:52 transcript has 'help four before'; written as 'for before' (same phrase as in ②)

Step None: explanation not found in the transcribed classes

• ... בעינין כי יתן. Answer

► Westwood · May 16, 2012 · 38:15

① The pasuk, which talks about liquid preparing produce to be in a ready state to accept Tumah, says:

”When it will be put.”

② The language of the pasuk seems to indicate that even if the liquid is placed on the produce passively, it prepares the produce to accept Tumah.

③ However, even though the word in the pasuk for placing is read in a way that indicates passive is enough, however, the word is written:

”When he will put.”

Indicating that active placing of liquid is required.

④ The Gemara now concludes with the explanation of Rav Papa, who resolves this issue.

⑤ *Passive placing of liquid is enough.*

⑥ *However, the passive placing of liquid must be similar to where the owner actively put the liquid on the produce.*

⑦ (A) *Just as when liquid is placed actively, the owner is aware and pleased.*

(B) *So, too, even if the liquid is placed passively, the owner must be aware and pleased.*

⑧ *Therefore:*

(A) *Dew qualifies as a liquid, even though it is placed passively.*

(B) *But only on the condition that the owner is aware and pleased.*

(C) *Therefore, if the produce is still wet with dew, it is as if the dew is being placed with the knowledge of the owner.*

(D) *So, if the owner is pleased, it qualifies the fruit.*

(E) *But if it is already dry, it is not as if he is placing the liquid with knowledge.*

(F) *Therefore, even if he is pleased, it does not qualify the fruit.*

⑨ *This entire process applies to preparing fruit to be able to accept Tumah, as is governed by the special wording of the pasuk, which indicates that some kind of placing of liquid is required, and not just mindset.*

⑩ *However, in general, such as by lost objects, we can still say that even a clear potential mindset can be considered as if it is already there.*

⑪ *Therefore, the case of the dew is no longer a proof against Rava.*

□ ... תא שמע דאמר רבי יוחנן. Question

► Westwood · May 30, 2012 · 16:12

① *The Gemara now brings another Braisa to resolve the dispute between:*

(A) *Abaye*

(B) *And Rava*

Regarding the issue of whether prior or actual giving up hope is required for the finder to be permitted to keep the lost object, or potential giving up hope is enough.

② *In the Braisa, Rabbi Yochanan says, in the name of Rabbi Yishmael, son of Yehotzadak:*

From where do we learn out that an object that became lost to its owner by having been flooded away by a river, that the finder of such an object may keep it?

③ He explains that the pasuk that obligates the finder to return the lost object of his friend says:

"And so you shall do to his donkey, and so you shall do to his garment, and so you shall do to every lost object of your brother, that it shall be lost from him, and you will find it."

④ In the pasuk, when it mentions the lost object, it says:

"It shall be lost from him."

⑤ The words "from him" are extra.

⑥ From this, we learn out: A finder must return a lost object that is lost only from its owner, but the object is accessible to any person.

⑦ This excludes an object lost to its owner through having been flooded away from its owner, since, while it was being lost, it was equally inaccessible to the owner and everyone else.

⑧ Since the Torah excludes it from the obligation to return lost objects, the finder may keep it.

□ ... ואיסורא דומיא דהיתירא. unclear

► Westwood · Jun 6, 2012 · 2:07

① Regarding an object lost to its owner. There are two cases referred to in the Torah.

(A) One case which is stated openly.

(B) And the other case which is implied.

I And the openly stated case:

The object is lost to its owner, but accessible to everyone.

II the implied case:

The object was lost to its owner. In a way that it was lost to him and everyone else.

② The din, by where it is lost, only to its owner:

The finder must try to return it to its owner.

(B) It was not accessible to its owner as well as everyone else:

The finder may keep it.

③ And the Torah mentions two laws in the same pasuk that have different laws from each other. Because of the changing of a certain variable. This implies that all other variables are similar and comparable.

④ In case of the lost object, the law is determined by how the object was lost.

○
Ⓐ only to its owner.

