

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the dispute

The Gemara clarifies the circumstances in which R' Meir recognizes that one prohibition can take effect on an existing prohibition.

The Gemara wonders and explains why the Mishnah did not add the prohibition of piggul to the prohibitions one could violate in a single eating.

It is noted that according to R' Ada bar Ahava the Mishnah did indeed have a fifth case which was piggul.

It is suggested that they could have added the prohibition of consuming blood.

The reason this was not included is explained.

2) The laws of eruv and transferring

Rafram infers from R' Meir's wording that the laws of eruv and transferring do not apply on Yom Kippur.

This inference is rejected and the Gemara suggests an alternative context from which Rafram drew this conclusion.

This inference is also rejected.

3) MISHNAH: The Mishnah teaches that a single act of sexual relations could generate an obligation to offer six Chataos

4) Clarifying R' Meir's position

The Gemara explains how according to R' Meir all of these different prohibitions could take effect upon each other.

5) MISHNAH: The Mishnah presents other circumstances in which one could be liable for many Chataos for a single act.

6) Clarifying the Mishnah

The circumstances of the prohibition of one's father's wife are clarified.

7) One prohibition taking effect on another

The Gemara discusses the circumstances in which R' Yosi allows one prohibition to take effect on another prohibition.

8) MISHNAH: Additional cases of multiple violations are presented.

9) Multiple violations in a single act

R' Elazar in the name of R' Hoshaya asserts that R' Yochanan ben Nuri and Sumchus agree with one another's ruling that relates to multiple violations in a single act. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Carrying on Shabbos, carrying on Yom Kippur

אמר רפרם זאת אומרת עירוב והוצאה לשבת ואין עירוב והוצאה ליום הכיפורים, ממאי—שאני שעיר המשתלח וכו'

The Mishnah says that for a single episode of sinful eating there are up to four chattaos and one asham for which a person might be liable. R' Meir said that in addition to the sins mentioned, it is also possible to add even two more chattaos. If it would be Shabbos and Yom Kippur and a person had food in his mouth, he could be liable for transporting the food in his mouth from one domain to another.

Rafram notes that in order to add more chattaos, R' Meir introduced the factor of this scenario taking place on Shabbos, and he did not suffice with its being on Yom Kippur. This must mean, says Rafram, that R' Meir holds that carrying is only prohibited on Shabbos, but not on Yom Kippur. The Gemara refutes this proof, however, because it could be that carrying on Yom Kippur is indeed prohibited, but R' Meir wished to illustrate a case where a person who transports food in his mouth could be liable for both Shabbos and Yom Kippur.

The Gemara brings another possible context of Rafram's comments, a discussion in Yoma (66b), but his statement is once again refuted. The Gemara in Yoma is discussing permission given to the person who escorts the goat of Azazel on Yom Kippur on its way to be thrown over the cliff. This person is permitted to carry the goat, if necessary. Rafram comments that it must be that it is permitted to carry on Yom Kippur. Our Gemara quickly explains that it could be that there is a special dispensation given for this goat to be carried if necessary, as this is part of the service of the day, as indicated in the verse.

Tosafos points out that the Gemara (Yoma 66b) also refers to the statement of Rafram, but there it is not refuted. Tosafos resolves these discussions by noting that it is normal for infor-

Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. Explain איסור מוסיף and איסור כולל.

2. How much food can one's throat hold at one time?

3. Is it permitted to marry one's son's daughter-in-law?

4. What halachic principle is shared by R' Yochanan ben Nuri and Sumchus?

HALACHAH Highlight

The size of a person's throat

דאין בית הבליעה מחזיק יותר משני זיתים

A person's throat cannot hold more than the volume of two olives at one time

The Gemara states that Chazal calculated that a person's throat cannot hold more than the volume of two olives at one time. Mordechai¹ cites this teaching and wonders how Hillel was able to eat in his Korban Pesach sandwich an olive's volume of matzah, an olive's volume of Korban Pesach and an olive's volume of maror. He answers that the Gemara's statement that a person's throat cannot hold more than the volume of two olives at one time refers to eating whole pieces of something. If, however, one were to eat ground up food one's throat could hold the volume of three olives at one time. Accordingly, when Hillel would eat his sandwich he would chew the matzah, Korban Pesach and maror very well before he would swallow it so that he could swallow it all at once.

