

They are equal and the mishna chose one of them – כִּי הִדְדִי נִגְדָה וְחִדָּא מִיְיָהוּ נִקְטָה: The measure of a date was chosen, although it is equal to the more standard measure of an egg-bulk, because the first measure that determines liability, an olive-bulk for the prohibition of leaven, was based on one of the seven fruits of the land. The second measure that determines liability, for leavened bread, should be as well (*Tosefet Yom HaKippurim*).

An olive-bulk...an egg-bulk – עַד כְּוִית עַד כְּבִיצָה: It seems that both approaches are referring to the rabbinic requirement to recite Grace after Meals. The Torah obligation applies only to one who has eaten and is full; however, the Sages established different, specific measures for eating and for satisfaction (*Tosafot Yeshanim*).

HALAKHA

The measure of food that requires a *zimmun* – שִׁיעוּר לְיִמּוֹן: One who eats less than the volume of an olive-bulk may not join a *zimmun* (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 196:4*).

ממאי? דילמא לעולם אימא לך: כותבת הגסה שאמרו – יתירה מכביצה, הא סתמא – כביצה. ואי נמי: כי הדדי נינהו וחידא מינייהו נקט.

The Gemara rejects this: From where is your proof? Perhaps I could actually say to you that the measure of the volume of a large date that they said is larger than an egg-bulk; however, the volume of a date of normal size is the same as an egg-bulk, and Beit Shammai were referring to a normal-sized date. Alternatively, say that the volume of a large date and an egg-bulk are equal, and the mishna chose to use one of them.^N Either way, there is no proof from here that the volume of a large date is greater than an egg-bulk.

אלא מהכא: עד כמה מזמנין? עד כוית, דבין רבי מאיר. רבי יהודה אומר: עד כביצה. במאי קא מפלגי? רבי מאיר סבר: "ואכלת" זו אכילה, "ושבעת" – זו שתיה. ואכילה בכוית. ורבי יהודה סבר: "ואכלת ושבעת" – אכילה שיש בה שבעה, ואי זה – זה כביצה.

Rather, it cannot be proven from here. Proof can be found from here: How much must one eat to obligate those with whom he ate in an invitation [*zimmun*]^H for Grace After Meals? An olive-bulk of food suffices to obligate those with whom they ate in a *zimmun*; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yehuda says: An egg-bulk is the minimum measure to obligate those with whom they ate in a *zimmun*.^N The Gemara clarifies: With regard to what do they disagree? Rabbi Meir holds that the verse "And you shall eat and be satisfied and bless the Lord your God" (Deuteronomy 8:10) should be understood as follows: "And you shall eat"; this is referring to eating. "And be satisfied"; this is referring to drinking. The definition of eating throughout the Torah is consuming an olive-bulk. Rabbi Yehuda holds: "And you shall eat and be satisfied" is referring to eating that causes satisfaction, and what is that? The volume of an egg-bulk. Less than that amount of food is not satisfying.

ואי סלקא דעתך כותבת הגסה שאמרו יתירה מכביצה – השתא כביצה שבויעי משבעא, דעתא לא מיתבא? אלא לאו שמע מינה: כותבת הגסה שאמרו פחות מכביצה, כביצה – משבעא, ככותבת – מיתבא דעתיה.

And if it should enter your mind to say that the volume of the large date that they spoke of is larger than an egg-bulk, the following question can be asked: Now that we have said that the volume of an egg-bulk satisfies, can we say that it does not settle the mind, and thereby remove the affliction of Yom Kippur? Rather, must one not conclude from this that the volume of a large date that they said is less than the size of an egg-bulk? Eating the larger amount of an egg-bulk satisfies a person, but eating the volume of a large date only settles his mind.

תניא, רבי אומר:

It was taught in a *baraita*: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says:

Perek VIII

Daf 80 Amud a

כל השיעורין כולן בכוית, חוץ מטומאת אוכלין, ששינה הכתוב במשמעון ושינו חכמים בשיעורין. וראיה לדבר יום הכפורים. מאי שינה הכתוב במשמעון – מ"לא תעונה", ומאי שינו חכמים בשיעוריה – ככותבת.

All the measures in the Torah connected to eating are the volume of an olive-bulk,^H except for the amount of food that renders objects impure, because the verse changed its expression in this case, and the Sages altered the measure^N accordingly. The proof of this, that the Sages gave it a different measure because the verse used different language for it, is from Yom Kippur. Also in the case of Yom Kippur the Sages assigned a different measure because the verse used a different phrase. The Gemara asks: How did the Sages learn that the verse changed its expression? They learned from: "Any soul which shall not be afflicted" (Leviticus 23:29). The verse does not state: Any soul that shall eat, but rather: "Any soul which shall not be afflicted." How did the Sages change its measure? One does not violate the prohibition unless he has eaten the volume of a large date-bulk, as opposed to the usual olive-bulk.

