

ובפלוגתא דרבי יוחנן וריש לקיש –

And in the dispute of *Rabi Yochanon* and *Reish Lokish*

Overview

The *ברייתא* ruled that if one took out food in a vessel and he also needed the vessel to be outside, he is *חייב* for the vessel as well. *רב* explained this *ברייתא* in a case where he was a *שוגג* regarding the food and a *מזיד* regarding the *כלי*. However *אשי* *רב* disagrees and explained that the *ברייתא* is in a case where he was a *שוגג* for both the *אוכלין* and the *כלי*; however he first became aware of one transgression and later he became aware of the other transgression. The *גמרא* concludes and this depends on the dispute between *ר' יוחנן* and *ריש לקיש*. There is a dispute between *רש"י* and *תוספות* whether this statement of *ור"ל* was made by the *דגמרא* (*רש"י*), or it was made by *רב אשי* (*תוס'*).

פירוש חייב שתי חטאות לרבי יוחנן כשנודע לו וחזר ונודע לו ידיעות מחלקות -

The explanation of *ור"ל* is that *רב אשי* is saying that in a case of *נודע לו* (*he first became aware of one transgression [the אוכלין for instance] and later became aware of the other transgression [the כלי]*), **he is liable for two חטאות, because according to ר"י, knowledge of a transgression after it was done, separates it from another transgression that he did בשוגג together with this transgression (of which he is now reminded) -**

ולריש לקיש¹ אחר שנתכפר² נודע לו על אחד³ -

And according to *ר"ל* he will be *חייב* two חטאות (for these two שגגות of *שגגת אוכלין* and *שגגת כלי*), **he became aware of the other שוגג** (for which he was not aware of when he brought the *קרבן* for the first שוגג).

פירש"י cites and disagrees with *תוספות*:

¹ *ר"ל* maintains that ידיעות are not מחלקות; if one did two אחד מלאכות בעולם and then he became aware of one of the *קרבן* חטאת, but he did not bring a *קרבן* חטאת for it, and then he became aware of the second שוגג, he brings one חטאת for both of them (even though there was a ידיעה בינתיים [after they were both done]), since he did them בשוגג בעולם. However *ר"י* maintains ידיעות שלאחר המעשה are מחלקות.

² The *גמרא* amends this to read, *נודע לו על אחד חזר ונודע לו על אחד*, (instead of *נודע לו על אחד*).

³ *רב אשי* is saying that it is possible to bring two חטאות for two שגגות that were done אחד בעולם (as the *ברייתא* states). According to *ר"י* this is possible if there was a ידיעה בינתיים (after he did both שגגות), since *ר"ל* maintains ידיעות מחלקות (who maintains מחלקות לחטאות) he will be *חייב* two חטאות only in a case where he already brought one חטאת for the one שוגג that he remembered; when he will remember the second שוגג he will need to bring a second חטאת, since כפרות are מחלוקת according to everyone. See 'Thinking it over'.

ופירוש הקונטרס⁴ אין נראה לרבינו יצחק דנהי דלית ליה לרב ששת ידיעות מחלקות -
And the ר"י does not agree to פירש"י, for granted that ר"ש does not maintain
- (ר"י agrees with ר"ל and disagrees with ר"ש) ידיעות מחלקות

מכל מקום יעמיד בנודע לו על האחד בשכבר כיפר דכפרה לכולי עלמא מחלקת:
Nevertheless ר"ש could have established the ברייתא by 'he became aware of one
'שוגג', in a case where he was already atoned for, since all agree (even ר"ל) that
כפרה separates.

Summary

are מחלקות according to everyone, so there is a possibility of bringing two
שוגג before he became aware of the other שוגג, if he brought a חטאת on one חטאת.

Thinking it over

assumes that the answer of רב אשי is valid both according to ר"י (in a case of
and according to ר"ל (where שנתכפר נודע לו);⁵ so why did רב
say (which is valid only according to ר"י), and did not say אחר
שנתכפר נודע לו (which is valid according to everyone)?!⁶

⁴ ובפלוגתא דר"י ור"ל, understands that the words, רש"י בד"ה ובפלוגתא ⁴
that the ברייתא, which said he is חייב twice, was in a case of נודע לו וחזר ונודע לו. The reason is
(according to רש"י) because רב ששת disagrees with ר"י and maintains that ידיעות are not מחלקות, so therefore even if it
was, he is still only חייב one חטאת.

⁵ See footnote # 3.

⁶ See אברהם.