



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

Shabbos Daf Ayin Aleph

- In the previous Gemara **Rava** said that the chatas brought for the cutting of the second set of melachos exempts the need to bring a separate chatas for the cutting of the first set of melachos, since they are the same melacha (cutting). Also, once the chatas is effective on the cutting of the first set, it is effective for the grinding melacha of the first set as well through "greira" ("pulling along"). (However, it does not help for the grinding of the second set of melachos).
 - **Q:** We learned that if someone eats 3 olive sized pieces of cheilev and the first 2 were eaten in the same period of unawareness and the last 2 were eaten in the same period of unawareness (he became aware of eating the first piece before he ate the third piece), **Rava** says, if he brings a chatas on the first piece, it is effective for the second as well (but not for the 3rd, because he does not hold of "greira"). If he brings a chatas for the third piece, it is effective for the second as well. If he brings a chatas for the second piece it is effective for all three. **Abaye** says, when he brings a chatas on any one them, it is effective for all 3 (because of "greira"). We see that **Rava** does NOT hold of "greira"?! **A:** After he heard the concept of "greira" from **Abaye** in this case, he agreed with it.
 - **Q:** If **Rava** now holds of "greira", why is the chatas not effective for the grinding of the second set as well?! **A:** **Rava** holds of "greira" which is why the chatas for the second cutting helps for the grinding of the first set (through "greira" from the cutting of the first set). However, he does not hold of "greira" from something which itself came about through "greira" (the grinding of the second set of melachos cannot be included through "greira" via the first grinding, because the first grinding itself came about through "greira" via the first cutting).
- This issue that is agreed to by **Abaye** and **Rava** (that one chatas is effective for two of the same melachos even though one was done with an unawareness of Shabbos and the other with an unawareness of the melacha) was posed as a question by **R' Zeira**. He asked, if one cuts or grinds half the amount needed to be oiver on Shabbos, because he was unaware that it was Shabbos, and then he cuts or grinds another half of the amount needed to be oiver, but this time because he was unaware that the melacha was assur, do those 2 half amounts combine to one, large amount and thereby require the person to bring a chatas? **R' Assi** answered, since they are separate for chatas purposes, they cannot be combined to become one large melacha.
 - **Q:** Is it correct that if 2 things are considered separate for their chatas obligations they cannot be combined to create a minimum amount? A Mishna says, if one ate two half-olive sized pieces of cheilev in one period of unawareness, they combine and require that a chatas be brought. **Reish Lakish** in the Gemara explains that the chiddush is that these 2 half-olive sized pieces were prepared in different ways and the Mishna follows **R' Yehoshua**, who says that if pieces of the same item (e.g. cheilev) are prepared in 2 different ways (one is cooked and one is roasted), they are considered two, separate entities and would require 2 chataos. This means, that even according to **R' Yehoshua**, although the pieces have separate chatas liabilities, the Mishna says that they combine to create the minimum required amount!?! **A:** **Reish Lakish** did not say the explanation on the part of the Mishna that says that they *do* combine. He said his explanation on the part of the Mishna that says when one has 2 half-olive sized pieces of 2 different foods,

they do **not** combine. On that, **Reish Lakish** says, the 2 different foods referred to here are both cheilev, just prepared in different ways, and this goes according to **R' Yehoshua** who says that they will not combine. They don't combine for chatas liability or for the minimum required amount.

- According to this answer, the first part of the Mishna which says that 2 of the same foods that are half-olive sized do combine, refers to where they were prepared the same way as well. **R' Huna** says that the chiddush is that even if after eating the first half-olive sized piece he realizes what he did, that "realization" does not prevent the second half-olive sized piece from combining with the first one to make a complete olive-sized piece. This is because we are following **R' Gamliel** who says that a "realization" only has significance if it is a realization on a complete amount, not when it is on less than a complete amount.
- If one ate 2 olive-sized pieces of cheilev in one period of unawareness, and he was made aware of eating the first piece, and then was made aware of his eating the second piece, there is a machlokes regarding what he must do. **R' Yochanan** says he must bring 2 separate chatas, because the pasuk says "Ahl Chataso V'heivi" ("for his sin he shall bring a chatas"), which means that he must bring a separate chatas for each aveirah that he does. **Reish Lakish** says he only needs to bring one chatas, because the pasuk says "**Mei'** chataso V'nislach Lo" ("**from** his sin and it will be forgiven for him"), which means even if the chatas is brought for only some of his aveiros, he is totally forgiven for all aveiros.
 - **Reish Lakish** says that **R' Yochanan's** pasuk refers to after the chatas was already offered. **Reish Lakish** agrees, that if he finds out about his eating the second piece after the chatas has been offered, he must bring a second chatas.
 - **R' Yochanan** says that **Reish Lakish's** pasuk refers to a case where one ate one and a half olive-sized pieces of cheilev, then became aware that he ate one olive-sized piece, and then he ate a second half-olive sized piece. We would have thought that the two half-olive sized pieces should combine together and make him chayuv for a chatas. The pasuk tells us that the chatas for the first olive sized piece is effective for the first half-olive sized piece as well.
- **Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, do **R' Yochanan** and **Reish Lakish** argue only before the chatas was actually separated, and it is then that **Reish Lakish** says the chatas helps to atone for both aveiros, but **R' Yochanan** says, once there is an awareness the aveiros become distinct entities, each needing its own korbon, but, if the second aveirah is discovered after the chatas is separated even **Reish Lakish** would agree that 2 chatas are required. Or, maybe they argue even if the second aveirah is discovered after the chatas has been separated, and **Reish Lakish** says that even then only one chatas is needed and only after the korbon has been offered is a second chatas needed, and **R' Yochanan** says that once the chatas has been separated, it can no longer be effective for an aveirah that has been discovered after that? Or maybe, they argue in both cases? **R' Ashi** said, it makes sense that they argue in both cases. If they only argue before the separation of the chatas, but after the separation **Reish Lakish** agrees with **R' Yochanan**, then why did **Reish Lakish** explain **R' Yochanan's** pasuk as referring to after the korbon had been offered? He should have explained that it is referring to after it was separated?! And, if they argue after the separation, but before that **R' Yochanan** agrees to **Reish Lakish**, why did **R' Yochanan** explain **Reish Lakish's** pasuk as referring to the case of one and half olive-sized pieces, why didn't he just say that it is referring to before the separation of the korbon?
 - The Gemara says, **R' Ashi's** points are not valid, because it could be that the Gemara that offered the explanations of the psukim wasn't sure itself as to the machlokes and offered these explanations in case the machlokes is even in the extreme cases. Therefore, a proof can't be brought from the way that the psukim were explained.