NOTES

The Sages altered the measure – שינו חכמים בשיעורין: The commentaries discuss (see *Tosefet Yom HaKippurim*) the terminology employed here, which gives the impression that the Sages determined the size of measures. That approach seems to contradict a statement of the Gemara later in the discussion that all measures are *halakha* transmitted to

Moses from Sinai. One resolution suggests that the measures themselves, e.g., an olive-bulk and an egg-bulk, were given to Moses at Sinai, but they were not linked to specific transgressions. It was the Sages who defined which measure is appropriate for which transgression (Rabbi Tzvi Hirsch Chajes).

HALAKHA

All the measures are the volume of an olive-bulk – כָּל הַשִּׁיעוּרִין כּוּלָן בְּכוִית: The measure for all prohibited foods in the Torah is the bulk of a medium-sized olive. This applies to transgressions punishable by lashes, *karesh*, and death at the hand of Heaven. Excluded, however, are those cases where the verse employs unusual language (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha, Hilkhot Ma'akhalot Assurot* 14:1).

And what does the *baraita* mean when it says a proof for this – מאי ראיה לדבר – One commentator suggests that the term: Proof for this, indicates that the proof is not so clear, but that there is support for the approach. Therefore, the Gemara asks why the proof is insufficient. The response is that the Yom Kippur text is a weak proof, since the language used there is totally different. Eating is not mentioned there at all. This is not so with regard to impure foods (Rabbi Elyakim).

Ben pekua – בן פקועה: All organs of a slaughtered animal may be eaten. Given this, if a pregnant animal is slaughtered and a live fetus is found in its womb, the fetus is called a child of an animal who was ripped open [*ben pekua*], and it has the status of the mother's organs. Even if it is a viable animal and continues to live normally, it is considered already slaughtered based on its mother. It does not require an additional slaughtering to be eaten.

Requires cutting – טעון קריעה: One explanation of this phrase is that the *ben pekua* is alive, and the required cutting refers to slitting the throat of the animal, meaning that it must be killed before it can be eaten. Alternatively, the Gemara may be referring to a *ben pekua* that is already dead, and the cutting required is in order to prepare it for consumption, since nobody would eat it as it is (Rav Shmuel Strashun; see *Ohel Moshe*).

One who repents due to his awareness – השב מידיעתו: An example of this is one who habitually violates a particular *halakha* intentionally, but one time he transgressed unwittingly. When he later wishes to repent he is not obligated to bring an offering for his unwitting transgression. This is due to the fact that, at the time that he transgressed unwittingly, even had he become aware of his transgression he would not have repented. The *baraita* derives from the verse (Leviticus 4:27) that in such a case one does not bring an offering for the unwitting transgression.

HALAKHA

Impure foods the volume of an egg-bulk – טומאת אוכלין – **כביצה**: Food of any size can become impure, but to transfer ritual impurity to something else it must be the bulk of an egg without its shell. This ruling is in accordance with the Gemara here and in tractate *Eiruvim* (Rambam *Sefer Tahara*, *Hilkhot Tumat Okhalin* 4:1 and *Kesef Mishne* there).

ומאי ראיה לדבר יום הכפורים? דאי מהתם – הוה אמינא: אורחא דקרא הוא.

טומאת אוכלין כביצה מנלן? אמר רבי אבהו אמר רבי אלעזר: דאמר קרא: "מכל האוכל אשר יאכל" – אוכל הבא מחמת אוכל, ואיזה זה – ביצת תרנגולת. ואימא גדי! מחוסר שחיטה, ואימא בן פקועה! טעון קריעה.

ואימא ביצת בר יוכני! תפסת מרובה לא תפסת, תפסת מועט – תפסת. ואימא ביצת דציפורתא, דזוטר טובא!

רבי אבהו דידיה אמר: "מכל האוכל אשר יאכל" – אוכל שאתה אוכלו בבת אחת, ושיערו חכמים: אין בית הבליעה מחזיק יותר מביצת תרנגולת,

אמר רבי אלעזר: האוכל חלב בזמן הוה צריך שיכתוב לו שיעור, שמא יבא בית דין אחר וירבה בשיעורין.

מאי ירבה בשיעורין? אי נמא דמחייבי קרבן אכזיב קטן – והתניא: "אשר לא תעשינה בשגגה ואשם" השב מידיעתו – מביא קרבן על שגגתו,

The Gemara asks: **And what** does the *baraita* mean when it says: **A proof for thisⁿ** is from **Yom Kippur**? Why is the verse pertaining to ritual impurity not sufficient to show that the Sages changed the measure based on the different words in the verse? The Gemara answers: **If we learned it only from there**, the case of impurity, **I would have said that that is the style of the verse**, and no *halakha* can be derived from it. Therefore, the verse pertaining to Yom Kippur teaches that whenever a verse deviates from the usual language, it implies a change in the *halakha* as well.

