

**חזינן אי משום שבת קא פריש כולי –**

**We see; if he refrained because of שבת, etc.**

### **OVERVIEW**

רבא presented a query to רב נחמן; what would the ruling be if one was unaware that it is שבת (for which he is חייב only one קרבן) and was also unaware that these מלאכות are אסור (for which he is usually חייב for each מלאכה); is he חייב one קרבן or many. רב אשי replied that we need to ascertain what caused him to refrain from doing the מלאכה; was it because he was aware it was שבת (then he will be חייב only one קרבן), or was it because he became aware that this מלאכה is אסור (then he will be חייב for each מלאכה). There are various interpretations as to the meaning of רב אשי, which תוספות will discuss.

-----  
**פירש בקונטרס<sup>1</sup> שאמרו לו שבת היום ופירש –**

**רש"י explained that פריש קא שבת קא means that they told him, ‘today is שבת’, and he refrained from doing (more) work. In this case it is a שבת and he is חייב only one קרבן.<sup>2</sup>**

תוספות disagrees with רש"י and ask:

**– וקשה דשמא כי הוּא אמרי ליה נמי מלאכה היא היה פורש אפילו לא יזכירוהו שבת –**  
**And this explanation is difficult to understand, for perhaps if they would have told him, ‘this is a מלאכה’ he would have also refrained, even if they would not mention שבת to him.<sup>3</sup>**

תוספות offers an alternate explanation:

**– אלא נראה לרבינו יצחק דהכי פירושא אי משום שבת קא פריש –**  
**Rather it is the opinion of the ר"י that this is the explanation of אי משום –**  
**- שבת קא פריש**

**שאומר בעצמו<sup>4</sup> דאי הוּא מודעי ליה אשבת לבד היה פורש –**

---

<sup>1</sup> בד"ה אי

<sup>2</sup> (בד"ה ה"ג continues רש"י) However, if they told him this מלאכה is forbidden and he refrained, then it is considered מלאכות and he is חייב for each מלאכה.

<sup>3</sup> We cannot establish the person's שגגה by what he was told by others. There is no proof that he did the מלאכה because of שבת (or העלם מלאכה) by what the people reminded him. We need to ascertain what his שגגה is.

<sup>4</sup> See footnote # 5.

**That he – on his own - says, that if they would have informed him only regarding שבת he would have refrained from work -**

**ואי הוּ מודעי ליה אמלאכות לא היה פורש –**

**But if they would have informed him regarding the מלאכות that they are forbidden he would not have refrained from work -**

**אם כן העלם שבת עיקר שהוא היה שכוח יותר –**

**If this is indeed the case then the main cause of transgressing is the העלם שבת, for that was more forgotten than the מלאכות, since he claims that even if he was reminded of the מלאכות he would not refrain since even then he did not realize that it is שבת.**

פירש ר"י continues with תוספות

**ואי משום מלאכות פריש דשיילינן ליה<sup>5</sup> ואמר –**

**And if he refrained because of the מלאכות, meaning that we ask him and he says -**

**דאי הוּ מודעי ליה אמלאכות לא הוּ צריך לאודועיה אשבת –**

**That if they would have informed him about the מלאכות, it would not have been necessary to inform him about שבת -**

**ואי הוּ מודעי ליה אשבת הוּ צריך לאודועיה אמלאכות –**

**However, if they would have informed him about שבת it would still be necessary to inform him about the מלאכות, in this case -**

**הרי העלם מלאכות עיקר<sup>6</sup> וחייב על כל אחת ואחת –**

**The העלם מלאכות are the cause for his forgetfulness, so he will be חייב for each מלאכה.**

**אבל כששניהם שכוחות בשוה<sup>7</sup> מזה לא פשט כלום –**

**However in a case where he is equally unaware of both שבת and מלאכות, in this case רב אשי did not resolve anything as to what the ruling should be.**

**ולא בא רב אשי אלא לפשוט מקצת הבעיא –**

**And רב אשי came only to resolve part of the query -**

**כלומר לפעמים נוכל להבחין איזו העלמה עיקר –**

**Meaning that occasionally we may ascertain which is the main**

<sup>5</sup> It is not clear (to the translator) why here תוספות writes דשיילינן ליה, and previously (see footnote # 4) שאומר בעצמו תוספות.

<sup>6</sup> He is more unaware of the מלאכות that he is unaware of שבת, since even after he knows of שבת he is still unaware that these מלאכות are אסור (but when he was told about the מלאכות he realizes that it is שבת).

