

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Eating the equivalent of a large date

R' Pappa asked whether the large date mentioned in our Mishnah includes the pit or not.

R' Ashi asked: When the Mishnah in Oholos rules that a bone the size of a barley kernel transmits tum'ah, does that include the shell or not, and does it refer to a fresh kernel or a dried kernel?

It is noted that R' Pappa and R' Ashi were not bothered by each other's question.

Rava in the name of R' Yehudah explains that the date referenced in the Mishnah is larger than the volume of an egg and Chazal determined that this quantity of food puts a person's mind at ease.

The Gemara challenges Rava's assertion that the date referenced in the Mishnah is larger than the volume of an egg.

Two resolutions are presented.

In the second resolution, Rava submitted that fruit does not have to be eaten in a sukkah.

The Gemara's attempts to challenge and then find support for Rava's assertion fail.

R' Zevid maintains that the date referenced in the Mishnah is less than the volume of an egg.

An attempt to find support for R' Zevid from a Mishnah fails.

On the second attempt, the Gemara succeeds at demonstrating that the date referenced in the Mishnah is less than the volume of an egg. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What size bone transmits tumah?

2. Why did R' Gamliel eat dates and drink water in his sukkah?

3. Is one obligated to eat fruit in a sukkah?

4. What do the words *ואכלת ושבעת* teach?

Distinctive INSIGHT

The prohibition of eating on Yom Kippur—Is it when the food is in the mouth or after it is swallowed?

אלא מהכא עד כמה מזמנין עד כזית וכו' ואי ס"ד כותבת הגסה שאמרו יתירה מכביצה השתא כביצה שבועי משבעא דעתא לא מיתבא?

Minchas Chinuch (Mitzvah 316) inquires whether the benefit from food which is prohibited on Yom Kippur is that which is experienced when food is in one's mouth, or whether it is the benefit one enjoys when the food enters into one's stomach. The difference would be whether we calculate the food that is between the teeth and in one's gums towards the total amount consumed. Here, the mouth has enjoyed the food (as we find in Chullin 103b), but because this food has not been swallowed, the stomach has not benefited. Another case would be where half a *כותבת* was chewed and swallowed, but it was vomited out. Subsequently, the person ate an additional amount to complete the full volume of a *כותבת*. Here, a full *כותבת* has passed through the mouth. Yet because the first half was removed from the stomach before the second half was eaten, the stomach never was filled with a full *כותבת* at any moment.

Minchas Chinuch brings a proof to resolve this issue from our Gemara. In trying to determine whether a *כותבת*—a large date—is larger or smaller than an egg, the Gemara proposes an argument. We know that one who eats food the volume of an egg is satisfied (*משבעא*), while a date has the ability to soothe one's mind (*מיתבא דעתא*), although not fully satisfy one's appetite. We see, concludes the Gemara, that a date must be smaller than an egg. The volume necessary to "settle one's mind" happens earlier than the point of fully satisfying one's appetite. We see, posits the Minchas Chinuch, that the nature of consuming food on Yom Kippur is a function of filling one's stomach, because it is there that soothing one's mind or satisfying one's appetite occurs, and not just when food is introduced into the mouth. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Eating bread for the three meals of Shabbos

רבא אמר התם היינו טאמא משום דהווי ליה פירי ופירי לא בעו סוכה
Rava said the reason [eating two dates does not require a sukkah] is that they are fruit and fruit does not require a sukkah.

According to the Gemara's conclusion, all opinions agree that varieties of targima – תרגימא – could constitute a meal in a sukkah and the unresolved issue is whether fruit are included in the category of targima. Tosafos¹ writes that one should not conclude, based on this discussion, that one may fulfill the obligation of one of the Shabbos meals with varieties of targima. The reason for the distinction is that the obligation to eat three meals on Shabbos is derived from the appearance of the word היום in reference to the manna². Since the requirement to eat a meal is derived from the manna and the manna was eaten in place of bread, the seudah requirement must be to eat bread. Other Rishonim³, though, disagree and maintain that one does fulfill his seudah requirement with varieties of targima.