S The Gemara asks: **From where do we derive that the measure for impure foods is the volume of an egg-bulk?**^H **Rabbi Abbahu said that Rabbi Elazar said that the verse states:** "Of all food [*okhel*] which may be eaten [*ye'akhel*], on which water comes shall be ritually impure" (Leviticus 11:34). The double usage of the root *akhal* teaches that the ritual impurity of food applies even to the amount which can be described as **food that comes on account of food**, i.e., food that comes from another food. **And which food is that? A chicken egg.** The Gemara asks: **And say it is referring to a kid**, which comes from a mother goat, and is therefore also food that comes from another food. The Gemara answers: **It lacks ritual slaughter.** The young goat is not yet food, since it is not edible until it has been slaughtered. The Gemara asks further: **And say it is referring to a ben pekua.**^N Since the slaughter of its mother made it fit to eat, the fetus itself need not be slaughtered, even if it survives and continues to live independently of its mother. The Gemara answers: The calf still **requires cutting**,^N since it cannot be eaten live, but it does not require ritual slaughter.

The Gemara asks: Even if we claim that the measure for impure foods is an egg-bulk, one could say it is referring to the giant egg-bulk of the bird called *bar yokhani*. The Gemara answers: **If you grasped many, you did not grasp anything; if you grasped few, you grasped something.** This means that in a case of doubt, take the smaller number, as it is included in the larger number. Therefore, the correct measure is the volume of a chicken egg. The Gemara questions this: If so, say it is referring to a **very small bird's egg**. Consequently, no proof can be brought from the verse that the volume of a chicken egg is the measure for ritual impurity.

Rabbi Abbahu himself said: The verse states: "Of all food which may be eaten." This is referring to **food that you can eat at one time.** The Sages estimated: **The esophagus cannot hold more than the volume of a chicken's egg**, and therefore this is the measure used for the ritual impurity of foods.

Incidental to the discussion on Torah measures, **Rabbi Elazar said:** **One who unwittingly eats forbidden fat even today must write down the exact measure that he ate, lest another court come in the future and increase the measure.**

The Gemara asks: **What does it mean to increase the measure?** **If we say that a future court will obligate him to bring an offering even for the bulk of a small olive**, which is less than what is considered an olive-bulk today, he would not be liable to bring a guilt-offering. **Wasn't it taught in a baraita:** It was said with regard to guilt-offerings: "And if any one of the common people sin through error, in doing any of the things which the Lord has commanded **not to be done, and be guilty**" (Leviticus 4:27)? This teaches that **one who repents due to his awareness**,^N i.e., one who repents following becoming aware that he performed a transgression, **brings an offering for his unwitting transgression.**

One who repents due to his awareness – **הַשֵּׁב מִיָּדָעוֹ** – An example of this is one who habitually violates a particular *halakha* intentionally, but one time he transgressed unwittingly. When he later wishes to repent he is not obligated to bring an offering for his unwitting transgression. This is due to the fact that, at the time that he transgressed unwittingly, even had he become aware of his transgression he would not have repented. The *baraita* derives from the verse (Leviticus 4:27) that in such a case one does not bring an offering for the unwitting transgression.

Repentance and the changing of measures – **שֵׁב מִיָּדָעוֹ** – **שְׁנֵי הַשְּׁעוּרִים**: Later commentaries identified two major problems with this passage. Firstly, tractate *Horayot* teaches that even if the transgression is based on a mistaken ruling from the court, subsequent repentance is nevertheless considered to be due to one's awareness. Secondly, according to Rabbi Yoḥanan, even a half-measure is prohibited, in which case one would have repented even if there had not been a later change of measure. These questions were answered in several ways, the primary solution being that one must differentiate between a mistake made by the court with regard to a matter of law and a court changing measures. With regard to the half-measure, the issue of repentance does not apply to the bringing of an offering but only to the recognition of sin (see *Tosefet Yom HaKippurim*; *Gevurat Ari*; *Derakhekha Shalom*; *Nimmukei Hayyim*).

The court of Jabez – **בֵּית דִּינֵוֹ שֶׁל יַעֲבֵץ** – Jabez is listed in the book of Chronicles among the sons of Judah (I Chronicles 2:55, 4:9–10). From the context, it seems he was among the leaders of the Jewish people in his generation. Some authorities say that Jabez is an alternative name for Othniel ben Kenaz, mentioned in the book of Judges (Rashi). The text is referring to: “And the families of the scribes that dwelt at Jabez,” which suggests this individual led the scribes, who were the sages of his time.

לא שב מידעתו – אין מביא קרבן על שגגתו.

However, one who does not repent due to his awareness that he sinned does not bring an offering for his unwitting action. Similarly, if one eats less than an olive-bulk, based on the current measures, he will not be obligated to bring a guilt-offering in the future if the measures change, even if the amount that he ate equals the volume of a revised olive-bulk. This is because the individual would not be bringing his offering because he became aware he had sinned, but because the Torah measures had been changed.

