

## ואמר רבה זרק כלי מראש הגג –

**רבה said; one who threw a vessel from on top of a roof**

### OVERVIEW

The גמרא cited a ruling regarding זרק כלי מראש הגג. There seems to have been conflicting readings whether this ruling was made by רבה or רבא. Our תוספות clarifies this matter.

-----  
רבה גרסינן דרבא מספקא ליה לעיל (דף יז,ב) אי בתר מעיקרא אזלינן אי לא<sup>1</sup> -

**Our texts read רבה (not רבא); for רבא was previously unsure whether we follow the initial status or not -**

וקאמר דנפשוט מרבה<sup>2</sup> שהוא<sup>3</sup> רבו:

**And the גמרא suggested there that we resolve this query from a ruling of רבה who was the רבי of רבא.**

### SUMMARY

The text reads רבה (who was the רבי of רבא who had the query).<sup>4</sup>

### THINKING IT OVER

Perhaps those texts that read here רבא are גורס previously רבה, and they brought the ruling of רבא to resolve the query of רבה! What is תוספות proof?!

---

<sup>1</sup> רבא there posed a query; what if a בהמה trod on something and it did not break immediately, but rather it rolled away and broke later somewhere else; do we follow the initial trodding and so it is רגל which pays a שלם, or do we follow the actual breaking, which would make it צרורות and he would be liable only for a נזק חצי נזק.

<sup>2</sup> The גמרא there cited this ruling of רבה regarding זרק כלי מראש הגג to prove that בתר מעיקרא אזלינן. The גמרא there rejected this proof, saying that even though רבה resolved the issue; however by רבא it remained unresolved. In any event we cannot be גורס here רבא, for how would we then understand the גמרא there (especially the rejection of the proof [since it is רבא who both posed the query and made the ruling]).

<sup>3</sup> See 'Thinking it over'.

<sup>4</sup> See # 115. אוצר מפרשי התלמוד.