Ⓑ or to everyone.

⑤ this implies that all the other variables must compare and be constant.

⑥ therefore we say:

Ⓐ just like in the case of being inaccessible to everyone. The finder may keep it. Whether or not it has a sign.

Ⓑ so too. By the case where it is lost only to its owner, where the finder may not keep it, it must also be speaking about, whether or not it has a sign

⑦ where it has a sign, we can readily understand why the finder cannot keep it. Since, its owner does not give up hope and therefore it is still his.

⑧ but, in a case where the object has no sign, Why is it that the finder cannot keep it, since the owner will surely give up hope?

⑨ It must be because, since he did not actually give up hope. Since he was unaware of its loss, we do not consider it as if he already gave up hope. And, therefore, the object still belongs to him.

⑩ So we see that the fact That he surely will give up hope is not considered to be like he already gave up hope.

⑪ therefore the finder may not keep it.

• תיובתא דרבא תיובתא... Statement

► Westwood · Jun 6, 2012 · 52:58

Based on the conclusion of the Gemara, that potential giving up hope is not sufficient, This Braisa is a refutation of the opinion of Rava.

• והלכתא כוותיה דאביי... Statement

► Westwood · Jun 25, 2012 · 34:25

① The Gemara concludes that the law follows Abaye. That unless the owner has already given up hope prior to the finding of the object the finder may not keep it.

② The Gemara says that in six separate disputes between:

Ⓐ Abaye.

Ⓑ and Rava.

The law follows Abaye.

③ The Gemara abbreviates the six cases by identifying them with the first letter of each case. And putting together a group of three letters at a time to form two separate words of three

letters each. The six letters are: yud, ayin, lamed, kuf, gimmel, mem.

I יאוש – giving up hope (Yud circled: the Yud of קג'ם)

שלא – that not

מדעת – from knowledge

II עד – a witness (Ayin circled: the Ayin of קג'ם)

זומם – a plotter

למפרע – retroactively

הוא – it is

נפסל – he is invalid

III לחי – A side post (Lamed circled: the Lamed of קג'ם)

העומד – the one that stands

מאליו – from itself

IV קידושין – marriage (Kuf circled: the Kuf of קג'ם)

שלא – that not

נמסרו – they are given over

לביאה – for relations

V גילוי – a revealing of (Gimel circled, for קג'ם)

דעתא – the mind

בגיטא – by a divorce document

VI מומר – an open transgressor (Mem circled, from קג'ם)

אוכל – one who eats

נבלות – meat from an animal that was not properly slaughtered

להכעיס – to cause anger

פסול – he is invalid

לענין – to the matter of

עדות – testimony

- ① *The Gemara concluded that the Halacha follows Abaye. That in order for the finder to be permitted to keep the found object, the owner must have already realized his loss and he must have already given up hope on finding his lost object prior to its being found by the finder.*
- ② *The common practice at that time, which went undisputed, was that if a person finds dates that were detached and blown away from the tree of their owner by the wind, the finder may keep them.*
- ③ *This is, in spite of the fact that normally The owner does not give up hope on the fallen dates of his tree because they normally fall under the tree. And the owner is confident that he will get his fallen dates.*
- ④ *In a case where the dates are distanced from their tree by the wind, the owner will surely give up hope on those dates.*
- ⑤ *But when the finder finds the dates, the owner is not yet aware that the dates did not fall in their usual way. But rather, they were distanced from the tree by the blowing wind.*
- ⑥ *But if the owner would know, he would surely give up hope.*
- ⑦ *And still, the dates are permitted to the finder.*
- ⑧ *So, the Gemara now asks, If it is true, that the Halacha follows Abaye and not Rava, and that actual giving up hope is required, what is the reason why these windblown dates are permitted to the finder?*