אלא, דלא מחייבי קרבן עד דאיכא ביות גדול.

Rather, it should be explained as follows: It is possible that in the future a court will not obligate one to bring an offering until he has eaten the bulk of a large olive, which is more than today's amount. One should write down how much he ate, since in the future a court might rule that the amount he ate is less than the size of an olive, and therefore he will not be obligated to bring an offering.^N

ולמאי דסליק אדעתיה מעיקרא דמחייבי קרבן אכזית קטן, מאי ירבה בשיעוריו? – שפמא ירבה בקרבנות מחמת שיעוריו.

The Gemara returns to its first suggestion: **According to what entered his mind initially**, that in the future a court might obligate him to bring an offering for the bulk of a small olive, what is the meaning of **increase the measure**? Rabbi Elazar should have said decrease the measure. The Gemara answers: The statement may have meant that **perhaps there will be an increase in offerings** that are brought due to the smaller measure for liability.

אמר רבי יוחנן: שיעוריו ועונשין הלכה למשה מסיני. עונשין? מכתב בתיבי! אלא הכי קאמר: (אמר רבי יוחנן.) שיעורים של עונשין הלכה למשה מסיני.

With regard to this topic, **Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Measures and punishments are halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai**. The Gemara expresses surprise at this: **The punishments for all transgressions are written explicitly in the Torah**, and therefore are not part of an oral transmission from Moses. **Rather, this is what was said: Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Measures that determine liability for punishments^H are halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai.**

תניא נמי הכי: שיעוריו של עונשין הלכה למשה מסיני, אחרים אומרים: בית דינו של יעבץ תיקנום, והכתוב: “אלה המצוות” – שאין נביא רשאי לחדש דבר מעתה! אלא: שכתוב וחרו ויסודם.

The Gemara comments: **This was also taught in a baraita: Measures of punishments are halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai. Others say: These measures were instituted by the court of Jabez.**^N The Gemara questions this: How can this be? **Isn't it written: “These are the mitzvot which the Lord commanded Moses for the children of Israel at Mount Sinai” (Leviticus 27:34).** The word “these” underscores that **a prophet is not permitted to introduce any new element related to the Torah and its mitzvot from here on. Rather, over the course of time, the people forgot the measures; subsequently the prophets reestablished the measures and taught them to the masses.**

“השותה מלא לוגמיו.” אמר רב יהודה אמר שמואל: לא מלא לוגמיו ממש, אלא כל שאילו יסלקנו לצד אחד ויראה כמלא לוגמיו. והא אמר תנן מלא לוגמיו! אימא: כמלא לוגמיו.

S We learned in the mishna that **one who drinks a cheekful on Yom Kippur is liable. Rabbi Yehuda said that Shmuel said: This does not mean two cheeks actually full. Rather, the measure that determines liability is the volume of liquid if one pushes the drink to one side of his mouth, and it appears as though his cheek were full.** The Gemara questions this: **Didn't we learn in the mishna: A cheekful**, in the plural form, meaning two cheeks full? The Gemara answers: **Say: Like two cheeks full in appearance.** If viewed from only one side, one whose cheek is full appears as if his entire mouth is full.^H

HALAKHA

The measures for punishments – **שיעורי עונשים**: All the measures assigned to prohibited foods and all measures in the Torah are *halakhot* transmitted to Moses from Sinai, in accordance with the Gemara here (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha, Hilkhot Ma'akhalot Assurot* 14:2).

שיעור איסור שתיה ביום הכפורים: One who drinks a cheekful on Yom Kippur is liable. The exact measure depends on the size of the person. A cheekful does not refer to filling both sides of the mouth, but rather is the amount that gives one the appearance of a full mouth when the liquid is pushed to one side of the mouth. For an average-sized person, the measure is smaller than a quarter-log (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 612:9).

The measure for the prohibition of drinking on Yom Kippur –

NOTES

A cheekful and a quarter-log – מלא לוגמיו ורביעית – See *Tosafot*. According to the *Rid*, the terminology of the Gemara and logic dictate that even filling both cheeks is less than a quarter-log. Therefore, Rav Hoshaya's question does not specifically relate to Shmuel's opinion, but to all the approaches, since even the basic meaning of the words of the *baraita* imply that this is one of Beit Shammai's leniencies.

מיתבי: כמה ישתה ויהא חייב? בית שמאי אומר: רביעית, ובית הלל אומר: מלא לוגמיו. רבי יהודה אומר משום רבי אליעזר: במלא לוגמיו, רבי יהודה בן בתירא אומר: כדי גמיעה!

מי עדיפא ממתניתין, דאוקימנא כדי שיראה – הכי נמי – כדי שיראה. אי הכי היינו רבי אליעזר! איכא בינייהו מלא לוגמיו דחוק.

