

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the Mishnah (cont.)

The Gemara analyzes the Beraisa that will prove that R' Yehoshua retracted his opinion as a result of R' Akiva's response.

Five different Amoraim offer explanations for R' Yehoshua's reference to "five dishes."

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah records another dialogue between R' Akiva and one of his teachers, R' Eliezer, regarding the number of chattas one brings for multiple Shabbos violations.

3) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara seeks to clarify the precise inquiry R' Akiva posed to R' Eliezer.

Rabbah offers the first explanation of the inquiry and suggests a proof to his inquiry.

Abaye suggests another interpretation of R' Akiva's inquiry.

R' Chisda offers a third explanation of R' Akiva's inquiry and suggests a proof to his interpretation. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What are the five different explanations of the term תמחויך ?

2. What is the point of dispute between R' Akiva and R' Eliezer ?

3. How does Rabbah explain R' Akiva's inquiry ?

4. What is R' Chisda's explanation of R' Akiva's inquiry ?

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 In loving memory of*

אלטר בן-ציון בן אהרן שמואל
 רבקה רחל לאה בת אלטר בן-ציון
 אסתר בת יצחק

Distinctive INSIGHT

Did R' Akiva accept the proof of R' Eliezer?

אמרתי לו הבהמה כשבת

In the Mishnah, R' Akiva asked R' Eliezer what the halacha would be in a case where someone violated several halachos of Shabbos, but all under one category of labor, and he did so over many weeks, without realizing his error in the meantime. R' Eliezer answered that in this case, a person would be liable for a separate chattas for each violation. The discussion in the Mishnah concludes with R' Eliezer bringing a proof to his contention from the case of bestiality, where each incident warrants a separate chattas, and R' Akiva responded by saying that the case of bestiality itself "is the same as Shabbos."

This final response of R' Akiva needs clarification, and Rashi refers to two approaches in the Gemara to explain it. The first explanation, that of Rabba, is that R' Akiva did not accept the answer of R' Eliezer, and he said that the halacha in the case of sinning with the animal was also unclear, just as he questioned the case of Shabbos violations. The second approach, that of Rav Chisda, is that R' Akiva accepted the answer of R' Eliezer, and his response was that he agreed that his question regarding Shabbos has now been resolved with the comparison to the case of the animal.

Shitta Mikubetzes notes that Tosafos challenges the explanation of Rashi to R' Chisda, that R' Akiva accepted the argument of R' Eliezer and the comparison to bestiality. It is clear from the Gemara that the question of R' Akiva was whether we say either that every Shabbos is a distinct event, or perhaps we say that the weekdays between each Shabbos serve as a period during which there must have been some element of awareness, thus separating each Shabbos as an event so that the violation of Shabbos each week would be a separate obligation. If this was the question of R' Akiva, then the comparison to bestiality and its separate chattas for each sin is not at all comparable to the situation regarding Shabbos. The violations of Shabbos are where the sins occurred a week apart, and it is precisely this distinction about which R' Akiva inquired. The case of bestiality does not involve separate entities of weeks or weekdays in between, so the proof of R' Eliezer would not have resolved the question of R' Akiva.

It must be, says Tosafos, that according to R' Chisda, R' Akiva accepted the proof of R' Eliezer, but not due to his argument in the Mishnah. It must be that he accepted the logic that each Shabbos is a separate entity, and that a separate chattas would be brought for each incident of violating Shabbos each week. The response of R' Akiva in the Mishnah of "Shabbos is like animals" was meant to mean that according to R' Eliezer's position that each sin with the animal warrants a separate chattas, it would indeed follow that this would be the case regarding Shabbos as well. However, R' Akiva himself did not necessarily accept this point. ■

HALACHA Highlight

Atonement for transgressions of a minor

שבע"פ שאין בהן עכשיו יש בהן לאחר זמן

Even though they only have one prohibition now there will be separate prohibitions at some later point

Terumas HaDeshen¹ reports that he was asked about a child who had cursed his father when the child was eleven years old. Additionally, around that same time he had testified falsely about someone and would like to repent for his transgressions. Terumas HaDeshen answered that a child is not subject to punishment for what he did even after he becomes as adult. Even if he had committed a transgression an hour before he became an adult he is not liable as the Gemara states (Yevamos 114a) that when a child eats non-kosher food Beis Din is not obligated to stop him. If he was subject to any sort of punishment for the transgressions that he commits as a child Beis Din would certainly be responsible to stop him from transgressing the prohibition. However, it seems evident from numerous places in Shas that it is detrimental for a child to have been the cause of wrongdoing; therefore, it seems that it is appropriate for this person to accept upon himself a course of repentance to be laid out by his local rov. This ruling is codified by Rema² and commentators cite differ-

ent sources for the principle that an adult should do something to atone for transgressions that he committed while a child.

Rav Shlomo Kluger³ in his commentary to Shulchan Aruch cited our Mishnah as proof to this principle. R' Eliezer cites as proof that one who does a single melachah on many Shabosos is liable for each transgression from the fact that one who is together with different underage niddos violates one prohibition since they as minors are not liable and yet he is liable for each transgression. R' Akiva rejects this proof because although at the moment the minors are not liable and do not commit separate transgressions, when they become adults they will certainly commit separate transgressions. Seemingly, the fact that when the minors grow up they will commit separate transgressions is irrelevant to what is happening now. Why then does R' Akiva focus on this point? It must be, asserts Rav Kluger, that when the girls become adults they will require some sort of atonement for the transgression that was committed while minors. It is that requirement that makes them separate prohibitions even now and for that reason it is not parallel to the case of one melacha transgressed on many Shabosos which will always constitute a single transgression. ■

¹ תרומת הדשן פסקין וכתבים ס"י ס"ב.
² רמ"א אר"ח ס"י שמ"ג סעי' א'.
³ חכמת שלמה שם. ■

STORIES off the

"Speak on Shabbos!"

"כלל גדול אמרו בשבת השוכח..."

We cannot begin to appreciate the greatness of singing zemiros during the Shabbos meals. Rav Shlomo of Karlin, ז"ל, highlights the importance of Shabbos zemiros with a statement on today's daf. "In Kareisos 16 we find, 'כלל גדול אמרו בשבת'. This statement itself can be read alternatively as, 'There is an important rule—speak on Shabbos.' This teaches that instead of being silent on Shabbos, one should use his voice to sing. As we find in Tehilim, 'למען יזמרך כבוד ולא ידום'. In

this context too, speaking up means singing."¹

Rav Aharon of Belz, ז"ל, learns a different lesson from this statement. "When one sees a Jew profane Shabbos he must never judge him harshly. He must follow the words of the Mishnah in Kareisos: 'כלל גדול בשבת כל השוכח'. This teaches an important rule: if one sees someone doing what is prohibited on Shabbos he should give him the benefit of the doubt. Perhaps he forgot!"²

Interestingly, the Imrei Chaim of Vizhnitz, ז"ל, would often quote this very same statement in a tone of amazement. "In Kareisos 16 we find the halachah of one who forgot it was Shabbos. I have never understood this. How can a Jew forget the holiness of Shabbos?"

After a momentary pause, he again spoke in a tone that expressed his disbelief. "How could a Jew actually forget that it is Shabbas kodesh?"³ ■

¹ שמע שלמה, ע"י קיי"ט

² בקדושתו של אהרן

³ מאיר החיים, ח"ב, ע"י צ"ז ■

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 as a zechus
 for a refuah sheleimah for*

אברהם גרשון בן ציפי

שושנה בת עליזה

דינה חיה שרה בת שיינע מירה