

And רבי יוחנן said that if he transgressed on all the מלאכות שבת ל"ט in one lapse of awareness, etc. – ואמר רבי יוחנן שאם עשאן כולם בהעלם אחת כולי

Overview

The גמרא asks that there is a contradiction between the ruling of איסי בן יהודה which states (in the original reading of his text) that for transgressing the ל"ט you are only קרבן חטאת חייב one; and the statement of רבי יוחנן which states that you are קרבן חטאת חייב a for all the מלאכות (that you transgressed). The unwritten question is; perhaps איסי argues with רבי יוחנן, so there is no contradiction.

In the previous תוספות ד"ה הא קמ"ל, תוספות maintained that the גמרא assumes¹ that איסי will not argue with the משנה in גדול כלל, that specifies the number of אבות מלאכות, in order to teach us (as רבי יוחנן states), that you are חייב for each מלאכה. Are we to understand that the contradiction between איסי and רבי יוחנן, which the גמרא poses here, is predicated on that assumption? פשט תוספות will say that there is no need to, because there is a better

It is not necessary to explain that the reason why there is a valid question, meaning that the contradiction between איסי and רבי יוחנן, cannot be explained away by simply saying that איסי argues with רבי יוחנן, and the reason why we cannot say this, is –

because we assume that איסי will not argue on דמסתמא לא פליג איסי עלה – משנה in גדול²; there is no need to say this, for we have a better explanation why we cannot say that איסי argues with רבי יוחנן

because we can derive this³ from the words of איסי himself – אלא מדברי איסי נמי יש לדקדק כן

since איסי also specifies the number of the אבות מלאכות – מדקתני מנינא

as the גמרא derives later in גדול כלל גדול – פרק כלל גדול, that the purpose of the משנה specifying⁴ the number of מלאכות is to teach us, that you are חייב on every מלאכה. The same applies to איסי, since he also specifies the number of מלאכות, by stating: "אבות מלאכות מ' חסר אחת", he must also maintain that you are חייב on each and every one, so how can he conclude (in his own statement): "ואינו חייב אלא אחת", which (beside being self contradictory) contradicts the (clear) statement of רבי יוחנן.

¹ When we corrected the text of איסי to read: "ואינו חייב על אחת מהן".

² See previous תוס' ד"ה הא קמ"ל.

³ That he agrees with רבי יוחנן.

⁴ Which is seemingly unnecessary, since we are able to count them on our own.

Therefore the גמרא concludes that we must change the text of איסי to read "חייב⁵ על אחת מהן", that (only) on one, he is not חייב.

Summary

Since איסי states the number of מלאכות, it is self evident that he maintains that you are חייב חטאת on all of them, certainly not just on one.

Thinking it over

1. What is the advantage of פשט actual תוספות over פשט proposed תוספות?
2. Why is it necessary to ask on איסי from רבי יוחנן, since איסי's statement itself is seemingly self contradictory?
3. Did איסי enumerate all the מלאכות ל"ט in his statement?

⁵ We cannot say that there is still a self contradiction in the statement of איסי; first he specifies the number of the אבות מלאכות, meaning that you are חייב on every one, and then he says that there is one מלאכה for which you are not חייב. This however is not a contradiction; because what he is really saying is, that from all the 39 מלאכות, on which you are חייב, there is one מלאכה, for which you are not חייב. If the text would have read however, that 'you are חייב only on one' (as the original text read), then the self contradiction is self evident (and that is what our current תוספות is referring to).

Following this logic, we could then say that even איסי למסקנא, is referring to שוגג and חטאת, and he would not be self contradictory, for he would maintain that you are חייב חטאת only on 38 מלאכות. This however would not agree with the previous תוספות where he derived from our גמרא that איסי is referring to סקילה and not חטאת; so how did the גמרא come to this conclusion that this is the opinion of איסי?

This is why in the previous תוספות, we were taught, that the גמרא assumes that איסי will not argue with the (interpretation of the) משנה in כלל גדול, which states that there are 39 אבות מלאכות, and therefore you are חייב חטאת on all of them without exception; so how does איסי make an exception? Therefore (if we accept this assumption) we must conclude that איסי is referring only to סקילה, but concerning חטאת he agrees with the משנה that he is חייב חטאת on all the מלאכות ל"ט. See מהרש"א תוס' ד"ה הא קמ"ל.

In our תוספות however, when we are discussing the original text of איסי there is no need for any assumptions, because we realize that the statement of איסי is self contradictory.