מתקיף לה רב הושעיא: אם בן הוה ליה מקולי בית שמאי ומחומרי בית הלל! אמר ליה:

The Gemara raises an objection to this from a *baraita*: How much does one need to drink on Yom Kippur to be liable? Beit Shammai say: A quarter-log, and Beit Hillel say: Two cheeks full. Rabbi Yehuda says in the name of Rabbi Eliezer: Like two cheeks full in appearance from the side, i.e. a single cheekful. Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira says: The amount that one can swallow in one gulp. In this *baraita*, Beit Hillel's opinion is that the measure for drinking on Yom Kippur is a cheekful.^N This implies that a cheekful means an actual cheekful.

The Gemara expresses surprise: Is the *baraita* preferable to the *mishna*? Since it was established that the measure in the *mishna* is so that it appears like a cheekful, so too, the *baraita* can be explained as meaning an amount that looks like two cheeks full. The Gemara questions further: If so, Beit Hillel require an amount that appears like two cheeks full; this is identical with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, who says: Like two cheeks full. The Gemara answers: We could say that the practical difference between them is evident in the case of a paltry cheekful, which is not a complete mouthful but slightly less. According to Beit Hillel, one is not liable unless he drinks a full cheekful; but according to Rabbi Eliezer, one is liable even for a paltry mouthful.

Rav Hoshaya strongly objects to this understanding: If so, if Beit Hillel's measure is a single cheekful, then this is an instance of Beit Shammai's leniencies and Beit Hillel's stringencies, since the measure of a quarter-log is larger than a single cheekful. If so, why isn't this debate listed in tractate *Eduyyot*, which lists all the cases where Beit Shammai are more lenient than Beit Hillel? He said to him:

Perek VIII
Daf 80 Amud b

NOTES

What is different with regard to eating – מאי שנא אכילה – The connection between this question and the previous statement is as follows: At first, the Gemara thought that a cheekful is a fixed measure, based on the mouth of an average person and applying equally to a large and small person. However, once the Gemara explained that this measure varies from person to person, the question is posed as to why this should be only for drinking and not for eating (*Tosefet Yom HaKippurim*; *Siah Yitzhak*).

Everyone of average size has his mind greatly settled – בגלי – עלמא טובא: It seems that this does not mean that the mind is settled only at the moment of eating. Rather, the food sits in one's stomach, and as such his mind is settled. Therefore, even Og, king of Bashan, in whom a small amount of food is digested quickly, has a settled mind for a short time (*Tosefet Yom HaKippurim*).

כי אתשיל – בעוג מלך הבשן אתשיל, דהו ליה בית שמאי לחומר.

מתקיף לה רבי זירא: מאי שנא אכילה – דכל חד וחד בככותבת, ומאי שנא שתיה דכל חד וחד בדידיה? אמר ליה אבוי: קים להו לרבנן בככותבת דבהכי מיתבא דעתיה, בציר מהכי – לא מיתבא. בשתיה – בדידיה מיתבא דעתיה, בדחבריה לא מיתבא דעתיה.

מתקיף לה רבי זירא: וכל העולם כולו בככותבת, ועוג מלך הבשן בככותבת? אמר ליה אבוי: קים להו לרבנן דבהכי מיתבא דעתיה, בציר מהכי – לא מיתבא דעתיה. מיהו, בגלי עלמא – טובא, ועוג מלך הבשן – פורתא.

When this question with regard to the measure of liquid was asked, it was not asked about an average-sized person, for whom a mouthful is smaller than a quarter-log. Rather, the question was asked even about Og, king of Bashan, in which case, it is Beit Shammai who are stringent, for Og's cheekful is much more than a quarter-log.

Rabbi Zeira strongly objects to this *halakha* with regard to the measure for liability for drinking: What is different with regard to eating,^N in that all people have the same measure, the volume of a large date; and what is different with regard to drinking, where each and every person is liable according to his own measure, i.e., every individual's measure depends on the size of his own mouth? Abaye said to him: The Sages have an accepted tradition with regard to the volume of the large date, that eating this amount settles his mind, but less than this amount does not settle his mind. However, with regard to drinking, his mind is settled with the amount of his own cheekful, but his mind is not settled with the cheekful of his fellow who is smaller than him.

Rabbi Zeira strongly objects to this for a different reason: Is everyone of average size satisfied with eating the volume of a large date, and even Og, king of Bashan, is also satisfied with the volume of a large date? If not, there should also be relative measures for eating. Abaye said to him: The Sages have an accepted tradition that this amount settles his mind, but less than this amount does not settle his mind. However, everyone of average size has his mind greatly settled,^N whereas Og, king of Bashan, has his mind only a little settled. But even so, this measure settles the mind of any person and relieves his affliction.

Half of a half-loaf of bread in the time it takes to eat a half-loaf – תְּחִי פָּרִס בְּכֵי אֲכִילַת פָּרִס – פְּרָס: The first challenge was with respect to Yom Kippur. The Gemara answered: Because the term affliction is stated, whether or not any given type of eating is prohibited depends upon the satisfaction derived from it. However, Rava's challenge is with respect to ritual impurity, which does not depend upon satisfaction. If so, he asks, why did the Sages establish the measure of half of a half-loaf in the time it takes to eat a half-loaf (*Me'il Shmuel*)?

