

Explanation Sheet · 23a

Bava Metzia 23a · 13 entries

EXPLANATION SHEET

23a

Step None: explanation not found in the transcribed classes

◻ ... תא שמע ככרות. Question

► Westwood · Dec 3, 2012 · 21:02

① The Gemara now brings... The case mentioned in our Mishnah:

If someone finds loaves of a baker, he may keep them.

② This implies:

If someone finds loaves of a private person, he must announce them.

③ The Gemara explains that the reason why the finder must announce them is because they have a sign.

④

a loaf of a person is the person

⑤ This means: everyone makes his own loaf in his own unique way

⑥ therefore it is a sign and the finder must announce them

⑦ by the case of:

small bundles of wheat... but

a distinction was made between finding them:

Ⓐ in a public place... you may keep them

Ⓑ or in a private place... you must announce them

⑧ regarding the loaves of the private person no distinction is made between finding them

Ⓐ in a public place.

Ⓑ and in a private place.

⑨ The finder must always announce that.

⑩ Since we see that the finder must announce that, even in a public place, this proves that the Mishnah holds:

a sign that is likely to be trampled:

and a sign that is likely to be trampled is a good sign. (optimist)

⑪ This is a proof:

Ⓐ against Rava.

Ⓑ and for Rabbah. By inference.

• Answer

► Westwood · Dec 10, 2012 · 20:09

① The Gemara answers that Rava would say:

Really? A sign that is likely to be trampled is not a good sign.

② However, loaves of a private person are different.

③ The reason is because there is an halacha that when a person sees food on the ground He must pick it up.

④ Therefore: the owner is confident that whoever finds his loaf of bread will pick it up. Therefore:

⑤ So, it will not get trampled.

⑥ And therefore, the finder must announce it even if he finds it in a public place.

• ... והא איכא גוים. Question

► Westwood · Dec 17, 2012 · 22:59

① Above... The Gemara asked on Rava:

Ⓐ Our Mishnah indicates. That if a person finds loaves of a private person in a public place, he must announce them.

This seems to be in spite of the fact that loaves of a private person in a public place are likely to be trampled.

② The Gemara answered: Rava could say that the loaves are not likely to be trampled, since there is a ruling that you cannot pass by food.

③ The Gemara now asks: even if it is true A ruling, that you cannot pass by food, but there are non-Jews present in the public place, who will trample on the loaves of the private person.

④ therefore, the loaves of the private person will trample on the loaves of the public person. The loaves, therefore, are still likely to be trampled.

⑤ and therefore, the question on Rava comes back.

unclear 28:01 first sentence of ④ ('the loaves of the private person will trample on the loaves of the public person') seems garbled

• Answer

► Westwood · Dec 19, 2012 · 15:42

The non-Jews will not trample on the loaves of bread.

Since they think that they were placed there.

As a means to cause them to stumble.

As a result of witchcraft.

① *The Gemara now asks:*

In the reshus harabim, there are animals and dogs that will trample the loaves of bread of the private person.

② *And still our Mishnah says that the finder must announce them.*

③ *So we see that in spite of the fact that the loaves are likely to get trampled, we cannot assume that the owner gave up hope.*

④ *Therefore, the question on Rabbah comes back.*

unclear 44:10 circle numbering is confused in the transcript: he first says 'our Mishnah implies... that the finder must announce them', then restates it as 'says' after saying 'three circle'

unclear 46:00 he says 'four circle' and repeats 'we cannot assume that the owner gave up hope' before saying 'last step, number four circle'

◻ ... באתרא דלא שכיחי... Answer

► Westwood · Dec 24, 2012 · 47:22

① *The Gemara answers that Rabba could say:*

② *Our Mishnah when referring to finding loaves of a private person that must be announced, whether found in the public domain or the private domain, is talking about a place where there are no animals / dogs present in that place.*

③ *Therefore, they are not likely to be trampled.*

And the finder must announce them, even according to Rava.

Step None: explanation not found in the transcribed classes

◻ ... רבי יהודה אומר כל... unclear

► Westwood · Jan 9, 2013 · 0:55

|| passing_by_food:

Ⓐ *And Rabbi Yehuda is:*

over the issue of whether or not you can pass by food.

Ⓐ The Tanna kama:

You can pass by food and therefore the sign is likely to get trampled and is not a good sign, so the finder may keep it.

Ⓑ Rabbi Yehuda:

You cannot pass by food. And therefore, the sign is not likely to get trampled. And therefore, the finder must announce it.

ⓑ Yet, the Amoraim originally thought that this is not the point of dispute between the Tanna kama and Rabbi Yehuda.

ⓒ And they all agree that you can pass by food.

III a sign that is usual to be trampled:

Ⓐ Since the Amoraim concluded that everyone agrees:

Ⓐ A sign that could have happened on its own is a good sign.

Ⓑ And you can pass by food.

