That of Ilfoh and Rabi Oishayoh

– דאילפא ורבי אושעיא

OVERVIEW

The conclusion of the גמרא is that the מחלוקת between ר"י ור"א and ר"י ור"א is regarding the rulings of אילפא ור' אושעיא previously. ר"מ ור"י disagree with אילפא ור"א and maintain that מתוך הרחבה is always פטור, while ר"י ור"א agree with the rulings of אילפא ור"א that in those cases he is חייב (since אילפא ור"א)

לאו מענין אחד -

The cases of אילפא ור"א are not of the same content -

דרבי אושעיא² מיירי בקופצת דהוי קרן³ ואילפא איירי על גבי חבירתה⁴ דחשיב שן: For א"ז is discussing a case where the בהמה jumped in order to eat, which is considered קרן (for it is unusual for a בהמה to jump), while אילפא is discussing a case where a בהמה ברה"ר ate from the back of a neighboring animal which is considered שן in the רשות הניזק.

SUMMARY

The cases of אילפא (which is שן) and ר"א (which is קרן) differ from each other.

THINKING IT OVER

- 1. The case of קופצת by קופצת is considered משונה and is חייב on account of קרן; the case of מעל גבי חברתה is also unusual since the reason he is חייב according to ור"א is because אין דרכה לאכול דרכה אין זין is because ר' אושעיא 'ר considered אין דרכה אושעיא 'ר considered ארן and the case of אילפא considered מילפא?!⁶
- 2. The גמרא אילפא first and then רוספות. Is there any reason why תוספות 7 reverses this order and discusses x"¬ first?!

¹ א,כ.

² See 'Thinking it over' # 2.

³ The פרן (seemingly) maintains that it is not קרן, therefore it is פרן, שלון, while פרן, יור"א agree with ד"י, that it it is פרן, אין (that is what they mean אין דרכה לאכול אלא להלך [and certainly not to jump and eat]).

⁴ The ת"ק maintains that since it is ברה"ר even though it was מעל חברתה it is not considered ר"י ור"א, while ר"י ור"א agree with אילפא that it is considered רשות הניזק (since אין דרכה לאכול אלא להלך; see "Thinking it over' # 1.

⁵ See footnote # 4.

 $^{^6}$ See (ד"ה והביאור בזה) בית לחם יהודה אות קיז

⁷ See footnote # 2.