In addition to the dispute whether targima could be used for one of the Shabbos meals, the Beis Yosef⁴ rec-

ords differing opinions regarding the correct definition of targima. Rabbeinu Nissim and Rashi explain that targima refers to fruit. Tosafos, however, disagrees and defines targima as those foods that a person eats together with bread, such as meat and fish. Rabbeinu Asher, based on a Tosefta, defines targima as foods upon which the berachah of mezonos is recited.

Shulchan Aruch⁵ cites the different opinions and rules that the primary opinion follows the position that maintains that all the meals of Shabbos must include bread. Rema⁶, in the name of Maharil, rules that in a circumstance where one cannot eat bread, i.e. erev Pesach that falls on Shabbos, one may follow the lenient opinions. ■

1. ד"ה מיני כתב, "ואין ללמוד מכאן שיועילו מיני תרגימא להשלים שלש סעודות של שבת מדאמר הכא אם השלים במיני תרגימא יצא דשאני התם דילפינן להו מדכתב תלתא זימנין היום גבי מן שהוא במקום פת"
2. גמ' שבת קי"ז
3. ר"מ' שבת מד. ד"ה ואיכא וה"ר יונה ברכות לו: ד"ה בכרת
4. בית יוסף או"ח סי' רצ"א ד"ה ויש אומרים ומביא שם כל הדעות המובא הכא
5. סי' רצ"א סע' ה' וז"ל, "צריך לעשותה בפת, וי"א שיכול לעשותה בכל מאכל העשוי מאחד מחמשה מיני דגן, וי"א שיכול לעשותה בדברים שמלפתים בהם הפת כבשר ודגים אבל לא בפירות, וי"א דאפילו בפירות יכול לעשותה. וסברא ראשונה עיקרשצריך לעשותה בפת א"כ הוא שבע ביותר"
6. רמ"א שם וז"ל, "או במקום שא"א לו לאכול פת, כגון בערב פסח שחל להיות בשבת שאסור לו לאכול פת לאחר מנחה כדלקמן בהלכות פסח" וסי' תמ"ד סע' א' ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The protection of the Sukkah

מעשה והביאו לרבן יוחנן בן זכאי לטעום את התבשיל

Today's daf brings an anecdote about the stringencies observed by Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakkai and Rabban Gamliel regarding the minimum amount of food that would obligate a person to eat in a sukkah. We find, however, that Rav Tzadok held to the actual letter of the law regarding the amount of bread requiring a sukkah.

The Minchas Elazar, zt"l, explains why Rav Tzadok was not equally as stringent as the other sages mentioned. It is his example which teaches that one may be lenient and eat an amount that is less than the shiur outside the

sukkah. A sukkah represents the providential protection that surrounds the Jewish people, which is mainly in the merit of the great tzaddikim of the generation, and specifically those who lead the nation. It is crucial that such leaders be more stringent regarding this mitzvah and remain within the protection of the sukkah as much as possible. Although Rav Tzadok was truly righteous, he was not so responsible for the level of protection over the nation as a whole as the other two sages mentioned in the Gemara. Since he did not bear the yoke of the community on his shoulders, he did not have to be so stringent as Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakkai and Rabban Gamliel.

The Chazon Ish, zt"l, once said bitterly to his brother-in-law, Rav Shmuel Greineman, zt"l, "Heaven hid the de-

cree regarding the Holocaust from me. Because I did not know that the destruction of the Jews of Europe was looming ahead, I could not even make efforts to nullify the decree through prayer!"

When the subject arose on another occasion, the Chazon Ish explained one reason why many of the Gedolim (especially those outside of Europe) did not sense what was coming:

"As long as Rav Shimon Shkop, zt"l, and Rav Baruch Ber Liebowitz, zt"l, were still alive, it was absolutely impossible for the Nazis, ימ"ש, to conquer Lithuania. These tzaddilim exerted every breath in their study of Torah, לשמה, and this generated powerful protection for the entire country. It was only after they passed away that the Nazis overwhelmed Lithuania!" ■

