

שָׁמָא יִטְלֵנוּ בְיָדוֹ וְיַעֲבִירֵנוּ אַרְבַּע אַמּוֹת
בְּרִשּׁוֹת הַרְבִּים. אָמַר לִיה אַבְי: יֵשׁ לִי
בּוֹר בְּחִצְרוֹ, מֵאֵי אֵיכָא לְמִימַר? אָמַר
לִיה: גְּזִירָה בּוֹר בְּחִצְרוֹ אֵטוּ בּוֹר בְּרִשּׁוֹת
הַרְבִּים.

הֲתִינַח שַׁבָּת, בְּיוֹם טוֹב מֵאֵי אֵיכָא
לְמִימַר? גְּזִירָה יוֹם טוֹב אֵטוּ שַׁבָּת.

וּמִי גְזִירֵנָּה? וְהָא תַּנּוּ: וְשׂוּיָן שְׂמִשְׁקִין
אֶת הַמַּיִם בְּכֵלֵי אֲבָן לְטַהֲרוֹ, אֲבָל לֹא
מִטְבִּילִין. וְאֵי אֵיכָא – נִגְזָר הַשְּׂקָה אֵטוּ
הַטְּבִילָה.

וְתַסְבְּרָא, אֵי אֵיכָא לִיה מַיִם יָפִים – הֲנִי
לְמַדָּה לִי לְמַעֲבָד לְהוּ הַשְּׂקָה? אֲלