

# Explanation Sheet · 24b

Bava Metzia 24b · 53 entries

|                                              |                                                                                                                   |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div> | <div><div>EXPLANATION SHEET</div><div>24b</div></div> <div>Explanation not found in the transcribed classes</div> |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

◻ ... מי קתני הן שלו... Answer

► Adas Torah · Jun 3, 2015 · 2:59

*(it's an alternate answer)*

① Gemara now says, a second answer. To explain how it is possible not to bring any measure of clarity from the Mishnah of the Ta shma to any of the five questions.

② The Gemara now suggests that it is possible to say that the author of the Mishnah of the Ta shma could really be the Rabbanan.

③ And, even though the Mishnah differentiates between:

Ⓐ Mostly Jews (the finder must announce it)

Ⓑ and mostly non-Jews.

④ It is possible to say, that the Rabbanan could really hold, Object is always an optimist.

⑤ Whether he lost the object, or even in a place of mostly non-Jews.

⑥ When the Mishnah says that by mostly non-Jews, the finder does not need to announce the object,

⑦ it does not mean he can keep it.

⑧ but rather he does not need to announce it.

⑨ he should hold the object without announcing it,

⑩ and if a Jew comes by and gives a sign on it,

⑪ you must return it.

⑫ since it was found in a place of mostly non-Jews, It is not necessary to announce it since perhaps it fell from a Nanju.

⑬ but if it fell from a Jew and he comes and gives its sign, the finder must give it to him.

⑭ since the author is the Rabbanan,

⑮ and they hold that the owner does not give up hope.

⑯ even by mostly Nanjus.

**unclear 6:59** 'Object is always an optimist' — probably 'the owner is always an optimist' (compare summary ⑧⑤), not confirmed

**unclear 8:12** line ⑤ wording 'Whether he lost the object, or even in a place of mostly non-Jews' seems incomplete

**unclear 11:45** 'Nanju' — likely 'non-Jew', not confirmed

**unclear 13:55** 'Nanjus' — likely 'non-Jews', not confirmed

- ① Therefore, there is no clarity from this Mishnah. To any of the five questions.
- ② When it says that by mostly non-Jews, the finder does not need to announce it.
- ③ It could mean,  
The finder may keep it.
- ④ And the Mishnah is differentiating between
- Ⓐ mostly Jews.
- Ⓑ and mostly non-Jews.
- ⑤ And the author might be
- Ⓐ Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar.
- Ⓑ or it might be the Rabbanan.
- ⑥ And if you want to prove that between the two of them that someone is differentiating
- ⑦ you can say that neither one differentiates. And they are both to the extreme.
- ⑧ Ⓐ Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar:  
he holds. The owner is always a pessimist.
- Ⓑ the Rabbanan:  
They hold the owner is always an optimist.
- ⑨ and the Mishnah that is differentiating between,
- Ⓐ mostly Jews,
- Ⓑ mostly non-Jews,  
is really the Rabbanan.
- ⑩ and they are saying, that by mostly non-Jews, the finder does not need to announce it.
- ⑪ but he may not keep it either.

Explanation not found in the transcribed classes

Explanation not found in the transcribed classes

① The Gemara now brings a new Ta shma that seems to resolve the uncertainty raised above regarding the position of Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar.

② In a case where someone lost an object in a place of many people:

③ Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar holds that the owner will give up hope.

④ Is that:

Ⓐ Only by mostly non-Jews.

Ⓑ Or even by mostly Jews.

⑤ The Gemara brings that Rav Asi set:

I Ⓐ The case:

Someone found a barrel of wine.

In a city of mostly non-Jews.

II Ⓐ The ruling...

Ⓐ It is permitted to the finder... pertaining to the laws of returning a lost object.

Ⓑ It is forbidden to drink the wine.

I Ⓑ The case: A Jew comes and gives a sign on the barrel of wine.

II Ⓑ The ruling:

the finder may now drink the wine.

⑥ The Gemara now says:...

like whom does Rav Asi hold?

⑦ The Gemara answers... that Rav Asi is holding like Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar.

⑧ And since Rav Asi said his ruling that the barrel of wine is not obligated to be returned even if the owner is a Jew and comes with a sign.

⑨ Rav Asi said this only in a case where the barrel was found in a place of non-Jews.

⑩ This clearly indicates that Rav Asi said his ruling only by mostly non-Jews.

⑪ but by mostly Jews. The ruling would be that the finder must announce it.

⑫ So we see that Rav Asi differentiates between

Ⓐ mostly non-Jews.

ⓑ and mostly Jews.

**unclear 51:40** ⑤ 'The Gemara brings that Rav Asi set:' — 'set' as transcribed (probably 'said'); not confirmed by a read-back  
**unclear 52:30** before 'In a city of mostly non-Jews' the transcript has 'Roman numeral two, circle', which repeats the numeral of the next line; it is unclear what number, if any, goes on this line

**unclear 59:40** ⑫ the name after 'So we see that' is marked [?] in the transcript

⓪ ... לעולם אימא לך. Statement

► Adas Torah · Jun 29, 2015 · 17:43

① Rav Asi differentiates between finding a lost object in a place of:

ⓐ Mostly Jews:

The finder must announce it.

ⓑ and mostly non-Jews:

the finder may keep it.

② the Gemara assumed that Rav Asi is following the ruling of Rabbi Shimon Ben Elazar.

③ So we see that Rabbi Shimon Ben Elazar differentiates between:

Ⓐ Mostly Jews.

Ⓑ and mostly non-Jews.

④ the Gemara now says: there is no proof from the ruling of Rav Asi that Rabbi Shimon Ben Elazar differentiates.

⑤

⑥ really? Perhaps Rabbi Shimon Ben Elazar could hold to the extreme. That when someone loses an object in a place of many people

ⓐ non-Jews

ⓑ or even Jews

⑦ the owner gives up hope

⑧ and Rav Asi holds like Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar by mostly non-Jews

But argues on him by mostly Jews ...

⑩ and holds that the finder must announce it.

⑪ therefore We cannot bring clarity from the ruling of Rav Asi

**unclear 23:20** after ④ the transcript has 'Five circle. Six circle, really?'. No text survives for ⑤; it is unclear whether 'really?' Perhaps... belongs to ⑤ or ⑥

**unclear 25:00** 'But argues on him by mostly Jews ...' — the transcript does not give the step number (probably ⑨) and has a gap before ⑩

## ד"ה

Tosfos now brings from the Gemara. Which says:

① It is possible to say. That really Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar holds. That the finder may keep the lost object, whether it is found in a place of:

(a) mostly non-Jews

(b) or even by mostly Jews.

② and Rav Asi:

(a) holds like him, by mostly non-Jews

(b) and does not hold like him, by mostly Jews.

