

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Worshipping idolatry out of love or fear (cont.)

Rava responds to Abaye's attempt to prove that one is liable for worshipping idolatry out of love or fear.

2) Multiple forms of worship in one period of unawareness

R' Zakai cites a Baraisa that one who performs different forms of worship in one period of unawareness brings only one Korban Chatas.

R' Yochanan told him to take the Baraisa out of the Beis Midrash.

R' Abba explains the rationale behind the Baraisa cited by R' Zakai.

R' Yosef rejects this explanation.

Another challenge to R' Abba's approach is presented.

The Gemara presents a second version of the exchange between R' Zakai and R' Yochanan that relates to liability for multiple transgressions and inadvertent violations.

The Gemara analyzes the Baraisa until it finally identifies the meaning of the Baraisa and the point of dispute between R' Zakai and R' Yochanan. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why did R' Yochanan tell R' Zakai to take his Baraisa out of the Beis Midrash?

2. Explain the principle of **אומר מותר**.

3. In what way is Shabbos more severe than other mitzvos?

4. According to the second version, why did R' Yochanan ask R' Zakai to take his Baraisa out of the Beis Midrash if there is a reasonable explanation for the Baraisa?

Distinctive INSIGHT

The Torah is Precious for those who study it

דאמר רבי יוחנן מאן דמתרגם לי חבית אליבא דחד תנא מובילנא מאניה בתריה לבי מסותא

The Gemara reports that Rebbe Zakai taught a Baraisa in front of R' Yochanan, but R' Yochanan felt that the Baraisa was not accurate, and he told Rebbe Zakai not to teach it in this beis midrash. The Gemara then probed to determine what R' Yochanan felt was problematic with the Baraisa.

The Baraisa comprises two statements. The **רישא** states that the laws of Shabbos are relatively strict, in that a person can be liable for two offerings of chattas, one for each separate violation, even when the acts are performed at the same time. This is as opposed to "other mitzvos," where two simultaneous violations would result in having to bring only one chattas offering. The second part of the Baraisa (**סיפא**) notes that regarding "other mitzvos" one is required to bring an offering even if the violation was done by accident, as opposed to the halachos of Shabbos, where no chattas would be brought under these circumstances. The Gemara proceeds to analyze the particular situation in which the Baraisa speaks, both in its **רישא** and in its **סיפא**.

According to the conclusion of the Gemara, the Baraisa can only be understood if the **רישא** is contrasting the laws of Shabbos with those of avoda zara, while the **סיפא** is dealing with a contrast between the laws of Shabbos and other mitzvos. This is precisely why R' Yochanan rejected the Baraisa and told Rebbe Zakai that it was taught in error, and should not be learned in the beis midrash. In fact, R' Yochanan here is consistent with a similar remark he made in Bava Metzia in reference to a Mishnah, where he said, "Anyone who can explain the Baraisa of 'the barrel' (a Mishnah in Bava Metzia 41a) according to one Tanna, I will carry his clothes behind him to the bathhouse!" We see that R' Yochanan was not in favor of splitting up a Baraisa and of explaining one part according to one Tanna, and another part according to a second Tanna.

Regarding R' Yochanan's announcement, Rabeinu Chananel explains that if someone would be able to teach how our Baraisa or the Mishnah in Bava Metzia could be understood according to one consistent approach, R' Yochanan was ready to acknowledge his superiority in Torah knowledge, and that he would be willing to serve and assist him as a student does for his teacher. Hence, the reference to carrying his clothes behind him to the bathhouse.

מצפה איתן explains that the Mechilta in Parashas Mishpatim teaches that a master may not assign his Jewish slave to do degrading jobs, such as carrying his clothes be-

HALACHAH Highlight

Eating matzah and maror without intent

המתעסק בחלבים ובעריות חייב

One who is preoccupied in his eating of cheilev or having illicit relations he is liable

The Gemara draws a distinction between prohibitions that provide benefit and those that do not. Generally, if a person violates a prohibition while preoccupied – מתעסק – he is not liable. If the prohibition provides benefit, e.g. eating a prohibited food or having illicit relations, he is liable since he benefited from the transgression. This distinction is helpful to resolve a contradiction between two rulings of Rambam. Rambam¹ rules that a person who ate matzah without intent, for example, he was forced to eat matzah against his will, has fulfilled his obligation. In contrast, when discussing the laws of shofar Rambam² rules that one who blows the shofar while preoccupied does not fulfill the mitzvah. Either intent is necessary or it is not; why by matzah is intent not necessary but for shofar it is? Ran³ answers that since the mitzvah of matzah involves eating the mitzvah could be fulfilled even without intent since there is benefit for the one who is eating. By shofar there is no benefit one receives from hearing the shofar blast and thus intent is necessary to fulfill the mitzvah.