Ritual impurity of the body – טוּמְאַת הַגּוּיָה: Ritually impure foods and beverages render other foods and beverages impure, but not vessels or people. However, in order to prevent people from eating impure food while they drink *teruma* beverages, the Sages decreed a measure of food that can transfer second-degree ritual impurity to a person. The Sages fixed the amount of food that causes this impurity at half of a half-loaf of bread (see *Tosafot*). In tractate *Eiruvin*, there is a disagreement between the *tanna'im* about the measure of this loaf.

A vegetable and brine on Yom Kippur – יֵרֶק וְצִיר בְּיוֹם הַכִּפּוּרִים – Reish Lakish emphasizes that this rule is for Yom Kippur, when the essential factor is settling the mind. With regard to other forbidden foods in other contexts, brine has the status of a drink and does not combine (*Tosefet Yom HaKippurim*).

HALAKHA

Ritual impurity of the body – טוּמְאַת גּוּיָה: The Sages decreed that one who ingests impure food or drink contracts impurity to the second degree and must immerse himself to be purified (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot She'ar Avot HaTumot* 8:10).

All foods combine – כָּל הָאוֹכְלִין: All types of food combine to reach the measure of a large date, including salt with meat and brine with a vegetable. Anything that prepares food has the status of food. Food and drink do not combine with each other. This ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Rav Pappa and Reish Lakish (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 612:2).

מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַבִּי זֵירָא: בְּשׂוֹר שְׁמֹן – בְּכֹוֹתֶבֶת, וְלוֹלְבֵי גִפְנִים בְּכֹוֹתֶבֶת?! אָמַר לִיָּה אֲבִי: קִים לְהוּ לְרִבְנָן דְּבִהְבִּי מִיִּתְבָּא דְעֵתִיָּה, בְּצִיר מְהֵכִי לָא מִיִּתְבָּא דְעֵתִיָּה. מִיהוּ, בְּשׂוֹר שְׁמֹן – טוּבָא, לְלוֹלְבֵי גִפְנִים – פּוֹרְתָא.

מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַבָּא: כְּבִית בְּכֵי אֲכִילַת פְּרָס, וְכֹוֹתֶבֶת בְּכֵי אֲכִילַת פְּרָס? אָמַר לִיָּה אֲבִי: קִים לְהוּ לְרִבְנָן דְּבִהְבִּי מִיִּתְבָּא דְעֵתִיָּה, בְּטַפֵּי מְהֵכִי – לָא מִיִּתְבָּא דְעֵתִיָּה.

מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַבָּא: (בְּכֹוֹתֶבֶת) בְּכֵי אֲכִילַת פְּרָס חֲצִי פְּרָס בְּכֵי אֲכִילַת פְּרָס? אָמַר לִיָּה רַב פַּפָּא: הִנֵּחַ לְטוּמְאַת גּוּיָה, דְּלָאוּ דְאוֹרִיָּתָא הִיא.

וּמִי אָמַר רַב פַּפָּא הֵכִי? וְהִכְתִּיב: "וְלֹא תִטְמְאוּ בָהֶם וְנִטְמַתֶּם בָּם" וְאָמַר רַב פַּפָּא: מִכַּאֵן שְׁטוּמְאַת גּוּיָה דְאוֹרִיָּתָא! מְדַרְבְּנָן, וְקִרָא אֶסְמִקְתָּא בְעֵלְמָא.

"כָּל הָאוֹכְלִין". אָמַר רַב פַּפָּא: אֲכַל אוֹמְצָא וּמִלִּחָא – מִצְטָרְף, וְאִף עַל גַּב דְּלָאוּ אֲכִילָהּ הִיא, כִּיּוֹן דְּאֲכָלִי אֲיַנְשֵׁי – מִצְטָרְפִין. אָמַר רִישׁ לְקִישׁ: צִיר שְׁעַל גַּבֵּי יֶרֶק מִצְטָרְף לְכֹוֹתֶבֶת בְּיוֹם הַכִּפּוּרִים. פְּשִׁטָּא! מַהוּ דְתִימָא: מִשְׁקָה הוּא, קָא מִשְׁמַע לָן: כָּל אֲבִשׁוּרֵי אוֹכְלָא – אוֹכְלָא הוּא.

Rabbi Zeira strongly objects to this further: If it is on account of settling one's mind, the following question can be raised: If one ate fatty meat, his mind would be settled with the volume of a large date, but if he ate edible grapevine shoots, would his mind similarly settled with the volume of a large date? Abaye said to him: The Sages have an accepted tradition that with this measure one's mind is settled, but with less than measure his mind is not settled. However, with fatty meat, his mind is greatly settled; if one ate the same measure of grapevine shoots, his mind is only a little settled.