· ... ולא בעי למימר. Statement Tosafos

► Adas Torah · Jul 8, 2015 · 2:09

① The Gemara thought to prove, from the ruling of Rav Asi... That, Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar differentiates between,

(a) mostly Jews,

(b) and mostly non-Jews.

② the Gemara then says that there is no proof from Rav Asi.

③ Since it is possible that really Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar himself does not differentiate between,

(a) mostly Jews,

(b) and mostly non-Jews.

④ and it is Rav Asi who is differentiating.

⑤ and he is:

(a) going like Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar by mostly non-Jews.

(b) but he is arguing on him by mostly Jews.

⑥ Tosfos explains that it would seem that the Gemara could have accomplished the same thing by saying that, perhaps, Rav Asi is going like the Rabbanan.

⑦ and it is the Rabbanan who differentiate.

⑧ and that Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar.

⑨ Tosfos explains that the Gemara did not want to go that route because then we would have a proof that either:

Ⓐ Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar.

Ⓑ or the Rabbanan.

are differentiating.

⑩ and they cannot both be to the extreme.

⑪ but by saying that it is Rav Asi, who is differentiating.

⑫ It is possible to say that both:

Ⓐ the Rabbanan.

Ⓑ and Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar.

are to the extreme.

⑬ And Rav Asi holds like Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar. By mostly non-Jews.

⑭ but not by mostly Jews.

⑮ Tosfos concludes that based on the ruling of Rav Asi, there is partial clarity to the five questions.

⑯ The last two of the five questions were:

Assuming that both:

Ⓐ Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar.

Ⓑ And the Rabbanan.

Are to the extreme in their opinions.

⑰ Do we hold like:

Ⓐ Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar.

or not.

⑱ And if we do hold like Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar:

Ⓐ Is it only by mostly non-Jews?

Ⓑ or even by mostly Jews?

⑲ From the ruling of Rav Asi, we see that the ruling is definitely like Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar. By mostly non-Jews.

Ⓣ by mostly Jews. Where the ruling is that the finder must announce it. It might be because:

Ⓐ We go like Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar, (and this is what he holds)

Ⓑ Or we go like the Rabbanan, (and this is what they hold)

Ⓒ or:

Ⓐ We go like Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar, by mostly non-Jews,

Ⓑ and we go like the Rabbanan by mostly Jews.

**unclear 7:26** Ⓣ 'and that Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar.' is incomplete as transcribed

**unclear 8:10** the sub-letters under Ⓣ and Ⓥ are transcribed as 'eighth/eight circle'; they are taken as A circle, which fits the B circle that follows

**unclear 15:34** in Ⓣ 'call it' is taken as 'colon' and 'next time keep/skip line' as 'next line, skip line'

Ⓣ ... וכי מאחר דאסירא בהנאה. Question

► Adas Torah · Jul 13, 2015 · 35:55

Ⓣ The Gemara above brought the case / ruling of Rav Asi:

if someone finds a barrel of wine in a city of mostly non-Jews.

Ⓐ It is permitted with regards to the laws of lost objects

Ⓑ It is forbidden to have any benefit from it.

Ⓣ The Gemara now asks:

If it is forbidden in pleasure, what is it He is permitting to the finder, when he says: It is permitted because of a find.

Ⓣ ... אמר רב אשי לקנקנה. Answer

► Adas Torah · Jul 13, 2015 · 38:36

Rav Ashi answers: He is coming to permit the container.

Ⓣ ... ההוא גברא דאשכח. Statement

► Adas Torah · Jul 20, 2015 · 28:43

Ⓣ The Gemara now brings, that there was a certain man, that found four Zuz coins, tied up, and thrown into the Biran River.

Ⓣ He came before Rav Yehuda, who told him that he must announce them.

Explanation not found in the transcribed classes

Ⓣ ... והא זוטו של. Question

► Adas Torah · Jul 20, 2015 · 30:08

Ⓣ The Gemara questions the ruling of Rav Yehuda.

Ⓣ The fact that the coins were found in the river puts them into a category similar to finding something that was flooded away by the tides of the sea.

③ and there the ruling is that the finder may keep them.

④ So why did Rabbi Yehuda rule that he must announce them?

· ... שאני נהר בירן... Answer

► Adas Torah · Aug 19, 2015 · 28:56

① The Gemara now answers. An answer to clarify the reason for the ruling of Rav Yehuda.

② He ruled: The finder of the Zuz coins, that were found thrown into the Biran River, must announce them.

③ the Gemara asked: but this is a case of tides of the sea.

④ whose ruling is, the finder may keep the coins.

⑤ on this the Gemara answers: since it was the way of the Biran River to be dammed up,

⑥ the owner of the coins does not give up hope.

⑦ Since he is confident that the blockages in the river will prevent his coins from being washed away, and since there is activity going on in the water, such as damming up and maintaining the water flow.

⑨ The owner does not give up hope.

⑩ And therefore, the ruling is: the finder must announce it.

**unclear 33:20** no ⑧ is stated; it is unclear whether 'and since there is activity going on in the water...' was meant to be ⑧

Explanation not found in the transcribed classes

· ... שמע מינה אין... Statement

► Adas Torah · Aug 24, 2015 · 21:04

① The Gemara now makes the following observation. And deduction.

② Most of the people that live near the Biran River are non-Jews.

③ And still, Rav Yehuda ruled that the finder must announce it.

④ So we see that even by mostly non-Jews, ... The ruling is not like Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar.

⑤ who said, if someone loses an object in a place of a lot of people, the owner gives up hope.

⑥ and it was said above: Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar said it, for sure by mostly non-Jews.

⑦ And here, by the Biran River, it is mostly non-Jews.

⑧ And still Rabbi Yehuda said you must announce it.

⑨ so we see that the halacha does not follow Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar.

⑩ even by mostly non-Jews.

