



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying R' Meir's position (cont.)

The Gemara proves that R' Meir expresses a stringent position.

2) Eating a pras

Ravnai in the name of Shmuel makes a statement regarding eating within the time it takes to eat a pras.

R' Pappa clarifies the intent of this statement.

On the second attempt the Gemara refutes Ravnai's ruling.

Different parts of the second cited Baraisa are clarified.

The Gemara records a more lengthy analysis of the Baraisa's ruling that a child remains tahor even if he nurses from a woman who became tamei from a corpse.

A statement in the Mishnah is clarified.

3) Drinking wine and entering the Beis HaMikdash

A Baraisa presents a three-way dispute concerning the details of the prohibition of entering the Beis HaMikdash after drinking wine.

The rationale for each position is explained.

R' Yehudah bar Achorai rules in accordance with R' Elazar's opinion.

A practical application of this ruling is identified.

A Baraisa discusses the types of halachic decisions that may not be rendered after drinking wine.

A related Baraisa is cited that seemingly follows R' Yosi bar Yehudah's position rather than Rabanan.

It is explained how the Baraisa could even accord with Rabanan.

Rav rules in accordance with R' Yosi bar Yehudah's position.

Rav's position on this matter is challenged and clarified.

4) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the possibility of becoming liable for multiple chattaos for a single eating. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. How does R' Pappa explain Ravnai's ruling?

2. Why does a baby who nurses from a t'meiah mother remain tahor?

3. What is the point of dispute between Tanna Kamma and R' Yehudah?

4. How many chata'os could you be obligated to offer following the consumption of one olive's volume of food?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Entering the courtyard and performing a service while intoxicated

אכל דבילה קעילית ושתה דבש וכו' ונכנס למקדש ושימש

The Baraisa teaches that if a kohen were to eat a fig from Kei'la, or if he were to drink honey or milk and then enter into the Mikdash, he would be liable for lashes for having entered the Mikdash while intoxicated. The author of this statement is identified to be R' Yehuda, who says that the prohibition of consuming intoxicating beverages and foods is not limited to products from grapes. Tosafos adds that a kohen would only be in violation of this halacha if he entered into the Mikdash and performed a service while intoxicated. It is noteworthy that our Gemara actually has this stated in the Baraisa itself, which reads, "If a kohen entered the Mikdash and served..." The comment of Tosafos indicates that his text in the Baraisa did not have this written explicitly. Tosafos states that the Toras Kohanim (Shemini 1) is his source that lashes are only meted out for a kohen who performs a service. There, Rebbe associates the entry while intoxicated with a kohen's entering only after having properly washed his hands and feet. The requirement for a kohen to wash is only for the purpose of the service, so we learn that the issue of being intoxicated is only during a service.

Rambam (Hilchos Bi'as Mikdash 1:15) rules that a kohen who is intoxicated is in violation of this halacha as soon as he enters into the area of the courtyard beyond the Altar, even if he has done no service. A kohen who is eligible for the service may not present himself in a state of disgrace. We see that the kohen is punishable even without performing the service.

Ramban (Vayikra 10:9; also cited by Kesef Mishneh) agrees with Tosafos, as he says that a kohen's entering the courtyard while intoxicated without having done any service is only prohibited rabbinically, and he is liable from the Torah only after having performed a service. Ramban notes that the Toras Kohanim which connects the timing of washing and the law of a kohen being intoxicated can be explained by Rambam not to refer to the kohen's actual performing a service, but to limit the law of a kohen's being intoxicated to daytime hours, when the service may be performed. Ramban himself would explain as did Tosafos, that a kohen is only liable if he performs a service while intoxicated.