Rava strongly objects to this: For all prohibitions of eating, the measure that determines liability is the volume of an olive-bulk consumed within the time it takes to eat a half-loaf of bread. All forbidden food eaten within that period combines to the measure of an olive-bulk. However, one who eats an olive-bulk over a longer period is exempt. Yet, on Yom Kippur one who eats the volume of a large date, which is a larger measure, is culpable if this amount is eaten within the time it would take to eat a half-loaf of bread. This appears to be a leniency, since one must eat a larger measure in the same time period of time. Why is there not a longer period of time for liability on Yom Kippur, to reflect the larger measure? Abaye said to him: The Sages have an accepted tradition that one who eats within this duration of time, his mind is settled; but one who eats within a longer duration of time, his mind is not settled, and he remains in a state of affliction.

Rava strongly objects to this: The measure for liability for eating on Yom Kippur is the volume of a large date consumed within the time it takes to eat a half-loaf of bread; but the measure for eating impure foods that render one ritually impure is half of a half-loaf, which is two egg-bulks, a much larger volume, and this must also be consumed within the time it takes to eat a half-loaf of breadⁿ Rav Pappa said to him: Do not raise a challenge from here. Leave aside ritual impurity of the body^{nh} contracted through consuming impure foods because that is not by Torah law but by rabbinic law. The Sages were lenient in this matter. If one does not consume that amount of impure food within this time period, he is not rendered impure.

The Gemara challenges this: But did Rav Pappa actually say that the rendering of ritual impurity of the body through the consumption of impure foods is by rabbinic law? But he appears to say the opposite in another statement: Isn't it written: "You shall not make yourselves detestable with any creeping thing that creeps, neither shall you make yourselves impure with them, that you should be impure thereby" (Leviticus 11:43). And Rav Pappa said: From here, from the Torah's usage of the word "impure" with regard to the prohibition of eating, we learn that ritual impurity of the body is by Torah law. The Gemara answers: Rav Pappa did not mean that the law is actually Torah law. The law is indeed rabbinic law, and the verse brought as proof is a mere support.

We learned in the mishna: All types of foods combine^h to form a measure of liability with regard to eating on Yom Kippur. Rav Pappa said: If one ate meat and the salt that was on it, these combine to make the volume of a large date. Although consuming salt alone is not considered eating, since people do eat meat with salt together, they combine into one measure. Similarly, Reish Lakish said: Brine on a vegetable combines with the vegetable to make the volume of a large date with regard to the prohibition of eating on Yom Kippur.ⁿ The Gemara expresses surprise at this: It is obvious. Why should the brine not combine with the vegetable, considering that it is itself food? The Gemara answers: Lest you say that brine is a beverage, and food and drinks do not combine, it teaches us that any item that prepares food for eating is considered a food.

NOTES

Eats in an excessive manner – אוכל אכילה גסה: *Tosafot Yeshanim* point out that there are several levels of excessive eating. There is excessive eating in which one keeps eating when he is already full, and there is a further stage in which one eats so much that he gags on what he is eating (see *Nimmukei Hayyim*).

Excluding one who harms himself – פרט למזיק: Some commentaries explain that as such a person is not said to be eating but to be harming himself, the verse is not referring to him (*Me'iri*).

HALAKHA

Excessive eating on Yom Kippur – אכילה גסה ביום הכפורים: If one eats excessively on Yom Kippur, e.g., he finishes his meal on Yom Kippur eve and continues eating even though is too full to eat more, he is exempt. This ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Reish Lakish. If he ate tasty, fragrant food he is liable (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 612:6, and in the comment of the Rema).

A non-priest who ate *teruma* in an excessive manner – זר שאכל תרומה אכילה גסה: One who eats *teruma* in an excessive manner does not pay an additional fifth, but only the principal. Such a person is considered to have damaged *teruma* rather than eaten it. This is also the rule for someone who chews raw barley, for this is not the usual way of eating (*Rambam Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhot Terumat* 10:8).

Perek VIII
Daf 81 Amud a

NOTES

Who chews on barley of *teruma* – בוסס שעורים של תרומה: This is referring specifically to barley, which is normally considered to be animal food. One who eats unprocessed barley is not considered to have eaten. This is not the case with chewing wheat, which is considered the usual way of eating and should be preceded with a blessing. One who ate wheat of *teruma* pays the principal and a fifth (*Siah Yitzhak, Gevurat Ari*).

Food and drink do not combine – האוכל והשותה אין מצטרפין: The novel element in this *halakha* is understood by reading the following mishna: One who eats and drinks on Yom Kippur within one lapse of awareness is liable only for one sin-offering. Therefore, it is clear that eating and drinking are considered to be a single prohibition. They are both derived from the same verse, making them a single matter. Even so, they are treated as distinct here because they have different measures (*Tosefot Rid*).

