



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Shabbos Daf Ayin Beis

- **Ulla** said, according to **R' Tarfon** who says that one need not have definite knowledge of wrongdoing to bring an "asham vadai" (a definite asham, as opposed to an "asham talui" which is brought for possibly being oiver an aveirah), if one is mezaneh with a "shifcha charufah" (a slavewoman who was designated to marry a particular slave, with whom an act of znus requires that an asham be brought) multiple times b'shogeg, even over different periods of unawareness, he only needs to bring one asham. **R' Tarfon** can be said to hold this way, because he says that knowledge is not critical for a definite asham, which means that he holds that knowledge is not significant with regard to ashamos. If so, knowledge will also not separate the acts of znus to make them be chayuv in multiple ashamos.
 - **Q: R' Hamnuna** asked, if one were to be mezaneh with this shifcha, designate an animal for an asham, and then say to the Kohen, "Do not offer the korbon yet, because I am going to be mezaneh with her again", are you telling me that one asham would suffice in this case as well? **A: Ulla** answered, an act done after designation of the animal is certainly different than an act done after knowledge. An act done after designation would definitely require an additional asham.
- **R' Dimi** said, according to **R' Akiva** who says that one needs to have definite knowledge of wrongdoing to bring an "asham vadai", if one is mezaneh with a "shifcha charufah" multiple times b'shogeg, over different periods of unawareness, he needs to bring multiple ashamos. **R' Akiva** can be said to hold this way, because he says that knowledge is critical for a definite asham, which means that he holds that knowledge is significant with regard to ashamos. If so, knowledge will also separate the acts of znus to make them be chayuv in multiple ashamos.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, with regard to a chatas, knowledge is certainly required for it to be effective, and yet we have a machlokes between **R' Yochanan** and **Reish Lakish** whether or not knowledge separates acts done b'shogeg to require multiple chataos. **Reish Lakish** says that only one chatas would be required, and would therefore say that only one asham would be required in this case as well!? **A: R' Dimi** remained quiet. **Abaye** said, maybe you are being quiet because you were referring to a case where the acts were done after designation of the asham, in which case even **Reish Lakish** would agree that multiple ashamos are required. **R' Dimi** said, that was what he was referring to.
- **Ravin** said 3 statements: 1) All agree that sometimes multiple acts of znus with the shifcha require only one asham (like **Ulla** said, that according to **R' Tarfon** even **R' Yochanan** would agree that since knowledge is not significant for ashamos, knowledge will not necessitate multiple ashamos); 2) All agree that sometimes multiples acts of znus with the shifcha require multiple ashamos (even **Reish Lakish** would agree that acts done after designation of an animal for the asham require an additional asham); 3) There is a disagreement regarding the case of the shifcha (according to **R' Akiva** who holds that knowledge is significant with regard to ashamos, **R' Yochanan** would say that knowledge between acts would separate the acts for asham liability, and **Reish Lakish** would say that knowledge never separates acts for separate korbon liability).
- If one intended to lift a knife from the ground, and as he was lifting it he cut produce off the ground, he is patur (because he wasn't even intending to cut anything, so it is not even called a shogeg). If one intended to cut an item which was detached from the ground and he mistakenly cut something that was attached to the ground, **Rava** says he is patur (because he did not intend

to cut something which was assur), and **Abaye** says he is chayuv a chatas (because he did intend to cut something).

- **Rava** brings a proof from a Braisa which says, 1) Shabbos is more stringent than other mitzvos in that one who is oiver Shabbos twice in one period of unawareness is chayuv 2 chataos, but with other mitzvos, one who is oiver twice in one such period is only chayuv one chatas. 2) On the other hand, other mitzvos are more stringent than Shabbos in that one who is oiver other mitzvos b'shogeg without any intent is still chayuv a chatas. One who is oiver Shabbos b'shogeg and without any intent is patur.
 - The Gemara tries to explain the Braisa before discussing the point it was brought down for. In the first part of the Braisa, what are the "other mitzvos" that one can be oiver twice and only be chayuv one chatas? It can't be that he ate cheilev and blood, because then he would be chayuv 2 chataos. It can't be where he ate 2 pieces of cheilev and that's why he is only chayuv one chatas, because the comparable to Shabbos would be where he does the melacha of "cutting" twice, in which case he would only be chayuv one as well!? Rather, the case refers to avodah zarah. If he worships an avodah zarah in a few ways, he is still only chayuv one chatas.
 - This must mean that the second part of the Braisa is also discussing avoda zarah. That would mean that one who does avodah zarah b'shogeg and without any intention is chayuv. How is that so? If he bowed down to an avoda zarah thinking it was a shul and he had in mind to bow to Hashem, he would not be chayuv! If he bowed to a statue of the king, if he accepted it as a god, he is a meizid. If he didn't, then it is not avodah zarah at all! If it is talking about where he bowed to an idol out of love or fear for someone else, and that's when he is chayuv, that only follows **Abaye** who says one is chayuv in such a case, but according to **Rava**, this person would not be chayuv! If we say it is discussing where one thought it is permitted to worship idols, and he is still chayuv, that would mean that the Braisa is saying that if someone thought he is allowed to be mechalel Shabbos he would be totally patur. That is not true! We discussed whether one who didn't know that it was Shabbos is chayuv one or many chataos, but totally patur was never a thought.
 - It must be that when the first part of the Braisa discusses "other mitzvos" it refers to avoda zarah and the "other mitzvos" in the second part of the Braisa refers to some mitzvos other than avoda zarah. For example, when someone thought he was eating kosher fats and ate cheilev, he will be chayuv. But, with regard to Shabbos he is patur. That must mean that if he intends to cut a detached plant and cuts an attached plant, he would be patur. That would be a proof to **Rava**!
 - **Abaye** would say that the "other mitzvos" referred to in the second part of the Braisa refers to where one thought he was swallowing saliva and it turned out to be liquid cheilev, and he is chayuv. However with regard to Shabbos he would be patur – meaning that if he picked up a knife and unintentionally cut an attached plant as he was lifting the knife, he is patur. However, if he intended to cut a detached item and mistakenly cut something that was attached to the ground, he would be chayuv.