Ⓑ The cases disputed over by the Tanna kama / Rabbi Yehuda add up to be cases of finding something with a sign that is likely to be trampled.

Ⓐ The Tanna kama:

He holds it is not a good sign. So the finder may keep it.

Ⓑ Rabbi Yehuda:

He holds it is a good sign. So the finder must announce it.

⑦ So we see that the dispute between:

Ⓐ Rava

Ⓑ and Rava.

is really the same dispute as between:

Ⓐ the Tanna kama.

Ⓑ and Rabbi Yehuda.

⑨ Regarding whether or not a sign that is likely to be trampled is a good sign.

⑩ Therefore, it is a question on Rava / Rava, that their dispute was already disputed over by the Tannaim in our Mishnah.

unclear 0:35 the earlier part of this explanation (through 'capital E circle, be considered as a good sign') was dictated before these extractions and is not available

unclear 1:31 'And Rabbi Yehuda is:' seems incomplete; probably missing words before 'Rabbi Yehuda'

unclear 4:32 'Underline' before capital B: what is to be underlined is not clear

unclear 11:39 ⑦ Ⓐ name heard as 'Rava [?]; likely a mishearing of Rabba, not confirmed

unclear 12:50 heard as 'A circle'; the circle number of this line is unclear (number 8 is never stated)

unclear 14:15 'Rava slash Rava [?]: the first name is unclear

Step None: explanation not found in the transcribed classes

① The Gemara said above that the dispute between:

Ⓐ Rabbah

Ⓑ and Rava

② is really the same dispute as that of:

Ⓐ the Tanna Kamma (Rabbi Meir)

Ⓑ and Rabbi Yehuda

③ And although there is more than one possible way to explain the point over which they are disputing, it was originally thought that the Tanna Kamma and Rabbi Yehuda hold as follows:

I A sign that could have come by itself:

Everyone agrees it is a good sign.

II Passing by food:

Everyone agrees you can pass by food.

III A sign that is usual to be trampled:

Ⓐ

It is not a good sign.

Ⓑ Rabbi Yehuda:

It is a good sign, it is a sign.

④ Rav Zvid, in the name of Rava, now asks:

According to this explanation, the Tanna Kamma holds:

Ⓐ You can pass by food.

Ⓑ A sign that is usual to be trampled is not a good sign.

⑤ And that is why the Tanna Kamma (Rabbi Meir) holds you may keep the fig cakes with the pottery shard inside and the loaf of the baker with the money inside.

⑥ The Tanna Kamma himself stated above in the Mishnah that he holds that if a person finds loaves of a private person, even in a public place, you must announce it.

⑦ If it is true, like the Amoraim originally thought, regarding their explanation of the Tanna Kamma, as to why he holds you must announce loaves of a private person found in a public place...

⑧ Since, according to their assessment, the Tanna Kamma holds:

Ⓐ You can pass by food.

Ⓑ A sign that is usual to be trampled is not a good sign.

⑨ If so, loaves of a private person in a public place are usual to get trampled. And the Tanna Kamma should have said that the finder may keep them.

⑩ Since he says that the finder must announce them, it is a question on the way that the Amoraim originally explained the position of the Tanna Kamma.

unclear 28:20 words after 'A circle' under III (presumably who holds 'It is not a good sign') not in transcript

⬢ ... אלא אמר רב זביד. Answer

► Westwood int. · Apr 15, 2013 · 40:53

The Gemara now answers:

① Both:

Ⓐ Rava, with a V.

Ⓑ And Rabbah, with a B.

Can explain the Mishnah according to their reasoning.

② Rava:

Ⓐ The dispute between the Tanna Kama/Rabbi Yehuda by the case of the Parshas can be explained that they are arguing whether or not a sign that could come by itself is a good sign.

I Tanna Kama:

it is not a sign.

II Rabbi Yehuda:

it is a sign.

Ⓑ Both the Tanna Kama and Rabbi Yehuda hold:

A sign that is usual to be trampled is a sign.

Ⓒ Both hold you can pass by food.

Ⓓ So it comes out:

Rabbi Yehuda holds: You must announce the loaf with the money inside. Since it is a sign and since a sign that will be trampled is a good sign.

Ⓔ The Tanna Kama holds:

You may keep the loaf with the money inside. Since it has no sign. Because he holds that a sign that could come by itself is not a sign.

In a public place, you must announce them, since they have an intrinsic sign and the owner is an optimist.

③ Rabbah:

Ⓐ The dispute between the Tanna Kama and Rabbi Yehuda by the loaf with money inside is whether or not a sign that could come by itself is a sign.

I Tanna Kama:

it is not a sign.

II Rabbi Yehuda:

it is a sign.

Ⓑ Both the Tanna Kama and Rabbi Yehuda agree:

a sign that is usual to be trampled is not a sign.

Ⓒ Both hold you cannot pass by food.

