

If according to Rav; who says, etc.

אי לרב דאמר כולי –

OVERVIEW

אבנו סכיננו ומשאו of the משנה is intended to include צד השוה, which caused damage after they came to rest. When the גמרא considers the option that we are discussing a case of לא אפקרינהו, there is a discussion why there is a need for a צד השוה, according to שמואל. In some texts the גמרא asks the same question according to רב (who maintains that all אפקרינהו are derived from שור), why there is a need for a צד השוה, since it can be derived from שור. However תוספות maintains that this is an incorrect reading of the text and should be omitted. There was never a difficulty according to רב by לא אפקרינהו. According to רב we can be discussing a case of לא אפקרינהו and we derive it only through a צד השוה.

לא גרסינן כדפירשנו¹ לעיל:

We do not read in our text the phrase, 'אי לרב דאמר כולם משורו למדנו היינו שור'; as we explained previously.

SUMMARY

The text does not read אי לרב דאמר כולם משורו למדנו היינו שור.

THINKING IT OVER

Initially the גמרא asked בור לרב בין לשמואל היינו בור, and subsequently the גמרא reconsidered and said that אפקרינהו is not like בור, since by בור there is no כח (so we need the צד השוה). Let us say the same concerning רב, that initially the גמרא thought that by לא אפקרינהו we derive אסו"מ from שור, and subsequently we realize that it cannot be derived from שור alone (since שור is a בע"ח) and a צד השוה is required. Why cannot the גירסא be 'אי לרב וכו'?

¹ אסו"מ שהניחן בראש גגו. Even though רב maintains that כולם משורו למדנו, it does not mean that אסו"מ can be derived directly from שור. We can refute this מצינו, for שור is רוח חיים (and יש בו רוח חיים) which is not true for אסו"מ. Rather רב means to say that אסו"מ can be derived through a צד השוה from שור (let us derive it directly from שור), for according to רב we derive אסו"מ only through a צד השוה from שור, but not from שור alone.