<sup>7</sup> This means that informing him about either שבת or מלאכות would have been sufficient, or informing him about either שבת or מלאכות would not have been sufficient unless he was informed of the other.

unawareness.

גירסא rejects an alternate תוספות

– ולא גרסינן מה שכתוב בספרים<sup>8</sup> –

**And we do not read in our text that which is written in other texts -**

ואי כי מודעי ליה אשבת אכתי צריך לאודועיה אמלאכות העלם מלאכות בידו כולי –  
'and if when they inform him about שבת it is still necessary to inform him about the מלאכות, then it is העלם מלאכות בידו etc. This גירסא is incorrect -

– דלפי מה שפירש רבינו יצחק אכתי הוה צריך לפרושי –

**For according to the explanation of the ר"י it was necessary for the גמרא to continue and specify -**

– וכי מודעת ליה אמלאכות לא הוה צריך לאודועיה אשבת –

**But when he is informed about the מלאכות, it is not necessary to inform him about שבת,** (only) in this case is it considered מלאכות. It is not sufficient to be considered מלאכות if we only know that if when they inform him about שבת it is still necessary to inform him about the מלאכות, because it is possible that the reverse is also true, that he was informed about מלאכות he would need to be informed about שבת (so their העלמות are equal).<sup>9</sup>

– אלא גרסינן ואי משום מלאכות קא פריש כולי –

**But rather the text read, 'and if he refrained because of מלאכות', etc.** We then interpret this to mean that he was more unaware of מלאכות than he was unaware of שבת.

גמרא continues with the conclusion of the תוספות

– וקאמר רבינא כלום פריש משבת אלא משום מלאכות כולי –

**And רבינא responded to רב אשי, 'does he then refrain because of שבת unless he is aware of the מלאכות, etc.'** – רבינא –

– כלומר כיון ששניהם שכוחים במה שזה שכוח יותר מזה לא נפקא מיניה מידי –

**Means to say that since both שבת and מלאכות are forgotten, it is irrelevant that one is more forgotten than the other -**

– אלא לא שנא ותרווייהו תבעי<sup>10</sup> –

**Rather there is no difference and the query applies in both cases.**

<sup>8</sup> In other texts (after 'ואי משום מלאכה קפריש וכו' (אי משום שבת קא פריש וכו') instead of reading 'ואי כי מודעי ליה אשבת אכתי צריך לאודועיה אמלאכות העלם מלאכות בידו כולי'.

<sup>9</sup> The ר"י maintains that רב אשי does not resolve the query when the העלמות are equal; only when one is more שכוח than the other.

<sup>10</sup> The query will remain unresolved when one is more שכוח than the other just like it is unresolved (even according to רב אשי) when the העלמות are equal.

תוספות offers an alternate explanation:

– **ורבינו שמשון בן אברהם מקיים גירסת הספרים**

**And the רשב"א substantiates the reading of the texts** (which תוספות previously rejected) -

– **ומפרש דרב אשי בא לפשוט דהעלם זה וזה** <sup>11</sup> **חייב** <sup>12</sup> –

**And the רשב"א explains that רב אשי is coming to resolve that זה וזה is העלם זה וזה** (in a case where he is equally unaware of שבת and מלאכות). רב אשי explains -

– **אי משום שבת כפריש שהשבת שכוחה יותר העלם שבת בידו** <sup>13</sup> –

**If he refrains from מלאכה because of שבת, meaning that שבת is more forgotten by him than מלאכות, then העלם שבת בידו and he is חייב only one.** <sup>14</sup>

– **ואי** <sup>15</sup> **כי מודעת ליה אשבת אכתי צריך לאודועי אמלאכות** –

**And if when you notify him about שבת it is still necessary to notify him regarding the מלאכות, then -**

– **אפילו אי כי נמי מודעת ליה אמלאכות צריך לאודועיה אשבת דהוי העלם זה וזה** –

**Even if the case would be that had you notified him of the מלאכות it would still be necessary to notify him about שבת, which is a proper case of העלם זה וזה** (because they are both equally forgotten), the ruling is that -

– **חשיב כהעלם מלאכות וחייב** <sup>16</sup> –

**It is considered as העלם מלאכות and he is חייב for each מלאכה.**

תוספות explains how we know to insert the reverse that it is an equal העלם:

– **וכן מוכח מדנקט לעיל אי משום שבת קא פריש** –

**And this is indeed evident** (that if he is informed about the מלאכות he still needs to be informed about שבת), **since previously רב אשי mentioned אי** (indicating that the [main] העלם is שבת – **משום שבת קא פריש**

– **והכא נקט אי כי מודעת ליה אשבת כולי** –

**However here רב אשי mentioned אי, etc., but he did not**

<sup>11</sup> The ב"ה inserts here the word בידו.