- ① *Rav Ashi said to Rav Acha: The owner even gives up hope on the dates that fall straight down under the tree.*
- ② *It is usual for the tree to drop some dates.*
- ③ *When the dates fall they are eaten by insects and creepy crawlers.*
- ④ *Therefore, in anticipation of their loss, their owner has already abandoned those dates that will fall even prior to their falling.*
- ⑤ *Therefore, even the dates that were distanced from the tree by the wind were included in the prior giving up hope by the owner on his fallen dates.*
- ⑥ *therefore, even according to Abaye, there is no problem for the finder to eat them.*

☐ Question

► Westwood · Jul 9, 2012 · 40:36

① *The giving up hope of orphans which are minors is not considered to be giving up hope and cannot make the object ownerless.*

② *Rav Acha now asks Rav Ashi:*

since it is possible that these dates come from orphans that are minors, how are we able to eat them?

☐ Answer אמר ליה באגא...

► Westwood · Jul 11, 2012 · 37:24

① *Rav Ashi answered to Rav Acha:*

We do not need to be concerned that every stretch of land comprised of fields is the property of orphans. Therefore, even according to Abaye, since there is prior abandonment of the dates by their owner due to the presence of insects and creepers, who eat them, the finder may therefore keep them.

☐ Question מוחזק ועומד מאי...

► Westwood · Jul 16, 2012 · 5:52

Rav Acha now asked to Rav Ashi:

What about finding dates on land that is known to belong to orphans?

☐ Question כרכתא מאי...

► Westwood · Jul 16, 2012 · 7:38

Rav Acha also asked:

① *What about finding windblown dates? That fell from a date palm tree that is surrounded by a stone fence. This serves to effectively keep out insects and creepers.*

☐ Answer אמר ליה אסירן...

► Westwood · Jul 16, 2012 · 10:19

Rav Ashi answered:

① *In both these cases, there is no prior willful abandonment. Even though later on, there will surely be abandonment:*

Ⓐ *When the minor orphans reach the age of maturity, entitling their act of abandonment to be halachically effective.*

Ⓑ *And by the case of the date palm, surrounded by the stone fence. When the owner would discover his dates had fallen outside, the fenced-in area.*

② *However, since at the time the dates are found, there was not yet an abandonment by their owner.*

③ And the halacha follows. That actual prior abandonment by the owner is required.

④ Therefore, in these two situations, the finder may not keep the dates.

◻ ... כריכות ברשות הרבים הרי... Statement

► Westwood · Jul 16, 2012 · 58:18

① The Gemara now brings one of the cases of our Mishnah:

② If someone finds small bundles of wheat in a public place, the finder may keep them.

◻ ... אמר רבה ואפילו... Statement

► Westwood · Jul 23, 2012 · 52:37

① Rava now explains the case of the Mishnah, of finding small bundles of wheat, in a public place, which the finder may keep.

② He says that the finder may keep the small bundles of wheat, even if they have a sign.

③ The Gemara now says that we see that Rava holds that a sign that is likely to be trampled is not a good sign.

④ This means that since the sign was in a place that it was likely to be trampled, the owner thinks that it was surely trampled and therefore he gives up hope. Therefore, even if the sign was still intact, the finder may keep it.

◻ ... רבא אמר לא... Statement

► Westwood · Jul 25, 2012 · 48:00

① The Gemara now brings the opinion of Rava, R-A-V-A, who argues on Rabba, R-A-B-A.

② Rava says that the Mishnah is talking about a case of finding small bundles of wheat in a public place without a sign and therefore the finder may keep it.

③ If, however, the finder found small bundles of wheat with a sign, he must announce them.

④ The Gemara says, we see from Rava that he holds: an object found with a sign in a public place is a good sign in spite of the fact that it can be easily trampled.

⑤ This is because the owner is hopeful that the sign will still be attached to the object when it is found. And therefore, the finder will announce it. And he can get back his object.

◻ ... ואיכא דמתני להא... Statement

► Westwood · Jul 30, 2012 · 40:47

① The Gemara now brings a second version regarding the dispute between Rabba and Rava, whether or not the owner of an object with a sign that he lost in a public place is or is not a good sign.