Ⓓ So it comes out that Rabbi Yehuda holds:

you must announce the loaf with the money inside. Since it is a good sign and it will not get trampled because you cannot pass by food.

Ⓔ The Tanna Kama holds:

you may keep the loaf with the money inside. Since a sign that could come by itself is not a good sign.

Ⓕ However, by loaves of a private person in a public place, the finder must announce them. Since such loaves have an intrinsic sign and it will not get trampled since you cannot pass by food.

unclear 43:20 'by the case of the Parshas [?]' — the case named in ②Ⓐ could not be made out

unclear 49:33 ②Ⓔ/last letter garbled in transcript: 'E circle. And since a sign that will be trampled is a good sign' repeated; the letter and opening words of the last line of ② ('You must announce them. In a public place...') not clear

unclear 51:10 heading of ③ transcribed 'Rava'; content and printed text (ורבה) indicate Rabbah

• ... ורבה אמר לך. Answer

► Westwood int. · Feb 20, 2013 · 31:05

① The Gemara now brings the explanation of Rabbah regarding the dispute between:

Ⓐ the Tanna Kamma (Rabbi Meir)

Ⓑ and Rabbi Yehuda.

② Rabbah would say:

In the Mishnah, which discusses a case where someone found:

Ⓐ A baker's loaf with money inside.

Ⓑ A round pressed fig cake with a pottery shard inside.

③ And:

Ⓐ The Tanna Kamma:

He holds, the finder may keep them.

Ⓑ Rabbi Yehuda:

He holds, the finder must announce that.

④ So, according to Rava, the explanation of what they do and do not argue about is as follows:

I A sign that is usual to be trampled:

Step None: explanation not found in the transcribed classes

• Question

► Westwood int. · Mar 18, 2013 · 2:17

① The Gemara now brings another version of the question: Let us say that it is a dispute between the Tannaim.

② Our Mishnah brings the dispute between,

Ⓐ the Tanna Kamma (Rabbi Meir).

Ⓑ and Rabbi Yehuda.

③ regarding someone who finds.

Ⓐ round pressed fig cakes with a pottery shard inside.

Ⓑ a baker's loaf with money inside.

I the Tanna Kamma:

the finder may keep it.

II Rabbi Yehuda:

the finder must announce it.

④ There are three possible issues over which they could be disputing.

I a sign that can come from itself.

II a sign that is likely to be trampled.

III passing by food.

⑤ The Gemara now brings that when the Amoraim originally saw this dispute, they thought regarding it:

I a sign that is likely to be trampled:

Everyone holds, it is not a sign. (Pessimist)

II A sign that can come by itself:

Everyone holds, it is a sign.

III passing by food: It is a dispute between

The Tanna Kamma

And Rabbi Yehuda.

Ⓐ Tanna Kamma:

Ⓐ You can pass by food.

Ⓑ It will get trampled.

Ⓒ The owner is a pessimist.

Ⓓ Therefore the finder may keep it.

Ⓑ Rabbi Yehuda:

Ⓐ you cannot pass by food.

Ⓑ it will not get trampled.

Ⓒ the owner does not give up hope.

Ⓓ therefore the finder must announce it.

⑥ Since the dispute between the Tanna Kama/Rabbi Yehuda is regarding whether or not you can pass by food.

⑦ But they all agree that a sign that is usual to be trampled is not a sign.

⑧ Therefore, it is a proof against Rava with a V who says, a sign that is usual to be trampled is a good sign.

unclear 11:40 parenthesis after 'it is not a sign' transcribed 'Pessimist [?]

Step None: explanation not found in the transcribed classes

I Finding small bundles of wheat without a sign:

① In a public place:

You may always keep it.

② In a private place:

Ⓐ In a way of falling:

Ⓐ You may keep it.

Ⓑ Since the owner does not know where it fell, the place cannot be assigned.

Ⓑ In a way of being placed down:

Ⓐ you must announce it.

Ⓑ the place will be the sign.

II small bundles of wheat with a sign:

① In a public place:

Ⓐ In a way of being placed down:

Ⓐ You must announce it.

Ⓑ The sign will be the sign.

Ⓑ in a way of falling:

Ⓐ you must announce it.

Ⓑ the owner relies on the sign.

② in a private place:

Ⓐ in a way of placed down:

Ⓐ you must announce it.

Ⓑ since it was placed down, in a place that it is usually not placed down.

Ⓑ in a way of falling:

Ⓐ you must announce it.

Ⓑ the owner relies on the sign.

unclear 20:50 05-08 line 'The sign will be the sign' as transcribed; wording uncertain

Step None: explanation not found in the transcribed classes

① *Rav Zvid said in the name of Rava:*

When the owner of a lost object declares:

Woe is to the loss of my purse ... It constitutes giving up hope.

② *And if the finder found the object after the owner declared as above, the finder may keep the object even if it has a sign.*

Step None: 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.