

והלכה כרבי שמעון בגרירה –

And the ruling is like *Rabi Shimon* by dragging

Overview

אביי stated that רבה, his רבי, always followed the ruling of רב, except for three cases, in which he followed the ruling of שמואל. One of these cases is the case of גרירה (dragging)¹ that it is permitted (like ר' שמעון). Our תוספות explains how we know that ר' יוחנן (who [seemingly] also follows the ruling of ר"ש) followed the ruling of שמואל, perhaps he was following the ruling of ר"ש.

תוספות asks:

קשה תיפוק ליה משום דרבי יוחנן סבר כרבי שמעון -

There is a difficulty, why did אביי state that רבה followed the view of שמואל regarding גרירה (that a דבר שאין מתכוין מתיר like ר"ש) when **we can derive** that the ר"ש is like ר"ש **because ר"י agrees with ר"ש** –

תוספות proves that ר"י rules like ר"ש that דשא"מ is permitted:

דפריך בכמה דוכתי (שבת דף פא, ב) והא אמר רבי יוחנן הלכה כסתם משנה -

For the גמרא asks in many places, 'but ר"י maintains that the הלכה is (always) like an anonymous משנה'; and the גמרא continues there in מס' שבת -

ותנן נזיר חופף ומפספס³ כולי אלמא סבירא ליה דדבר שאין מתכוין מותר -

'And a משנה teaches, 'a נזיר may comb and separate, etc., his hair'. It is evident that ר"י maintains דשא"מ is permitted –

תוספות answers:

יש לומר שמא רבי יוחנן לא סבר לה כוותיה בגרירה -

One can say, perhaps ר"י does not agree with ר"ש regarding גרירה, even though he

¹ ר' שמעון rules that on שבת, one may drag a chair or a bench, etc. across the ground even though it is possible he will make a trench/furrow (which is the מלאכה of חורש [בונה] or חורש), as long as he does not intend to make a trench. This is known as a דבר שאין מתכוין, which is permitted according to ר"ש (and forbidden [מדרבנן] according to ר' יהודה). שמואל rules like ר"ש that it is permitted.

² There is an accepted rule that generally we always follow the view of ר' יוחנן ([even] when he argues with רב or שמואל [see עירובין מז, ב and ביצה ד, א]). Therefore, we should assume the reason רב agrees with ר"ש is not on account of שמואל, but rather because of ר"י!

³ A נזיר is not permitted to cut his hair; however, he may comb it (with his fingers), even though it is possible that by combing it, some of his hair will fall out, nevertheless since he is אין מתכוין, he has no intent to remove hair, it is permitted. This is a classic case of דבר שאין מתכוין מותר, and it is written in a משנה. The גמרא in שבת derives from this משנה that ר"י agrees with ר"ש and maintains דשא"מ מותר. The question remains why are we saying that רבה followed ר"ש, when it seems more likely that he followed שמואל.

generally maintains דשא"מ מותר. The reason he disagrees by גרירה is -

לפי שקרוב לעשות חריץ ודמי לפסיק⁴ רישיה:

Since it is likely that he will make a trench and it is similar to פסיק רישיה.

Summary

It is possible to maintain מתכוין מותר דבר שאין מתכוין מותר, and nevertheless forbid גרירה since it is similar to a פסיק רישיה (for it is so likely to happen).

Thinking it over

ר"ש (the אמורא) argues that ר"י (the תנא) permits גרירה explicitly (גורר אדם וכו'), so how is it that ר"ש (the תנא) agrees with ר"י that דשא"מ מותר, except for גרירה. However, ר"ש (the יוחנן) argues with ר"י (the תנא)?!

⁴ There is a rhetorical expression, פסיק רישיה ולא ימות, meaning, can you chop off its head and it will not die. One cannot say, 'I want to chop off the head of this chicken (on שבת) in order that my child should play with it, but I have no intent to kill the chicken'. Even ר"ש agrees that in such a case of פס"ר, since the איסור מלאכה is inevitable, there is no concept of דשא"מ and it is forbidden (מה"ת). It is the view of ר"י (that even though דשא"מ is generally מותר) that in this case of גרירה, the likelihood of making a trench is so high that it is like a פס"ר, and therefore forbidden. However, שמואל ruled explicitly by גרירה like ר"ש that it is permitted and it is not considered a פס"ר.