② According to this version, Rabba and Rava had this dispute on their own. Of our Mishnah.

unclear 40:47 line ① wording seems garbled in the transcript ('whether or not the owner of an object with a sign that he lost in a public place is or is not a good sign')

unclear 44:49 end of line ② ('on their own. Of our Mishnah') — a word seems missing (possibly 'independent')

• ... תנן כריכות ברשות הרבים. Statement

► Westwood · Aug 8, 2012 · 31:16

The Gemara now brings from our Mishnah that says:

① *If someone finds small bundles of wheat in a public place he may keep them.*

② *In a private place he must denounce them.*

unclear 32:53 'denounce' in line ② as transcribed; probably 'announce', but no read-back confirms it

• ... ה"ד = היכי / דמי. Question

► Westwood · Aug 8, 2012 · 40:53

The Gemara now asks:

What are the specifics of these two cases?

• ... אי דלית בהו. Answer

► Westwood · Sep 5, 2012 · 36:10

Maybe we should say:

The small bundles of wheat have no sign.

• ... ברשות היחיד מאי מכריז. Question

► Westwood · Sep 5, 2012 · 38:22

① *This cannot be so. Because.*

② *If the small bundles of wheat have no sign. Although, we would understand why the Mishnah says that he may keep them, if found in a public place, but why would he have to announce them if found in a private place?*

③ *If they have no sign, what can the finder call out? So, as to enable the owner to give a sign.*

④ *If he calls out the name of the object, nothing would remain for the owner to give as a sign.*

• ... אלא לאו דאית. Answer

► Westwood · Sep 10, 2012 · 55:04

① *The Gemara concludes that we must say that the Mishnah is talking about finding small bundles of wheat with a sign.*

② *Therefore, as stated in the end of the Mishnah, if someone found small bundles of wheat in a private place, he must announce them. Because of the sign.*

③ *As mentioned above, since the Mishnah differentiates between finding small bundles of wheat.*

Ⓐ In a public place:

You may keep them.

Ⓑ And in a private place:

you must announce them.

④ And we have just established that the Mishnah must be talking about with a sign.

⑤ It now comes out that the Mishnah is holding that if someone finds small bundles of wheat, in a public place, even with a sign, he may keep them.

⑥ So we see our Mishnah clearly holds a sign that is usual to be trampled is not a good sign.

□ ... אלמא העשוי לידרס. Question

► Westwood · Sep 10, 2012 · 60:47

The Gemara now says our Mishnah is a proof against Rava. Whose opinion is a sign that is likely to be trampled is a good sign.

Step None: explanation not found in the transcribed classes

□ Answer

► Westwood · Oct 22, 2012 · 44:40

The Gemara answers:

① Rava can say to you:

② Really, the Mishnah is talking about finding a lost object without a sign.

③ And the first part of the Mishnah which says: if you find small bundles of wheat in a public place, you may keep them. The Mishnah is talking about a case where the bundle of wheat had no sign. So, the finder may keep it.

④ And if it would have a sign, the finder could not keep it. Since the owner is an optimist and does not give up hope.

⑤ Which is finding small bundles of wheat in a private place. It is also talking about a case where the bundles of wheat had no sign. And it says in the Mishnah that the finder must announce them.

⑥ But if they have no sign, we asked above, what is there to announce?

⑥ So that the owner can prove his ownership by giving a sign.

⑦ To that Rava answers, the place where the object was found should be announced.

⑧ In other words, the finder should say, whoever lost an object in such and such a place should come and name the object and that will be its sign.

⑨ So, since the Mishnah can be explained to be speaking about finding small bundles of wheat without a sign, it is no longer a proof against Rava.

unclear 50:54 Line ⑤ appears to begin mid-sentence ("Which is finding..."). The opening words, presumably naming the second part of the Mishnah, are not in the extraction.