Its type of ritual impurity and its measure – טומאתו ושיעורו: There are several distinct levels of ritual impurity. There are differences both in type of impurity, i.e., whether it is imparted by contact, carrying, or other means, and the severity of impurity, i.e., whether the impurity lasts only until evening or for seven days, or whether it renders only clothing impure. There are also distinctions in amounts required to transfer impurity: A dead creeping animal transmits impurity at the size of a lentil; an animal carcass does so at the size of an olive-bulk; and a corpse, depending on context, has various amounts in which it transmits impurity, from the size of a barley groat and upward. In order for two items to combine, they must be identical both in their type of impurity and their measure (see Rashi and Rambam).

אמר ריש לקיש: האוכל אכילה גסה ביום הכפורים פטור, מאי טעמא "אשר לא תעונה" בתיב, פרט למזיק.

אמר רבי ירמיה אמר ריש לקיש: זר שאכל תרומה אכילה גסה – משלם את הקרן ואינו משלם את החומש, "כי יאכל" – פרט למזיק. אמר רבי ירמיה אמר רבי יוחנן: זר

שבוסס שעורים של תרומה – משלם את הקרן ואינו משלם את החומש. "כי יאכל" – פרט למזיק.

אמר רב שזיבוי אמר רבי יוחנן: זר שבלע שזפין של תרומה, והקיאו ואכלו אחר – ראשון משלם (את) קרן וחומש, שני אין משלם אלא דמי עצים לראשון בלבד.

"האוכל והשותה אין מצטרפין". מאן תנא? אמר רב חסדא: במחלוקת שנויה, ורבי יהושע היא. דתנן: כלל אמר רבי יהושע: כל שטומאתו ושיעורו שוה – מצטרף.

Reish Lakish said: One who eats in an excessive manner^N on Yom Kippur, to the degree that he forces himself to continue eating even when full is exempt,^H e.g., one who ate beyond being satiated on Yom Kippur eve and then ate something else as soon as the fast began. What is the reason for that? Because the Torah does not mention the prohibition of eating on Yom Kippur, but it was written "any soul which shall not be afflicted in that same day, he shall be cut off from his people" (Leviticus 23:29), excluding one who harms himself,^N e.g., one who does not enjoy his food at all.

Similarly, Rabbi Yirmeya said that Reish Lakish said: A non-priest who ate *teruma* in an excessive manner^H pays the principal, that which he took, and does not pay the additional fifth, which one who illegally eats *teruma* pays to the priest as a penalty. This is because it states about one who eats *teruma*: "And if a man eat of the sacred thing in error, then he shall add a fifth to it, and give the priest the sacred thing" (Leviticus 22:14). The word "eat" excludes one who is not eating but harming himself. He does, however, pay the principal, since he caused a loss to the priest. The fifth is only paid by one who eats normally, not excessively. Similarly, Rabbi Yirmeya said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: A non-priest

who chews on barley of *teruma*^N that has not been ground or baked pays the principal and not an extra fifth. The reason is that it states "eats" (Leviticus 22:14), which excludes one who harms himself. Consuming raw barley is considered self-harm, not eating.

Rav Sheizvi said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: In the case of a non-priest who swallowed plums of *teruma*^H whole and vomited them out, whereupon another person ate them, the first one pays the principal plus a fifth. When the first one benefited from the plums, he acquired them and must therefore pay for them, and the second one must pay their worth to the first one. Since they are only fit for fuel after the first one vomited them out, the second person is considered to have damaged their value as fuel. Therefore, he pays only the price of wood, i.e., fuel, to the first person.

It was taught in the mishna that food and drink do not combine.^N The Gemara asks: Who is the *tanna* who taught this? Rav Hisda said: This *halakha* is taught as a dispute, and the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua. As we learned in a mishna: Rabbi Yehoshua stated a general principle: Any item that is identical to another item in its type of ritual impurity, e.g., impurity that lasts only until evening, and its measure^{NH} for impurity, e.g., an olive-bulk, combines with the other item to reach one measure to render other items impure. Therefore, two half olive-bulk pieces of two corpses or of two animal carcasses, or two half lentil-bulk pieces from two creeping animals all combine to render other items impure.

HALAKHA

A non-priest who swallowed plums of *teruma* – זר שבלע: If a non-priest swallows plums of *teruma* and vomits them out, and then another person comes and eats them, the first person pays the principal value plus a fifth, and the second person pays the value of the plums as fuel (*Rambam Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhot Terumat* 10:9).

Any item that is identical to another item in its type of ritual

impurity and its measure – כל שטומאתו ושיעורו שוה: If several items are identical with respect to their type of ritual impurity and the measure at which they impart impurity to other items, they combine with each other to impart impurity. If their type of impurity is the same but not their measure, or their measure is identical but not their type of impurity, then they do not combine even to assume the status of the more lenient one (*Rambam Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Okhalin* 4:11).