

**ליתני היודע עיקר שבת וכל שכן הא –**

**The משנה should teach us “if someone knows the essence of שבת”, but forgot that today is שבת, he is חייב אכל מלאכה and certainly in this case where he knew that today was שבת but forgot that the(ם) מלאכות are forbidden.**

### **OVERVIEW**

Our משנה states; that one who knows that today is שבת and did many מלאכות (not knowing that they are prohibited) on many (consecutive) שבתים he is חייב a קרבן חטאת for each מלאכה. רבא infers from the fact that the משנה here states that he is חייב (only) for each מלאכה, but does not say that he is חייב for each מלאכה for each שבת, that proves that our תנא maintains that מלאכה is חייב only once for each שבת, regardless on how many שבתים he repeated doing this מלאכה.

Our גמרא here, at this point, asks that this ruling of מלאכה should be taught in the case of שגגת שבת and we will certainly know it by שגגת מלאכות. שגגת מלאכות is שגגת מלאכות will ask that even though it is true that we will know שגגת מלאכות, but if the משנה would state this by דין שבת, then according to רבא we will assume that שגגת שבת is not חייב אכל שבת, since the משנה omits this clause of שבת חייב אכל שבת. However it is illogical to maintain that שגגת שבת is not חייב אכל שבת [and also, as the גמרא previously taught us, that if שבת חייב אכל שבת is שבת חייב אכל שבת, then certainly שבת חייב אכל שבת is שבת חייב אכל שבת].

-----  
**תימה לרבינו יצחק לרבא דאמר בכריתות בסוף פרק אמרו לא (דף טז,ב) –**

**This statement is astounding for the ר"י; according to רבא<sup>1</sup> who says in פרק אמרו לו at the end of מסכת כריתות:**

**דבזדון שבת ושגגת מלאכות לא מחייב אכל שבת ושבת –**

**that in a case where he knew it was שבת, but was unaware that certain מלאכות are forbidden, and he did these מלאכות on consecutive שבתים, without becoming aware that they are אסור he is not מחייב a קרבן חטאת for each מלאכה, שבת, but rather he is מחייב only one קרבן for each different מלאכה that he did, regardless of on how many שבתים he repeated this מלאכה.**

<sup>1</sup> In גורם רבה תוס' ד"ה וכו' ש"ס. See also next the גירסא מס' כריתות.

**ודייק ממתניתין דהכא דלא קתני חייב על כל אב מלאכה ומלאכה של כל שבת ושבת –** מסכת **and here in משנה** **infers this abovementioned ruling from our** רבא, since our משנה states that the הרבה בשבתות הרבה, which (according to the מסקנא) is the identical case of רבא, i.e. שבת ושגגת, but **since it does not state that he is חייב for each מלאכה for each שבת**, that proves that he is only חייב once for each מלאכה.

will now present the question:

**ולדידיה היכי פריך הכא ליתני היודע עיקר שבת הא לא מצי למיתני הכי –** **and according to** רבא who maintains that since the משנה says only **חייב אכל**, we may infer that he is not **חייב אכל שבת**, **how can** the גמרא **ask that the משנה should teach us the דין of שבת עיקר שבת**, which is **יודע עיקר שבת** וזדון, **but the משנה cannot state it in this manner**, of mentioning שגגת שבת instead of mentioning מלאכות שבת,

**דאם כן הוה משמע דלא מחייב היודע עיקר שבת אכל שבת ושבת –** **for if the משנה** would state that מלאכות שבת וזדון **is שגגת שבת**, **it would be implicit**, according to רבא **that one who is שבת עיקר שבת** i.e. שגגת, **is not חייב for each שבת**, for רבא is the one who infers from this משנה that since it does not say **חייב וכל של כל שבת**, therefore it means that he is not **חייב for each שבת**, but we cannot say this concerning שגגת שבת where certainly he is **חייב for each שבת** since the שוגג is in the שבת! Therefore how can the גמרא ask that it should state שגגת שבת instead of מלאכות שבת, since the משנה states that he is **חייב (only) for each מלאכה**; and not for each שבת, this ruling is appropriate for מלאכות שבת, but certainly not for מלאכות שבת וזדון שבת.

responds:

**ותירץ דהכי פריך וליתני היודע עיקר שבת דחייב אכל אב מלאכה של כל שבת ושבת –** **And the ר"י answered that this is what** the גמרא **meant to ask<sup>2</sup> that the משנה should teach us that שבת עיקר שבת is חייב not only for each מלאכה but also for each שבת<sup>3</sup>.**

offers another explanation to resolve the above question:

<sup>2</sup> The ר"י will insert a different understanding of the reading in the גמרא's question.