<sup>12</sup> The רשב"א disagrees with the ר"י who maintains that רב אשי is not resolving the query in a case where the העלמות are equal (only in a case where one is more שכוח). [See (תוספות) by footnote # 7.] According to the רשב"א there is a resolution even in a case where the העלמות are equal.

<sup>13</sup> This explains the first statement of רב אשי saying; אי משום העלם שבת קא פריש הרי העלם שבת בידו ואינו חייב אלא פירוש ר"י. This is similar to the אהת.

<sup>14</sup> רב אשי responded to this statement of רב אשי that משום מלאכות אלא משום שבת. This can be understood as תוספות explained it previously; that it is irrelevant which is more forgotten; in all cases (since רב אשי maintains that העלם זה וזה is חייב then even if פריש קא פריש (משבת) he should be חייב for each מלאכה.

<sup>15</sup> Here begins the גירסת הספרים which תוספות rejects and the רשב"א accepts. The words (in the next line), אפילו..., are inserted by the רשב"א and are not part of the גירסת הספרים. (See footnote # 8.)

<sup>16</sup> Obviously, if העלם מלאכה is more forgotten than העלם שבת, he will be surely חייב אכל מלאכה.

mention פריש exclusively because of מלאכות, but rather he is equally unaware of שבת and מלאכות.

anticipates a difficulty:

– והא דקאמר כלום פריש ממלאכות אלא משום שבת<sup>17</sup> –

**And that which רבינא asked רב אשי, 'is he not refraining from מלאכות only because of שבת', so he should not be חייב for each מלאכה even if he was פריש משום מלאכות?**

responds:

הכי פירוש<sup>18</sup> אלא משום שבת ותהא שגגת שבת עיקר ולא מיחייב אלא חדא –

**This is the explanation of רבינא; he is not פורש because he is aware that these are מלאכות but rather he is פורש only because it is שבת, so therefore the שבת שגגת should be the main and therefore he should only be חייב one קרבן.**

דבענין אחר לא הוה פריך מידי כיון דבשניהן שוה חייב על כל אחת:

**For if we were to interpret רבינא differently<sup>19</sup>, he would not be challenging רב אשי at all since רב אשי maintains when שבת and מלאכות are both equal (העלם), he is חייב a קרבן for each מלאכה. Therefore we must interpret רבינא to mean that שבת is the main שגגה and it cannot be considered זה וזה and he should be חייב only one.<sup>20</sup>**

## SUMMARY

רש"י maintains that אי משום שבת קפריש means that he was informed that it is שבת (and similarly מלאכות, that he was informed that these are מלאכות). The ר"י maintains that it depends on which was more forgotten שבת (one) or מלאכות (many). However רב אשי has no resolution if they were שכוה. The רשב"א maintains that if they were שכוה (according to רב אשי) he is חייב for each מלאכה.

<sup>17</sup> This question by רבינא indicates that he understood רב אשי to be saying that if he was מלאכות (meaning that he was told that these are מלאכות) he is חייב אכל אחד (but not that even after he was informed about שבת he needs to be informed about מלאכות). This seems to follow תוספות view and not the רשב"א.

<sup>18</sup> רבינא did not mean (when he said משום שבת אלא משום שבת) that (מלאכות are not the only cause since שבת is also a cause, but rather that in any event שבת (in essence) is the only cause why he is פריש. According to רב אשי we were always aware that שבת and מלאכות were equal causes.

<sup>19</sup> See previous footnote # 18.

<sup>20</sup> See footnote # 14 (and 'Thinking it over').

### **THINKING IT OVER**

According to the רשב"א the first question of רבינא that כלום פריש משבת וכו' was that he should be חייב for each <sup>21</sup>מלאכה, while the second question of רבינא that כלום פריש ממלאכות וכו' was that he should be חייב only one <sup>22</sup>קרבת. How can we reconcile the seeming inconsistency?<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> See footnote # 14.

<sup>22</sup> See footnote # 20.

<sup>23</sup> See מהר"ם.