Shulchan Aruch⁴ cites Rambam's ruling that one fulfills the mitzvah of matzah even if one is forced to eat the matzah. Mishnah Berurah⁵ cites other authorities who disagree with

(Insight...continued from page 1)

hind him to the bathhouse. A student, however, must be prepared to do even such jobs for his rebbe who teaches him Torah, even tasks which are typically done only by a non-Jewish slave for his master. R' Yochanan proudly announced that he was eager to learn this Baraisa properly, and he would happily accord honor and esteem to the one who would teach it to him. ■

this ruling. Since we hold that mitzvos require intent there should be no difference between matzah and shofar. Although when it comes to violating a prohibition there is a rationale to obligate one who did not have proper intent since he benefitted from the prohibition, but when it comes to fulfillment of a mitzvah it is difficult to assume that benefit is synonymous with intent to fulfill the mitzvah.

Along the same lines Be'ur Halacha⁶ questions whether one who is forced to eat maror fulfills the mitzvah even according to Rambam and Shulchan Aruch. One could suggest that the rationale of Ran that intent is not necessary to fulfill a mitzvah is limited to matzah that one benefits from eating it. Maror which is bitter one could say that there is not an automatic benefit and as such the mitzvah would not be fulfilled if it was eaten without intent. ■

1. רמב"ם פ"ו מהל' חמץ ומצה ה"ג.
2. רמב"ם פ"ב מהל' שופר ה"ד.
3. ר"ן לראש השנה ז': ד"ה לפיכך.
4. שו"ע אור"ח סי' תע"ה סעי' ד'.
5. מ"ב שם ס"ק ל"ד.
6. ביאור הלכה סי' תע"ה סעי' ד' ד"ה כגון. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Protecting the honor of Shabbos

"זדון שבת..."

Today's daf discusses one who does prohibited labor on Shabbos.

The Chofetz Chaim, ז"ל, advocated protesting against flagrant Shabbos violation in his times. Nevertheless, he had certain general rules that he followed to ensure that his rebukes were as effective as possible. The first rule was to avoid protesting on Shabbos itself. He explained that while Jews are involved in sinning it is much more difficult to convince them to change. As the Mishnah famously states in Avos "עבירה גוררת עבירה" — One sin draws another in its

wake." When Jews are involved in sin, they find it much easier to sin again by disregarding the protestor—or worse, by falling into outright sinful behavior to retaliate. And the Chofetz Chaim would say that the inverse also holds true. The Chofetz Chaim would tell those who went around selling his sefarim to bring them to shuls after davening. He reasoned that after having davened with a minyan, people would be much more likely to do the mitzvah of purchasing a sefer on guarding their speech.¹

Not surprisingly, the Shabbos protests lodged by the Chofetz Chaim were very effective. On one occasion, he went to a certain city with his brother-in-law to raise money for the yeshiva in Radin. When he heard that the Jews there did

not keep Shabbos he wanted to leave immediately, but the locals begged him to remain so as not to shame their city. Instead of asking for donations from money tainted by chilul Shabbos, the Chofetz Chaim stayed a couple of weeks and gave three fiery derashos for the thousands of Jewish residents. In each of them he discussed the terrible ills of chilul Shabbos and the vast spiritual attainments of keeping Shabbos.

Later, when the Chofetz Chaim recounted this story to his son, he remarked, "Boruch Hashem, as a result of those derashos, three hundred stores closed for Shabbos! When people heard about this it made a great kiddush Hashem."² ■

1. הצדיק רבי שלמה, ע"י נ"ב
2. מכתבי הח"ח, קיצור תולדות חיינו, ע ע"ג