☐ ... שאני נהר בירן. Statement

► Adas Torah · Aug 31, 2015 · 30:36

① *While it is true that the Biran River is situated in a place of mostly non-Jews.*

② *however:*

Ⓐ *the damming of the river.*

Ⓑ *and the digging.*

*are done by Jews.*

③ *since Jews dam it up.*

④ *if you find something like the tied up coins in the river.*

⑤ *you must assume it fell from a Jew.*

⑥ *and since Jews dig it and maintain it.*

⑦ *the owner does not give up, (since tied up coins is considered to be a good sign.)*

⑧ *therefore the finder must announce it.*

⑨ *and this would be true, even according to Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar.*

☐ ... רב יהודה הוה שקיל. Statement

► Adas Torah · Sep 2, 2015 · 26:32

*The Gemara now brings*

*that Rav Yehuda was following behind his Rabbi, Mar Shmuel, in the marketplace, where they sold pounded wheat which was used for cereal.*

☐ ... אמר ליה מצא. Question

► Adas Torah · Sep 2, 2015 · 28:05

① *Rav Yehuda asked Mar Shmuel.*

② *What is the ruling in a case where someone would find a money purse in this very place?*

☐ ... אמר ליה הרי. Answer

► Adas Torah · Sep 2, 2015 · 29:03

*Mar Shmuel answered.*

*The finder may keep it.*

☐ ... בא ישראל ונתן. Question

► Adas Torah · Sep 2, 2015 · 29:31

*The question was then asked, what would be the ruling if a Jew came along and gave a sign on the money purse?*

☐ ... אמר ליה חייב. Answer

► Adas Torah · Sep 2, 2015 · 30:29

*Mar Shmuel answered: The finder must return it.*

*On this, the question was asked:*

- ① *How can we reconcile these two rulings together?*
- ② *If the original ruling... is: ... the finder may keep it.*
- ③ *The reason must be because... the owner gave up hope.*
- ④ *If he gave up hope... then, even if he comes later... and claims the object with a sign....*
- ⑤ *The ruling should still be... that the finder may keep it.*

*The Gemara answers.*

- ① *In truth... the ruling is... that the finder may keep it... even if... the owner comes with a sign,*
- ② *that which was said: the finder must give it back.*
- ③ *that is the ruling of going beyond the letter of the law.*

- ① *The Gemara now brings... an incident that happened with... the father of Shmuel.*
- ② *He found some donkeys in a desert.*
- ③ *Even though it had been 12 months that they had been separated from their owner, he returned them to their owner in order to fulfill doing beyond the letter of the law.*

ר"ה

- ① *Tosfos now brings from our Gemara that it once happened that the father of Shmuel found donkeys in the desert.*
- ② *He returned them to their owner, even though they had been separated from their owner for twelve months.*
- ③ *As an act of doing beyond the letter of the law.*

(ר"ה)

- ① *Tosfos now brings from our Gemara, which says that the father of Shmuel found some donkeys in the desert and returned them to their owner after 12 months.*

② The Gemara says that his act was doing beyond the letter of the law.

1 Statement Tosafos numbering restarts

► Adas Torah · Nov 2, 2015 · 7:37

① Tosfos now explains... his interpretation of the details of the case.

② He says that the father of Shmuel found the donkeys and he took care of them in the prescribed halachic manner for 12 months.

③ After the 12 months, the finder has a right to sell the animals and keep the money which must be returned to the owner upon the claiming of his animal.

④ Instead of taking advantage of his right to sell the donkeys, the father of Shmuel kept the donkeys. Even after the 12 months, in order to be able to return the actual animals themselves to their owner who would prefer them and not just receiving their value.

⑤ This is doing beyond the letter of the law.

Tosfos brings the source for the ruling of a finder being obligated to take care of the animals for 12 months and then to sell the animals and hold on to the money.

⑦ It comes from a coeth, Mishnah / brought down later on in our chapter, and there it says:

Anything that can:

Ⓐ produce profit.

Ⓑ yet it costs to maintain the animal.

Ⓐ the finder should maintain it for up to 12 months.

⑨ After the 12 months, he evaluates the value of the animal... sells it... and holds on to the money.

unclear 12:28 number of the 'Tosfos brings the source' line not heard (presumably 6)

unclear 13:23 'a coeth' unclear

unclear 14:21 number of the 'anything that can:' line not heard (presumably 8); the third sub-letter was heard as 'A circle' again (expected C)

2 Question Tosafos

► Adas Torah · Nov 16, 2015 · 41:01

① Tosfos now explains why Tosfos explains the Gemara differently than Rashi.

② Rashi explains the event involving the finding of the donkeys by the father of Shmuel to be talking about a case where the father of Shmuel found the donkeys after they had been lost to their owner for 12 months.

③ According to Rashi, the letter of the law would be that the donkeys belong to the father of Shmuel.

④ The reason being that any time an object is lost from its owner after 12 months, it is assumed that the owner gave up hope.

⑤ Yet the father of Shmuel returned the donkeys to their owner anyway.

⑥ Tosfos questions the explanation of Rashi as follows:

⑦ In order to learn like Rashi in the Gemara, it must be assumed that the ruling is that an owner gives up hope after his object has been lost to him for twelve months.

⑧ On this Tosfos asks: Why would it be assumed that the owner of an object would give up hope after it was lost for twelve months?

⑨ If anything, the owner would not give up hope, because he thinks that the finder will think that the object was just recently lost by its owner.

⑩ If so, giving back the donkeys would be the letter of the law

⑪ and not beyond the letter of the law.

unclear 45:00 'Great Circle' taken as eight circle (⊙)

unclear 48:20 the break between ⑩ and ⑪ is unclear; 'and not' was heard twice

• ... לפנים משורת הדין. Statement Tosafos

► Adas Torah · Nov 18, 2015 · 32:46

(ר"ה)

Tosfos now brings from our Gemara that mentions that the father of Shmuel acted beyond the letter of the law.

• מאשר יעשון נפקא... Statement Tosafos

► Adas Torah · Dec 16, 2015 · 17:07

① Our Gemara stated, that the reason why, the father of Shmuel, returned the donkeys...

② Even though, according to the ruling of the Torah, They were rightfully his to keep.

③ Is because He was acting Over and above The strict ruling of the Torah.

④ Tosfos now says That the source for this is Brought down later in this chapter That it is learned out from a pasuk.

⑤ Over there It brings a pasuk. From which is learned out several different things.

⑥ One of the things that is learned out is that it is proper to act over and above the strict letter of the law.

⑦ this is learned out from the words: "אשר יעשון"

⑧ which means: "that they shall do."

(line 16) דף כד: תוס' בא"ד לפנים משורת הדין - ובהגוזל קמא

Question (continued)

① Tosafos now brings two other places where the Gemara brings events that were done by someone to go over and above the actual ruling of the Torah which governs that case.

② פרק הגוזל קמא א

Ⓐ There was a certain woman who showed a dinar coin to Rabbi Chiya

Ⓑ to determine whether or not it was still a usable coin.

Ⓒ Rabbi Chiya, who was an expert money changer, told her that it was a good coin.

Ⓓ The next day she came back to Rabbi Chiya saying that no merchant would accept the coin as it was unfit.

Ⓔ Rabbi Chiya gave her a new coin at his own expense.

Ⓕ The Gemara questions the action of Rabbi Chiya based on the ruling that an expert money changer does not have to replace a coin on which he had ruled to be valid, which turned out to be invalid.