Machatzis HaShekel² was troubled by Mordechai's explanation. According to Mordechai the Gemara's question is that the Baraisa could have added another Chatas transgression. The reason the Gemara did not add the transgression of consuming blood was that a person cannot consume more than the volume of two olives at a time. According to Mordechai since it is possible for a person to hold the volume of three olives in his throat if it is ground up the Baraisa could have added the sixth transgression. Machatzis HaShekel answers by directing the reader to the comments of Tosafos Yeshanim³. In reference to the Gemara's declaration that a person's throat cannot hold more than the volume of two olives at one time

(Insight...continued from page 1)

mation to be given in one place in the Gemara, but not in another. "The words of Torah are poor in one place, yet rich in another." These discussions are not at odds with each other, and the Gemara in Yoma agrees that Rafram's view is not accepted for the halacha. The Gemara relies upon one who studies to know that in our Gemara his view is refuted.

Tosafos Yeshanim and Tosfos HaRosh also explain that the Gemara in Yoma did not refute the statement of Rafram because it relied on the conclusion of our Gemara. They add that it is possible to say that the Gemara in Yoma does not reject Rafram because the case could be where the one taking the goat out to the cliff was carrying the goat on his shoulders because the goat was weak or ill. That is why the Gemara there did not offer the answer given in our Gemara. It could therefore be that although one may not normally carry on Yom Kippur, the kohen was merely conducting the service as required. ■

Tosafos Yeshanim writes פירוש כדרך אכילה – meaning in the manner of eating. Chasam Sofer⁴ suggests that Tosafos Yeshanim was bothered by the fact that elsewhere (Yoma 80a) the Gemara indicates that one's throat could hold the volume of three olives. He then explains that Tosafos Yeshanim is answering that it is true that a person could chew his food very fine or force his throat to hold the volume of three olives, however, in the normal course of eating a person's throat will not hold more than the volume of two olives and the author of the Baraisa was referring to the maximum number of transgressions one can violate eating in the normal manner. ■

1. מרדכי פסחים קט"ו. ד"ה כורכן.

2. מחצית השקל או"ח סי' תפ"ו.

3. תוספות ישנים ד"ה אין.

4. שו"ת חת"ס או"ח סי' קכ"ז ד"ה תו. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The "Times"

ושלח ביד איש עתי

Rav Meir Shapiro of Lublin, ז"ל, was known for his endless love for every Jew, coupled with boundless energy to uplift the holy Torah. He did this in many ways, but he was most famous for starting the daf hayomi and building Yeshivas Chachmei Lublin. Rav Shapiro once said to another student. "As you know, I have no physical children. Nevertheless, I fulfill the mitzvah of procreation through my two spiritual offspring: daf hayomi and

Yeshivas Chachmei Lublin."¹

As a member of the Polish Sejm, he was a public person, constantly hounded by various journalists— especially Jewish journalists.

When one Jewish journalist was harassing him, asking his opinion about various items of lashon hara, Rav Shapiro rebuked him with a verse brought on today's daf. "You know, in Hebrew a journalist is called an עתונאי. Where do you think we find a hint to a journalist in the Torah? We find a reference to this profession regarding the scapegoat that was led out to its demise by an 'איש עתי' — a 'timely man.' And if you wonder why the hint is

found regarding the scapegoat, the answer is because the goat was a remembrance of all the sins of the Jewish people throughout the year. And, of course, the goat was sent out of the machaneh Yisrael—and it would be equally fitting to banish the tendency to constantly bring up the worst failings of other Jews..."

Interestingly, the Ruzhiner, ז"ל, said a similar thing regarding why we burn the candle used for bedikas chometz. "This candle was used to search for the negative in a Jew's home. For this reason, it is burned!"² ■

1. רבי מאיר אומר

2. כן שמעתי ■