HALACHAH Highlight

Sick patients eating on Yom Kippur

התירו לה לעוברת לאכול פחות מכשיעור

They permitted a pregnant woman to eat less than the minimum amount

The Gemara discusses a pregnant woman eating small amounts of food that do not violate the Biblical prohibition when there is danger. Shulchan Aruch¹ rules that when feeding pregnant woman or people who are ill on Yom Kippur, they should be given amounts smaller than the shiur so that they do not eat the minimum amount that could violate the Biblical prohibition against eating. After each eating they should wait the amount of time it takes to eat four volumes of eggs – *kdei achilas peras* – before eating another bit of food. The Brisker Rov² in the name of his father asserted that Shulchan Aruch's ruling about giving someone small quantities of food spread out over time in order not to violate the Biblical prohibition applies only for someone who is ill but is not yet in a life-threatening condition. It is just that the doctor is concerned that if the patient does not eat his condition will worsen and he could become an ill patient whose life is in danger. In such a circumstance since one could feed the patient in a manner that does not violate the Biblical prohibition and still provide the patient with the necessary nutrients this course of action should be fol-

(Insight...continued from page 1)

Aruch LaNer had a text in his Baraisa similar to our text, where the Baraisa says that a kohen is liable only if he enters and does a service. Accordingly, Aruch LaNer, based upon this Baraisa, challenges Rambam, who says that a kohen is liable as soon as he enters the courtyard area near the Altar, even without doing a service. Rambam obviously did not have the text which explicitly says that the liability is only after performing a service. ■

lowed. A patient whose life is already in danger follows a different set of standards. Anything the patient could eat or drink that will improve his condition and strengthen him may be consumed on Yom Kippur regardless of quantity or the duration of time it takes to consume the food.

Rav Tzvi Pesach Frank³ disagreed with this position and wrote that one should not be lenient with patients whose lives are in danger and feed them as much as they want as often as they want if one could effectively provide them with the necessary nutrients without violating the Biblical prohibition. He explains that the lenient position is based on a Magid Mishnah but Beiur Halacha observes that many Rishonim disagree with Magid Mishnah, therefore, one should not rely upon the lenient opinion as expressed by the Brisker Rov. ■

1. שו"ע או"ח סי' תר"י"ח סעי' ז'.
2. חידושי מרן הר"יז הלוי הלי' שביתת עשור.
3. מקראי קדש ימים נוראים סי' מ"ב. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

A New Soul

את כל החוקים אלו מדרשות

Many wonder how it became the norm for a bar mitzvah boy to deliver a derashah on his big day. And what about a young man who has a hard time? Must we really push every hapless young man to attempt to give a derashah?

The Kaf HaChaim, zt"l, explains this custom and deals with what should be done if giving a derashah is difficult for the bar mitzvah boy. "It is a custom for the bar mitzvah boy to speak during the meal eaten on his bar

mitzvah day. We do this since the boy merits a new level of soul on the day that he begins his fourteenth year, as we find in the Zohar. Yet not everyone receives the same level of soul. The level obtained is commensurate with the amount of effort made to attain holiness on this day. Through the seudas mitzvah and the derashah, the chasan bar mitzvah will receive a higher level of soul.

"The Ben Ish Chai, zt"l, writes that if the young man doesn't know how to give a derashah, others should speak in his stead. If his father can speak, it is better for him to speak than anyone else."¹

Interestingly, the Divrei Yeshayah, zt"l, offers today's daf as a source for

why a bar mitzvah boy should give a derashah. "The verse states, 'ושמרת את—And the chקה הזאת למועדה מימים ימימה'—And you shall guard this law at its time, from day to day.' In Menachos we find that this verse alludes to tefillin and the words 'מימים ימימה' teach us when we can wear tefillin.² The word 'למועדה' means at its time; clearly it refers to when the boy becomes obligated in tefillin. And in Kareisos we find that the word חקים alludes to medrashos. In this context, 'את החקה הזאת למועדה' means that the boy should give a discourse on the day of his bar mitzvah!"³ ■

1. כף החיים, סי' רכ"ה, ס"ק י"א.
2. עיין מנחות ל'.
3. דברי ישיעהו, דרשה כ"ב. ■