Ⓖ The Gemara explains that Rabbi Chiya was acting over and above the strict letter of the law.

Ⓗ and the Gemara goes on to source this course of action from the pasuk:

”אשר יעשו” / and they shall do”

③ So we see a pattern followed in the two places.

Ⓐ The one with Rabbi Yishmael and the wood.

Ⓑ And this case with Rabbi Chiya and the dinar coin.

④ In both places, the Gemara teaches that the person involved was acting over and above the actual ruling of the Torah.

⑤ And in both places, it sources this action from the pasuk ”אשר יעשו”.

⑥ So Tosafos is asking: why is it, in our Gemara, by the donkeys of the father of Shmuel, where he also went over and above the actual ruling of the Torah,

⑧ why did our Gemara not source his action from the pasuk

⑨ as it did in the other two places?

⑩ פרק האומנין ||

- Ⓐ Tosafos now brings the Gemara found later on in our tractate, in Perek Ha'ummin.
- Ⓑ Where? Some porters were carrying a barrel of wine that belonged to Bar Barchano took their coats as collateral for the payment of the barrel.
- Ⓒ Rav told Rav Bar Barchano to return the coats.
- Ⓓ When Rav Bar Barchano inquired: is this the ruling?
- Ⓔ Rav replied: yes. The pasuk says:
- ”למען תלך בדרך הטובים” / in order to go in the way of the good ones.”
- Ⓕ Rashi over there explains that this pasuk teaches to go over and above the actual ruling of the Torah.
- Ⓖ Tosafos asks: over here, in this Gemara, it does bring a source from a pasuk for going over and above the actual ruling of the Torah.
- Ⓗ But whereas the other two places cite a pasuk from the Torah,
- Ⓚ this Gemara cites the pasuk from Nach.
- Ⓛ Why would the Gemara desert the pasuk of the Torah in favor of bringing a pasuk from Nach?

**unclear 4:38** transcript reads 'Toslas now brings? To other places where? The Gemara brings events?'; 'To' is taken as 'two' and his question-mark pauses are not kept as punctuation

**unclear 19:03** between Ⓑ and Ⓒ the transcript runs the porters' case together; the rest of Ⓑ and all of Ⓒ and Ⓓ are missing (presumably breaking the barrel and Rabbah bar bar Chanah taking their coats). 'Bar Barchano' / 'Rav Bar Barchano' is kept as in the transcript.

Ⓜ ... ולקמן בסוף פרק. Question **Tosafos**

► Adas Torah · Jan 4, 2016 · 18:22

(line 14) בַּךְ כֵּה: תוֹס' בְּאֵד לַפְנִים מִשּׁוּרֵת הַדִּין - תִּימָה

Question

Tosafos now asks:

- Ⓜ Why is it that later on in this chapter,
- Ⓝ when the Gemara describes a case that occurred with Rabbi Yishmael.
- Ⓞ where Rabbi Yishmael acted in a way that was not required
- Ⓟ And he did so to go over and above the requirement of the Torah.
- Ⓠ And the Gemara there sources this by bringing the pasuk mentioned by Tosafos above:

”אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשׂוּן”

- Ⓡ "that they shall do"

- ⑧ And here in our Gemara.
- ⑨ By the case involving the father of Shmuel and the donkeys.
- ⑩ It does not bring the pasuk to source the act of the father of Shmuel, of going over and above the requirement of the Torah.
- ⑪ The case involving Rabbi Yishmael was as follows,
- ⑫ Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yossi, was going along the way.
- ⑬ a certain man passed him by.
- ⑭ that person had been carrying a load of wood.
- ⑮ he had put down the load to rest.
- ⑯ he now asked Rabbi Yishmael to perform the mitzvah of helping load.
- ⑰ Rabbi Yishmael asked the man, how much is the wood worth?
- ⑱ the man said, one half of a zuz
- ⑲ Rabbi Yishmael paid him the half zuz
- ⑳ He then made the load owner-less.
- ㉑ The original owner then repossessed it.
- ㉒ Once again, Rabbi Yishmael paid him half a zuz.
- ㉓ Once again, he made it owner-less.
- ㉔ Again, the man started to take possession of it.
- ㉕ and so on.
- ㉖ The Gemara then asks, Why did Rabbi Yishmael have to go through all of this in the first place?
- ㉗ He was legally exempt from this mitzvah of helping to load.
- ㉘ And was not in accordance with his stature.
- ㉙ The Gemara answers that Rabbi Yishmael was acting over and above the letter of the law.
- ㉚ And then the Gemara goes on
- ㉛ to source this action from the pasuk of "אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשׂוּן" / that they shall do.
- ㉜ So we see that there, the Gemara sourced his act from a pasuk.
- ㉝ And over here, by the father of Shmuel, the Gemara does not source it.

Daf ה' לפנים משורת הדין – ו"ל' Tos: כד' line number 23

① *Tosfos answers:*

② *The only time that the Gemara when discussing a matter of acting over and above the straight line of the law of the Torah*

③ *The only time it will bring the pasuk of: "אשר יעשו" / "That They Shall Do" Generally, a person is obligated to act in a certain way.*

④ *And there is a particular person that has a personal exemption from acting that way.*

⑤ *The pasuk tells us that when necessary the person should act in the manner of everyone else by obligating himself.*

⑥ *and he should not use his personal exemption.*

⑦ *Tosfos cites the two places where the Gemara sources acting above and beyond the letter of the law, as examples to this.*

הגזל קמא:

Ⓐ *Rabbi Chiya obligated himself to pay the woman a good coin in exchange for the invalid coin that he had previously ruled in error that it was valid.*

Ⓑ *There, all money changers*

Ⓒ *unless they were high-level experts*

Ⓓ *are obligated to stand behind their mistakes and pay.*

Ⓔ *Although Rabbi Chiya was a high-level expert...*

Ⓕ *who had a personal exemption for paying... for his mistaken ruling.*

Ⓖ *however, he chose not to take advantage of it*

Ⓗ *and to obligate himself to pay like the other people.*

Ⓘ *therefore... the Gemara sources his act... with the pasuk.*

II The Gemara later on in our chapter:

Ⓐ *In this case also*

Ⓑ *Yochanan generally is obligated to help his friend with his load.*

Ⓑ *Rabbi Ishmael had a personal exemption, since he was in the category of being an elder, which was not within his proper respect to help load.*

Ⓓ So, when Rabbi Shmuel opted to act beyond the letter of the law, by involving himself with the loading of his friend,

Ⓔ Here also the Gemara sources his act from the pasuk.

### III Our Gemara:

Ⓐ In the case of the father of Shmuel

Ⓑ and the lost donkeys.

Ⓒ Since the event took place after 12 months

Ⓓ everyone would be exempt,

Ⓔ therefore the pasuk is not brought.