- ① *The Gemara above said that Rabbah would explain our Mishnah to be speaking about finding small bundles of wheat without a sign.*
- ② *And when the Mishnah states that when these small bundles of wheat are found in a private place, the finder must announce them. The Mishnah is saying that the finder announces the place in which they were found. And the claimer would name the object as the sign.*
- ③ *The Gemara now says that Rava would say (Rava with a B), that he disagrees with Rabbah with a V. And he holds that announcing the place does not help.*
- ④ *Therefore, the Mishnah must be speaking about small bundles of wheat with an actual sign.*
- ⑤ *therefore:*

I In a private place:

The finder must announce it.

II In a public place:

- Ⓐ *The finder may keep it.*
- Ⓑ *Even though it has a sign.*
- Ⓒ *And that a sign that is likely to be trampled is not a good sign.*

⑥ *The Gemara concludes that we find that regarding the issue as to whether announcing the place is a good sign or not was actually, explicitly, disputed over by Rabba and Rava.*

I Rabba (with a B):

it is not a good sign.

II Rava:

it is a good sign.

unclear 34:55 In line ③ the spelling remarks ("Rava with a B" / "Rabbah with a V") are as transcribed. Which name the students actually write is unclear.

- ① *The Gemara now brings a Braisa, which seems to be difficult, according to both:*
- Ⓐ *Rabbah*
- Ⓑ *and Rava.*
- ② *The Braisa talks about the din of finding bundles of wheat.*

I small bundles of wheat:

① In a public place:

the finder may keep them.

② In a private place:

The finder must announce that.

II large bundles of wheat:

whether in:

① a public place

② or a private place

the finder must announce them.

③ The Gemara says that the ruling of large bundles of wheat is difficult

① on Rabbah

② and Rava.

④ according to Rabbah:

① He learns that the Braisa must be talking about finding bundles of wheat with a sign.

② By small bundles of wheat in a public place it says:

the owner may keep it.

③ This is even if it has a sign.

④ The reason is because the owner is a pessimist and he thinks that his bundle of wheat was trampled.

⑤ So, why does the Braisa say that you must announce the large bundles of wheat in a public place.

⑥ According to Rava:

① He learns that the Braisa must be talking about finding bundles of wheat without a sign.

② By small bundles of wheat in a public place, it says the owner may keep them.

③ This is only without a sign. Because with a sign the owner is an optimist, so the finder must announce it.

④ If so, why is it that the finder must announce large bundles of wheat found in a public place, since the Braisa is talking about where the large bundles of wheat have no sign.

Step None: explanation not found in the transcribed classes

• Answer

► Westwood · Nov 26, 2012 · 11:17

The Gemara answers that in the case of the large bundles of wheat that are found in a public place, where the ruling is that the finder must announce them. And that's according to the Braisa... This case can be explained according to both Rabbah and Rava. And each one according to his way of learning.

I Rabbah:

① He established the cases of the small bundles of wheat to be speaking about with a sign.

② The Gemara now says that... Rabbah can explain the case of large bundles. Also, to be speaking about with a sign.

(X) Small bundles of wheat with a sign:

(A) In a public place:

(a)

(b) Because they are likely to be trampled.

(c) So the owner is a pessimist. And thinks that they were trampled. So he gives up hope.

(B) In a private place:

(a) They are not likely to be trampled.

(b) So the owner does not give up hope. And the finder must announce them.

(□) Large bundles of wheat:

(A) In a public place:

(a) They are tall. And thus, not likely to be trampled.

(b) Therefore, the owner does not give up hope. And the finder must announce them.

(B) In a private place:

Since they have a sign. The finder must announce them.

II Rava:

① He established the cases of the small bundles of wheat to be speaking about without a sign.

② The Gemara now says that Rava can explain the case of large bundles of wheat also to be talking about without a sign.

(inserted under Rava ②) because the place is. The place can be the sign. Place can be a sign.

(X) Small bundles of wheat without a sign:

(A) In a public place:

(a) The finder can keep them.

(b) Since they get kicked around. The place is not considered to be a reliable sign.

(B) In a private place:

(a) They do not get kicked around.

(b) Therefore, the place itself will be the sign.

