21.2.6

а

25b (משנה ג2) → 26b (כי היכי דנפול מינאי דידי - הכי נפול מאיניש אחרינא, ומשכחנא מידי)

- ז. לא תַעַשׁק אָת רָעָה **וָלא תָגוֹל** לא תַלִין פָּעָלַת שָׂכִיר אָתָך עָד בַקר: *ויקרא פרק יט פסוק יג*
- 2. לא תראה אֶת שור אָחִיך או אֶת שֵׁיוֹ נִדְּחִים וְהְתְעַלַמְתָ מֵהֶם **הָשֵׁב תְשִׁיבֵם** לְאָחִיך: *דברים פרק כב פסוק א*

ג. וְכֵן תַּעֲשֶׁה לַחֲמֹרוֹ וְכֵן תַּעֲשֶׁה לְשִׁמְלָתוֹ וְכֵן תַּעֲשֶׂה לְכָל אֲבֵדַת אָחִיך אֲשֶׁר תֹאבַד מִמֶנוּ וּמְצָאתָה לא תוּבָל לְהָתְעָלָם: דברים פרק כב פסוק ג.

- I משנה ג
finding in abandoned circumstances $\,$ finder may keep
 - If: he finds a מציאה in an old wall or under a pile of rocks may keep
 - i *Reason:* he may claim that it is ancient and belongs to אמוריים but only if it is truly old and (e.g.) rusty
 - b If: he found a מציאה in a new wall
 - i *If*: it was in the outer half may keep
 - ii If: it was in the inner half (towards house) belongs to בעה"ב
 - 1 *Note*: if it had a handle e.g. a knife with a haft or a pouch with drawstrings the location of the haft or drawstrings determines ownership; our משנה is in re: something without a handle; e.g. cotton or a metal bar
 - 2 Note: if the wall was filled with this מציאה, finder and owner split
 (a) Challenge: this is obvious
 - (b) Answer: even if wall is slanted (and we might think it fell from higher side) still split
 - iii However: if house is rented out, finder may always claim it even inside the house
 - *Challenge*: why not assign it to ownership of most recent renter?
 (a) *Support*: status of coins found in ירושלים follows most recent use (ירושלים, מע״ש) etc.)
 - 2 Answer1 (ה"ל): in our case, the owner rented out house to 3 ישראלים; one who dropped it is מתייאש
 (a) Challenge: does this mean that הלכה כרשב"א even when a majority (totality) are ישראל Rather
 - 3 Answer2 (ר׳ מנשיא בר יעקב): in our case, he rented out to 3 נכרים
 - 4 Comeback (ד"ב): owner rented out house to 3 ישראלים; one who dropped it is מתייאש
 - (a) Reason: had he intended to return it, would've done so by now; rather, he intends to keep/steal it
 - (b) *Consistency* (*τ*"τ):
 - (i) If: he saw a coin fall from two men must declare
 - 1. Reason: owner knows that there's only one "suspect"; he can easily be accused
 - (ii) But if: he saw a coin fall from 3 men may keep1. Reason: owner gives up, knowing that either "buddy" that he accuses will claim other took it
 - (iii) Caveat (רבא): not returning to 3 only if less than ש"ע for each (3 פרוטות); else, they may be partners
 - (iv) *Possibly*: even if there are 2 ברוטות perhaps they are partners and one forgave his portion
 - iv Additional rulings of רבא:
 - 1 If: he took a coin before אושיי, intending to steal he violates all three prohibitions in vv. 1-3
 - (a) Note: even if he returns it after אוש that is a gift but the violations still hold
 - (b) But if: he took before אוש intending to return it; after אוש decided to steal, violates v. 2
 - (c) And if: he waited until יאוש and then took it, only violates v. 3
 - 2 If: he saw a coin fall from someone into the sand and he found it and took it no obligation to return
 - (a) *Reason*: he is מייאש, figuring that even if someone came with a sieve to find it, he may have found someone else's that fell there