Ⓕ However, even though in the case of the father of Shmuel everyone is exempt

Ⓖ but still, it is proper to return the donkeys to their owner who is claiming them

Ⓗ since there is no loss involved to the finder.

### IV The Gemara in האומנין:

Ⓐ There the Gemara relates, that while porters were carrying the barrel of Rabba bar bar Chana, they broke the barrel.

Ⓑ The pasuk of יֵעָשׂוֹן אִשׁר does not require a person who sustained a loss to go beyond the letter of the law.

Ⓒ therefore, a different pasuk is brought

Ⓓ למען תלך בדרך טובים / in order to go in a way of good ones.

**unclear 17:20** || Ⓑ begins 'Yochanan generally is obligated'; the first word is unclear (probably 'everyone')

**unclear 17:48** letter stated as B a second time; the sequence suggests C

**unclear 20:01** || Ⓓ: name heard as 'Rabbi Shmuel' (the Tosafos refers to Rabbi Yishmael); the end of the line ('Loading his friend') trails off

**unclear 5:04** 'the pasuk of Kolin' taken as 'the pasuk of:' (colon)

⓪ ... אמר ליה הרי. Answer

► Adas Torah · Feb 17, 2016 · 19:13

Gemara, Daf ל"ט, בד עמוד ב, א' ל"ט, nineteen lines from the bottom

Rav Nachman said to Rava: the finder may keep it.

⓪ ... בא ישראל ונתן. Question

► Adas Torah · Feb 17, 2016 · 37:33

Rava then asked: What if a Jew comes and gives on it a sign?

· Answer

► Adas Torah · Feb 22, 2016 · 13:23

*Rav Nachman answers:*

*the finder may keep it.*

· ... והלא עומד וצווח... Question

► Adas Torah · Feb 24, 2016 · 4:22

① *Rava asked:*

*But ... he is standing and screaming that it is his*

② *which indicates that he did not give up hope*

③ *So why did Rabbi Nachman rule that the finder may keep it?*

**unclear 4:22** Transcript has 'rubber asked'. Read as 'Rava asked', confirmed by his recap in the 2016-02-29 class at 1452: 'Rava asks that he is standing and screaming'.

**unclear 4:22** The words at the '...' before 'he is standing' could not be made out.

· ... נעשה כצווח על... Answer

► Adas Torah · Feb 29, 2016 · 24:22

① *It is like a person who is screaming about his fallen house or his sunken ship*

② *And that his screaming is to no avail.*

· ... ההוא דיו דשקיל... Statement

► Adas Torah · Mar 16, 2016 · 5:36

① *The Gemara now brings... that there was a certain vulture that took a piece of meat from the market place.*

② *And it threw it down between the palm trees of the house of Barmerion.*

③ *Rambam came before Abaye to inquire as to the ruling of what to do with the piece of meat.*

④ *Abaye told him:*

*Make it for yourself.*

**unclear 5:36** 'Rambam came before Abaye' is probably a mishearing of the person who came (perhaps 'Barmerion'). Not confirmed.

**unclear 8:10** 'Make it for yourself': the word sheet has 'take it' for שקול. Kept as transcribed.

Explanation not found in the transcribed classes

· ... והא רובא דישראל... Question

► Adas Torah · Mar 16, 2016 · 32:25

① *The Gemara now asks:*

*But the place from where the meat was taken was a place of mostly Jews.*

② *If so, we should be able to conclude*

③ *Based on the ruling of Abaye that Barmerion could keep the meat for himself*

④ That the ruling must be like Rabbi Shimon ben Elozer even by mostly Jews

⑤ The Gemara above raised 5 questions regarding the ruling of Rabbi Shimon ben Elozer who said that a finder may keep an object found in a place of many people

⑥ Based on this ruling of Abaye

⑦ It is clear that Rabbi Shimon ben Elozer must hold that a person will give up hope when he loses something in a place even of many Jews

⑧ and... that the ruling follows him!?

· ... שאני דיו דכוותו... Answer

► Adas Torah · Mar 21, 2016 · 5:53

① The Gemara answers:

② In truth, there is no proof from the ruling of Abaye that Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar holds that a person will give up hope even if he loses something in a place of mostly Jews.

③ And there is no proof that we hold like Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar altogether.

④ The ruling of Abaye, that Bar Marion can keep the meat, was based on a totally different halachic ruling, upon which there is no dispute.

⑤ (We learned above that the Torah permits the finder of the lost object to keep it, because when it was lost it was inaccessible to everyone, such as by the tides of the sea.)

⑥ The meat that was taken by the vulture was inaccessible while it was being lost.

⑦ Based on this ruling Abaye permitted the meat.

**unclear 5:58** line ③ ends 'All together' in the transcript, probably 'altogether'

**unclear 16:14** line ⑤ combines the original wording with his correction at 974-1010; he said 'end of parenthesis', and where the parenthesis opens is not clear

**unclear 6:54** in the 2016-03-30 review line ⑦ was read 'Abaye permitted to be...'

· ... והא אמר רב... Question

► Adas Torah · Mar 30, 2016 · 7:41

① The Gemara now asks:

② Rav said: It is only permissible to eat kosher meat that was under constant supervision of a Jew.

③ In the case of the vulture, even if it was assumed that the meat was taken from a Jew,

④ but it certainly was not constantly under the supervision of a Jew from the time the vulture took it

⑤ until it deposited a piece of meat by Bar Marion.

⑥ Therefore: How is it that Abaye ruled that the meat was permitted to be eaten by Bar Marion?

**unclear 7:41** the transcript shows '...' after the colons in ① and ②; words may be missing there

· ... בעומד ורואהו. Answer

► Adas Torah · Mar 30, 2016 · 13:02

① The Gemara answers that the case was where Bar Marion saw the meat:

(A) From when it was taken

(B) until it was thrown down by the vulture.

② Therefore:

(A) It is permitted to the finder regarding laws of lost objects because of the ruling of tides of the sea.

(B) And the finder may eat it because of the fact that it was watched by a Jew from the beginning when it was taken until the end when it was thrown amongst the palm trees of Bar Marion.

· ... מ"מ פריך שפיר. Statement **Tosafos**

► Adas Torah · Apr 20, 2016 · 1:02

Daf Chof Daled Amud Beis: Tos/ D"ח

① Tosfos brings from our Gemara, which said, that when a vulture took meat and threw it amongst the palm trees of Barmerion.

② and Barmerion came to inquire regarding the halachic status of the meat.

③ The ruling was given that the meat is permitted.

④ On this the Gemara asked:

How can the ruling be that the meat is permitted?

⑤ but Rav ruled that meat hidden from Jewish supervision is prohibited.