(C) Therefore, the finder must announce it.

(J) Large bundles of wheat:

(A) In a public place:

(a) They are heavy. So, they do not get kicked around.

(b) Therefore, the place itself is a good sign.

(C) Therefore, the finder must announce it.

(B) In a private place:

(a) They are not kicked around.

(b) Therefore, the place itself is a good sign.

(C) Therefore, the finder must announce it.

unclear 11:17 he began 'The Gemara now answers that the case of the large bundles of wheat ...' and restarted; restarted wording kept

unclear 15:10 name in Rabbah ② transcribed 'Rav'; written Rabbah because it is under the Rabbah heading

unclear 25:22 name in Rava ② transcribed 'Rav [?]' ; written Rava because it is under the Rava heading

unclear 18:20 text for little (a) under Rabbah / small bundles / public place not captured; only (b) and (c) dictated

unclear 43:00 wording of the insert under Rava ② unclear ('because the place is. The place can be the sign. Place can be a sign.')

• Answer

► Adas Torah · Feb 23, 2015 · 2:19

① The Gemara had wanted to remove the question against Rava from the end of the Braisa up by saying that the reason why fruits do not become prepared to accept tumah when the owner discovers them because dew cannot prep fruits. Because in order to qualify as a liquid that can

prep a fruit it must be actively placed on the fruit... Not passively... Due to the written form of the word in the pasuk: "וַיִּטֵּן" which denotes active placing of liquid.

② This would seem to disqualify dew. Which falls passively upon the fruit.

③ The Gemara then asked: If the reason why the fruits do not become prepared is because of the fact that it was dew, which is called passive, and not the required active, then why, in the beginning of the Braisa, is the dew able to prepare the fruits?

④ On this the Gemara now answers. In truth, dew is qualified to prep fruits.

⑤ However, there is a condition that must be met with the dew, in order for it to be able to successfully prep the fruits.

⑥ The condition is born out of the seeming conflict between the directive word used in the pasuk of placing liquid on the fruit

⑦ it is written: "וַיִּטֵּן" / he will put" implying active placing is required

⑧ however it is read ... it will be put" implying that even passive placing is acceptable

⑨ Rav Papa said: the way we are to understand the pasuk is,

Ⓐ passive is acceptable.

Ⓑ provided that the passive placing of the liquid is similar to active. (וַיִּטֵּן)

⑩ just like actively placing liquid is with Ⓐ the person's prior knowledge, and Ⓑ consent. (happy)

⑪ so too. Passive is acceptable, provided that it is with: Ⓐ the owner's prior knowledge, and Ⓑ consent. (happy)

⑫ therefore. If the person discovers the dew, Ⓐ while it is still wet. And Ⓑ he is happy. It is similar to actively placing liquid on the fruit. In that: Ⓐ he is knowledgeable. And Ⓑ happy.

⑬ But if the dew already dried up, when he discovered it, then, even if he is happy, this situation is not similar to actively placing liquid on fruit which is specifically Ⓐ with prior knowing and Ⓑ happy.

⑭ Therefore, as was said above, Rava can say that the reason why fruits do not become prepped, when the dew is discovered, after it has already dried up, is due to the language and directive of this particular pasuk,

⑮ which requires Ⓐ passive, Ⓑ similar to active,

⑯ and it has nothing to do with weather, where prior mindset is required, even a clear mindset of later on can help for before.

⑰ *But in a case such as giving up hope by lost objects where the issue is, whether a clear revelation of mindset helps for before.*

⑱ *Rava says, we can say that it does help.*

⑲ *And therefore there is no longer a question and Rava from this Braisa.*

unclear 13:56 ⑱: the start of the quoted read form (presumably the Hebrew word and its spelling) is missing; transcript has only 'so it will be put end of quote marks'

unclear 24:52 ⑱: 'weather' as transcribed; the intended word is unclear

unclear 27:44 ⑲: 'question and Rava' as transcribed; probably 'on Rava', but not confirmed

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.