

Rav Yitzchok challenged it

מתקיף לה רב יצחק -

Overview

The גמרא first cited the view of אב"י that **כל העושה על דעת ראשונה הוא עושה**, so therefore even if he forgot that he was מצניע and carried it out סתם he is חייב. The גמרא then cited the view of שמואל ר"י **than one is חייב for carrying out one wheat kernel for planting**. Then the גמרא cited the question of יצחק ר'. There is a dispute between רש"י and רב יהודה whether the question of יצחק ר' is on אב"י or on יהודה תוספות.

פירש בקונטרס¹ דפריך אב"י -

– אב"י explained that the objection of רב יצחק was directed towards רש"י

רש"י disagrees with תוספות

וקשה דאמאי נטר ליה עד הכא² -

And there is a difficulty with פרש"י, for why did the גמרא wait until now to cite the objection of רב יצחק –

תוספות offers his interpretation:

ואומר הרב פור"ת³ בשם רבינו שמואל⁴ דאדרב יהודה אב"י פריך -

ר' יצחק בריה דרב יהודה that רבינו שמואל says in the name of הרב פור"ת And challenged his father רב יהודה -

והכי פירושו כיון דאמרת דמוציא חטה אחת לזריעה חייב אף על פי שאין רגילות -

And this is the explanation of his question; since you (רב יהודה) said that one is חייב for carrying out one wheat kernel for planting, even though it is unusual, and the reason is -

משום דבתר מחשבתו אזלינן -

Because we follow his intention -

הכא נמי כשחישב להוציא כל ביתו ניזול בתר מחשבתו ולא נחייבנו בפחות⁵ -

So here too when he intended to take out his whole house, we should follow his intent and not hold him liable for less than he intended -

¹ See אלא מעתה. דמתני' בדעתיה תלינן כדקאמרת משום דעל דעת ראשונה מחשבת ליה שיעורא, רש"י ד"ה אלא, this is the view of אב"י that we follow ראשונה.

² The גמרא should have cited ר' יצחק's question right after אב"י's statement, and not wait until after the statement of ר"י. See 'Thinking it over' # 2. אמר שמואל.

³ This may be ר' יוסף בן משה מטרו"ש (See # 2 שם הגדולים אות פ' (רב"ש) of the תלמיד ר' יוסף בן משה מטרו"ש and was called פור"ת based on the פסוק (in מט"כ, כב) which reads יוסף (יחי) (בראשית) (בן פורת יוסף).

⁴ This is presumably the רשב"ם (and תוספות does not write רש"י [see footnote # 3]).

⁵ When he intended to remove everything from his house, but he actually removed less, he should not be חייב, since it is not what he intended. The question seems to be that just as we follow his intention לחומרא, we should also follow it לקולא.

כיון דפחות מיכן אינו חשוב בעיניו -

Since that less than this amount (his whole house) is not significant in his eyes.

This was the התקפה of ר' יצחק -

ומשני⁶ התם בטלה דעתו אצל כל אדם דאין אדם שלא יהא חשוב בעיניו פחות מכך -

And the גמרא answered; 'there (when he intended כל ביתו) his mind is nullified by all people, for there is no person that even less than his entire house would not be significant -

אבל הכא⁸ יש בני אדם שחשובה להם חטה אחת לזריעה:

However here (by the case of ר"י אמר שמואל) there are certain people that even one wheat kernel is significant for them to plant it.

Summary

The מתקין ר' יצחק is on אב"י (according to רש"י), and on רב יהודה (according to תוס').

Thinking it over

1. Why does תוספות cite the גמרא's answer;⁹ is it any different according to תוספות than according to רש"י?!

2. According to תוספות could ר' יצחק have asked on אב"י (as well)?¹⁰

3. רש"י understands¹¹ ביתו כל ביתו to mean that he is taking it out in one time; does תוספות agree with that?

4. Presumably by a majority of people one חטה is not significant; is the difference then whether it is all people (by כל ביתו) or a majority of people (by חטה אחת)?

⁶ See 'Thinking it over' # 1.

⁷ All people would find that much less than his entire house is significant; therefore אצל כל אדם.

⁸ Seemingly תוספות is answering that a מחשבה can make something insignificant into something significant (it is significant for the person for whom it is significant), but a מחשבה cannot make something significant into something which is not significant (even for a person who deems it insignificant).

⁹ See footnote # 6.

¹⁰ See (footnote # 2 and) מר דרור and אור החמה.

¹¹ See רש"י ד"ה הישב.