⑥ and the Gemara concludes that the case was talking about where the finder saw the meat from when the vulture took it

⑦ until it threw it.

⑧ Tosfos begins by saying that the text of the Gemara should read:

he (Bar Merion) came before Rav.

⑨ as opposed to our text, which reads:

he (Bar Merion) came before Abaye.

⑩ Tosfos brings support to his version that the incident took place with Rav and not Abaye.

⑪ From the fact that a similar incident is related in the Yerushalmi

⑫ And there the text reads that it was Rav

⑬ and not Abaye.

⑭ If the text would read Rav

⑮ Then it would come out that the Gemara when it asked on the ruling that was given,

⑯ that the meat dropped by the vulture was permitted,

⑰ that the meat should be forbidden because Rav ruled:

meat hidden from Jewish supervision is forbidden,

⑱ it turns out that the Gemara was asking a contradiction between: two rulings of Rav himself:

Ⓐ that the meat dropped by the vulture is permitted,

Ⓑ and that meat hidden from the eye is forbidden.

19 Tosfos goes on to explain that even if our text reads that Barmerion came before Abaye,

20 and it was he that permitted Barmerion to eat the meat.

21 that even if the text reads Abaye,

22 and that Rav,

23 it is still good.

24 Tosfos points out that to say that the text reads Abaye

25 would seem to be difficult.

26 because if the text reads Abaye,

⑳ it comes out that the Gemara was asking a question on the ruling of Abaye

28 That it is permitted to keep the meat

29 From a ruling of Rav

30 That meat hidden from the eye is forbidden.

31 And this seems to be difficult.

32 Since the ruling is not like Rav.

33 So why would the Gemara ask on Abaye from a ruling of Rav?

34 When we do not hold like Rav.

35 The proof that the ruling regarding meat that was hidden from the eye does not go like Rav, who forbids it,

36 is based on the language of a Gemara, that says:

37 regarding meat that was hidden from the eye,

38 if it is forbidden like Rav, how is it ever possible for Rav to eat meat?

39 the language seems to indicate that this is a problem only according to Rav.

40 Since he holds that meat hidden from the eye is forbidden.

④1 But according to us that we do not hold like Rav,

④2 And we hold that meat hidden from the eye is permitted.

④3 There is not a problem

④4 So we see that we do not hold like Rav.

④5 Tosfos goes on to say:

Nevertheless, we can still go with the text that the story with the vulture happened with Abaye.

④6 The reason is:

Rav rules that we are always concerned for meat that is hidden from the eye.

④7 Even in a situation in which we have no real grounds to say that a piece of unsupervised kosher meat was exchanged for a piece of non-kosher meat.

48 Still, Rav is concerned

49 That maybe a vulture was carrying a piece of non-kosher meat

50 and drafted it.

51 and took away the unsupervised kosher meat instead.

52 Even if we are not concerned to the degree of Rav.

53 However, if we actually saw the vulture drop the meat.

54 Even if the place where the meat was dropped was a place of Jewish slaughterers.

55 We should be concerned that the vulture brought the meat from a place that is non-Jews who do the slaughtering in that place.

(56) On that, the Gemara answers:

Barmerion watched the vulture from the taking of the meat until it dropped it.

57 Therefore, there is no problem of meat hidden from the eye.

58 Therefore, the text of our Gemara could read that the story took place with either:

Ⓐ Rav.

Ⓑ Abaye.

(59) Tosfos concludes by saying that the final answer of the Gemara

(60) That the meat was seen from the time it was taken until it was dropped.

(61) That answer must be refined

(62) Depending on whether the text was:

Ⓐ Abaye.

Ⓑ or Rav.

63 No matter what the text, the answer seems to satisfy both:

Ⓐ Rav.

Ⓑ or Abaye.

Ⓑ Rav.

(64) however:

I According to Abaye:

Ⓐ We can say that Barmerion saw the meat taken from anywhere in the city.

Ⓑ Since the city is mostly Jewish slaughterers.

Ⓒ We can assume the meat taken is kosher meat.

Ⓓ And that is the meat that was thrown down by the vulture in the property of Barmerion.

II According to Rav:

Ⓐ He is more particular about meat hidden from the eye.

Ⓑ Therefore:

In order for the answer of:

He stood and he saw.

In order for that to work according to Rav:

Ⓒ We cannot say that Barmerion saw the vulture take the meat from anywhere in the city.

Ⓓ Even if the city is mostly Jewish slaughterers.

Ⓔ Because Rav is concerned that maybe the vulture switched the meat.

Ⓕ We must explain that the answer of:

He is standing and he sees it.

Ⓖ He's speaking about where Barmerion saw the meat being taken because it was slaughtered and cut.

Ⓗ therefore. Then according to Rav, there would be no problem of meat that is hidden from the eye.

**unclear 16:00** line 22 'and that Rav,' is fragmentary; the rest of the phrase was not made out

**unclear 24:00** line 41 ends with a garbled word ('Chumash') after 'like Rav,'

**unclear 29:30** line 50 transcript reads 'and draft it' (possibly 'and dropped it'); not confirmed

**unclear 38:05** line 63 list repeats 'capital B circle, Rav' after 'Abaye'; unclear whether this is a slip

**unclear 45:00** Ⓒ 'because it was slaughtered and cut': wording may be garbled

⋅ ... רבי חנינא מצא גדי' Question

► Adas Torah · May 30, 2016 · 3:18

Gemara Daf Chof Dalet Amud Beis R'/Chanina 13 lines on the bottom

① The Gemara now brings that Rabbi Chanina found a slaughtered goat... on the road between:

Ⓐ Tverio.

Ⓑ Tzipori.

② The Gemara brings... that they permitted the goat to him.

③ Rabbi Ami explained the ruling as follows:

I Regarding the ruling of finding a lost object:

Ⓐ They permitted it to him. Because the halacha follows Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar.

Ⓑ That if you find a lost object on a large highway, you may keep it.

II Regarding the law of an animal being properly slaughtered.

A It is permitted, since we may assume that the animal was slaughtered in accordance with ...

B Like the opinion of Rabbi...

④ Rabbi Ami then goes on to bring the Braisa in which there is a dispute between:

Ⓐ Rabbi Yehuda.

Ⓑ and Rabbi Chanania.

Regarding the ability to assume that an animal found slaughtered was indeed slaughtered properly or not.

## I The case:

Ⓐ Someone lost his:

Ⓐ Young goats.

Ⓑ All his roosters.

Ⓑ and he found them slaughtered.

## II The ruling:

Ⓐ Rabbi Yehuda:

he forbids it.

Ⓑ Rabbi Chanania

he permits it.