<sup>3</sup> We would then know that שגגת שבת is **חייב אכל שבת**, and we would also know for sure that מלאכות שבת is **חייב אכל מלאכה**. Whether we would also assume that שגגת מלאכות would be **חייב אכל שבת** may be questionable. See following תוס' ד"ה וכל"ש (footnote # 3).

**ורבינו שמשון בן אברהם מפרש –**

**And the רשב"א explains** that we may understand the question of the גמרא as it is written, without implying – as the ר"י suggested – that the גמרא intended for the משנה to change its text to include של כל שבת –

**דאי הוה תני בהדיא היודע עיקר שבת חייב על כל מלאכה –**

**For if the משנה would have explicitly stated: היודע עיקר שבת חייב על כל** – של כל שבת ושבת and not include the clause מלאכה

**ליכא למידק דלא מיחייב אכל שבת מדלא קתני חייב על כל מלאכה של כל שבת –** we cannot infer from the omission that he is not חייב for each שבת, the omission being since the משנה did not teach us that he is חייב for each שבת, so that proves that שגגת שבת is not שבת אכל שבת, because this really is no proof at all –

**דלא צריך למיתניה דמרישא שמעינן לה –**

**For it is not necessary for the משנה to teach us** that שגגת שבת is also חייב for each שבת **for we understand this from the רישא** of the משנה

**דקתני בהכיר ולבסוף שכח דחייב על כל שבת ושבת כל שכן יודע עיקר שבת –** where the משנה stated that where he totally forgot about the concept of שבת, nevertheless he is חייב for each שבת, even though it is difficult to consider him a שגגת שבת, since he is not presently aware that there is a שבת altogether, nevertheless we consider each שבת a separate איסור and he is חייב for each שבת **then certainly one who is aware of שבת**, but forgot that today is שבת, he will certainly be חייב for each שבת, for his שגגה was about the day of שבת and every שבת is a separate שגגה, for he could have reminded himself between the שבתים when שבת is. Therefore it is not necessary for the משנה to repeat itself, as it will be readily assumed that שגגת שבת is certainly שבת אכל שבת –

**כדאמר לעיל:**

**as the גמרא previously said** that if we were to know that הכיר ולבסוף שכח is חייב אכל שבת then we will certainly know that שבת אכל שבת is שגגת שבת. However once we conclude that שגגת שבת means, not מלאכות שבת, but rather שגגת שבת, then we certainly cannot assume that שגגת שבת is חייב אכל שבת, even if we know that שגגת שבת is חייב אכל שבת, because the שגגה stems from the שגגה, therefore it could very well be that שגגת שבת is חייב אכל שבת, because the שגגה is on the שבת, however שבת will not be חייב אכל שבת, since there was no שגגה concerning the day of שבת. Therefore if our תנא maintains that שגגת שבת is חייב for each שבת, he should have said so explicitly, and since he did not state that שבת אכל שבת, then רבא presumes that he is not שבת אכל שבת, but only once for each מלאכה.

## **SUMMARY**

offers two interpretations how we can understand the question גמרא's that the משנה should teach us that שבת is חייב אכל מלאכה, and yet not be concerned, that we would interpret this to mean that he is not חייב אכל שבת.

The explanation of the ר"י is simply that when the גמרא questioned that the משנה should teach us the דין of שבת it meant that the משנה should also read that he is חייב אכל מלאכה של כל שבת, there will therefore not be any margin of error.

The רשב"א, however maintains that the גמרא did not intend that the משנה should be reworded to include של כל שבת, because in the case of שבת there is no doubt that he is חייב אכל שבת, for we would derive it from the רישא, which states that הכיר ולבסוף שכה is חייב אכל שבת, and certainly שבת שגגת will be חייב אכל שבת for that is his שגגה. Only in a case of שבת זדון does רבא maintain that if the משנה omits the חייב אכל שבת, then we can infer, that זדון is not חייב אכל שבת, if the משנה omits the clause חייב אכל שבת, since there was no שגגת שבת.

## **THINKING IT OVER**

What are the points of contention (and agreement) between the ר"י and the רשב"א?