Ⓒ Rabbi:

he holds:

Ⓐ the ruling of Rabbi Yehuda, who makes it forbidden, numbers correct, when the slaughtered animal is found in a garbage dump.

Ⓑ the ruling of Rabbi Chanania, who permits it, appears correct when the slaughtered animal is found in a house.

⑤ The Gemara now makes the following conclusion.

⑥ Since they permitted the slaughtered goats to be eaten by Rabbi Chanina.

⑦

⑧ And still, they permitted the goats to Rabbi Chanina. Because of the laws of lost objects. Because of Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar.

⑨ So the Gemara now concludes: we learn from here, that the halacha is like Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar, even by mostly Jews.

**unclear 21:12** end of II A ('slaughtered in accordance with ...') and II B ('Like the opinion of Rabbi...') cut off; whether A/B are circled is not clear

**unclear 21:14** Ⓑ 'Rabbi Hanan Yo' taken as Rabbi Chanania; Ⓑ 'All his roosters' possibly 'or his roosters'

**unclear 21:14** Ⓐ 'numbers correct' probably 'appears correct' (compare Ⓐ), not confirmed

**unclear 28:54** content of line ⑦ not captured (only 'Next line, skip a line, 7')

⬢ ... הר"י שאבדו כו' Statement **Tosafos**

► Adas Torah · Jun 1, 2016 · 35:49

[Dibur Hamaschil Harei She'avdu V'chulu]

① Tosfos now brings from the Braisa brought in the Gemara which speaks about:

② Someone lost his goats/roosters.

③ And he found them slaughtered.

□ ... ה"ה ה"ה נגנבו... Statement Tosafos

► Adas Torah · Jun 20, 2016 · 0:57

① Even though the Braisa gives its case by where the goats/roosters were lost.

② And the owner found them slaughtered.

③ Tosfos says that had the case been talking about where they had been stolen.

④ ... Slaughtered.

⑤ It would have the same ruling.

⑥ And that, according to Rabbi Chanania, they would be permitted.

⑦ Tosfos explains that in spite of the fact that the thief transgressed the negative prohibition of:

"You shall not steal."

⑧ We are not concerned that he would transgress the negative prohibition of eating meat that was not slaughtered according to the laws of the Torah.

⑨ Tosfos brings a proof from the Braisa as stated in the Tosefta,

⑩ where it states explicitly.

unclear 0:57 line ④ garbled: transcript gives 'four circle ... two circle. Slaughtered.'

unclear 0:57 lines ⑪–⑬ and ⑭ only numbered in the transcript, no content captured (no ⑰ heard)

□ unclear Tosafos

► Adas Torah · Jun 8, 2016 · 18:42

That the expression of hu hadin always means that we are taking the stated ruling and applying it to a non-stated case. And saying that they are exactly the same.

unclear 18:42 transcript 'who had dinner' taken as 'hu hadin' (printed ה"ה); where on the sheet this line goes is not stated

Explanation not found in the transcribed classes

Explanation not found in the transcribed classes

Step 16: explanation not found in the transcribed classes

□ ... אמר רבא רוב... Answer

► Adas Torah · Jun 1, 2016 · 22:15

Gemara Daf Chof Dalet Amud Beis Amar Rava six lines on the bottom

- ① Rava answered:
- ② Really the object was found in a place of mostly non-Jews.
- ③ And that is why the finder may keep it.
- ④ Therefore, we cannot resolve the issue of our uncertainty whether Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar who rules that the finder may keep an object that is found in a place of many people of non-Jews.
- Ⓐ Whether he meant only by a place of mostly non-Jews.
- Ⓑ or even in a place of mostly Jews.
- ⑤ regarding the ruling given to Rabbi Chanina that he was permitted to eat the meat.
- ⑥ This is because that most of the slaughterers were Jews.
- ⑦ And therefore, we can rely on the fact that the meat was slaughtered properly.

◻ ... שמצאן באשפה. Statement Tosafos

► Adas Torah · Jun 22, 2016 · 7:49

- ① Tosafos now brings from the Braisa that mentions what was said by Rabbi, who said:
- ② the ruling of Rabbi Yehuda
- ③ that the goats/roosters may not be eaten by their owner
- ④ Who found his goats after having lost them.
- ⑤ and he found them slaughtered.
- ⑥ That Rebbe said that this ruling of Rabbi Yehuda appears correct when the goats were found in a garbage dump.

◻ ... כפ"ק קמא דחולין. Statement Tosafos

► Adas Torah · Jul 6, 2016 · 29:38

- ① Tosafos now brings the Gemara in Chulin, which explains the teaching of Rebbe as follows,
- ② Even though it would seem that Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Hananiah are arguing in general.
- ③ Whether we can assume that:
- Ⓐ Most people that are involved with slaughtering animals are experts.
- Ⓑ or not.
- ④ And that Rebbe is saying that the ruling is really like Rabbi Hananiah.
- ⑤ that most people that are involved with slaughtering animals are experts.
- ⑥ however:
- Ⓐ If the slaughtered animal is found in a garbage dump.

Ⓑ we must assume that it was not slaughtered properly.

Ⓒ like the general ruling of Rabbi Yehuda.

Ⓓ and it is forbidden.

⑦ and:

Ⓐ If the slaughtered animal is found in the house.

Ⓑ We assume that it was slaughtered properly.

Ⓒ Like the general ruling of Rabbi Hananiah.

Ⓓ And it is permitted.

⑧ However, the Gemara in Chulin explains the teaching of Rebbe differently, as follows:

I Ⓐ Rabbi Hananiah

Ⓑ Who permits the meat

Ⓒ Agrees to Rabbi Yehuda that if the meat is found in the garbage dump, in the marketplace.

Ⓓ it is forbidden.

II Ⓐ Rabbi Yehuda

Ⓑ Who forbids the meat

Ⓒ Agrees to Rabbi Hananiah

Ⓓ it is permitted.

⑨ Both agree that the majority of slaughterers involved with slaughtering animals are experts.

⑩ However, the place that the slaughtered meat was found can reflect on determining whether this particular animal had a proper slaughtering

⑪ or something went wrong

⑫ There are three locations mentioned in regards to where the meat was found

Ⓐ in the garbage dump in the marketplace

Ⓑ in the house

Ⓒ in the garbage dump in the house

I In the garbage dump in the marketplace:

Ⓐ everyone agrees.

Ⓑ including Rabbi Hananiah.

Ⓒ that we must assume the meat is forbidden.

II In the house:

Ⓐ everyone agrees.

Ⓑ including Rabbi Yehuda.

Ⓒ that the meat is permitted.

III In the garbage dump in the house:

It is a dispute:

Ⓐ Rabbi Hananiah:

It is permitted.

Ⓑ Rabbi Yehuda:

It is forbidden.

14 In the case of Rabbi Hanina, the slaughtered animal was found on the road between the two cities.

Ⓐ Tverio

Ⓑ Tzipori

15 And Rabbi Ami explained that the reason why they permitted the meat to be eaten is because we hold like Rabbi Hananiah.

16 Tosafos explains: From this we see:

17 Finding a slaughtered animal

Ⓐ on the road

Ⓑ but not on the garbage dump

18 is like finding a slaughtered animal

Ⓐ in a garbage dump

Ⓑ in the house

19 since this case is the one in which there is a dispute between

Ⓐ Rabbi Hananiah

Ⓑ and Rabbi Yehuda,

②0 and that is why Rabbi Ami had to explain that the reason they permitted the meat to Rabbi Hananiah is because

②1 in the dispute between

Ⓐ Rabbi Hananiah

Ⓑ and Rabbi Yehuda

②2 We hold like Rabbi Hananiah

**unclear 39:20** under II, between 'Ⓒ Agrees to Rabbi Hananiah' and 'Ⓓ it is permitted' the dictation breaks off ('...'); any words in between could not be made out

**unclear 48:58** 'Rabbi Hanino' in ①5 and the name in ②0 — transcript unclear whether Rabbi Hananiah or Rabbi Hanina is meant

· Statement

► Adas Torah · Jul 18, 2016 · 12:14

① The Gemara now brings that Rabbi Ami found slaughtered some young birds, on the road between:

Ⓐ Tverio

Ⓑ Tzipori

② He came before:

Ⓐ Rabbi Asi

Ⓑ And some say, before Rabbi Yochanan

Ⓒ And some say, he came to the Bais HaMedrash

③ They ruled He may take them for himself.

· ... רבי יצחק נפחא אשכח. Statement

► Adas Torah · Jul 20, 2016 · 15:32

① The Gemara now brings that Rabbi Yitzchak, the blacksmith, found a ball of spun threads used by the trappers to make their nets.

② He came before:

Ⓐ Rabbi Yochanan.

Ⓑ And some say, he came before the scholars in the Beis Medrash.

③ And they ruled that he could take it for himself.

· Statement **Tosafos**

► Adas Torah · Jul 20, 2016 · 21:57

① Tosfos brings from our Gemara, which says:

② Rabbi Ami found, slaughtered, some young birds. On the road between:

Tiberio.

Ⓑ to Tzipori.

③ Rabbi Ami came before Rabbi Asi to ask him, What is the ruling with the finding of the slaughtered birds?

**unclear 24:00** '(to the right) Dalet, Dalet in parentheses' written by the heading — unclear what exactly is written

**unclear 24:37** transcript has 'The army found'; printed Gemara/Tosafos and his later dictation say Rabbi Ami — written as Rabbi Ami

**unclear 25:00** 'Tiberio' line: no 'A circle' heard in transcript, spelling of the place name as transcribed

· ... אתא לקמיה דרבי אסי. Statement **Tosafos**

► Adas Torah · Jul 27, 2016 · 15:33

① Tosfos begins by saying that the story with Rabbi Ami and the slaughtered birds should read:

② that Rabbi Ami came before Rabbi Asi.

③ to ask his halachic question.

④ Tosfos now brings a difficulty with this text based on the following:

⑤ he says that in all places where

Ⓐ Rabbi Ami.

Ⓑ and Rabbi Asi.

are mentioned together.

⑥ Ⓐ Rabbi Ami is mentioned.

Ⓑ before Rabbi Asi.

⑦ Tosfos brings a sample Gemara that says.

Ⓐ Rabbi Ami.

Ⓑ and Rabbi Asi.

⑧ the most esteemed Kohanim in Eretz Yisroel.

⑨ this would seem to indicate that Rabbi Ami was greater than Rabbi Asi.

⑩ since he is always mentioned first.

⑪ so how can it say that Rabbi Ami came before Rabbi Asi to ask his question?

⑫ And this Tosfos explains:

⑬ In spite of the fact that:

Ⓐ Rabbi Ami was greater than

Ⓑ Rabbi Asi.

⑭ It is still not a wonder that he came before Rabbi Asi to ask.

⑮ Since they were colleagues.

⑯ Now Tosfos brings an alternate text,

⑰ and explains why this text is incorrect.

⑱ The other text said that:

Ⓐ Rabbi Ami came before

Ⓑ Rabbi Abba.

⑲ Tosfos brings that:

Ⓐ Rabbi Abba was the student of

Ⓑ Rabbi Ami.

⑳ He brings the gemara that talks about the case of where one person grabbed away a silver bar from his friend.

㉑ There it says that Rabbi Abba was sitting before Rabbi Ami.

㉒ So we see that Rabbi Abba was the student of Rabbi Ami.

㉓ So why would Rabbi Ami come before him to ask?

㉔ Therefore, Tosfos concludes that the text should read (as it actually does in our text)

㉕ That Rabbi Ami came before Rabbi Asi as it actually does in our text.

㉖ and not before Rabbi Abba.

**unclear 16:00** transcript has 'Rabbi Ashi' in ② and ⑤Ⓑ; printed text and rest of dictation have Rabbi Asi — written Asi

**unclear 18:55** transcript 'Second circle' — he refers to number 7 (t=1253) and the sequence runs 6 → 9, so written ⑦

**unclear 19:30** transcript 'A circle, the most esteemed Kohanim' — sequence requires Ⓔ, written Ⓔ

**unclear 29:10** placement of the parentheses in ㉔/㉕ unclear: transcript has 'parentheses as it actually does in our text and the parentheses' in 24 and the same phrase repeated in 25

Explanation not found in the transcribed classes

Explanation not found in the transcribed classes

Explanation not found in the transcribed classes

Explanation not found in the transcribed classes

① *The Mishnah lists 12 cases I am finding a lost object in which the ruling is that the finder must announce them.*

② *Someone found*

Ⓐ *Fruits in a vessel*

Ⓑ *Just the vessel*

Ⓒ *Money in a purse*

Ⓓ *Just the purse*

Ⓔ *Piles of fruits*

Ⓕ *Piles of money*

Ⓖ *Three coins, one on top of the other*

Ⓗ *Small bundles of wheat in a private domain*

Ⓘ *Loaves of a private person*

⓵ *Shearings of wool that were taken from the house of the craftsman*

Ⓚ *Pitchers of wine*

Ⓛ *Pitchers of oil*

**unclear 3:33** 'I am finding' as transcribed (likely 'of finding'); not confirmed

**unclear 8:46** transcript has 'pictures of wine/oil'; written as 'Pitchers' per the word sheet (pitchers of wine / pitchers of oil)

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.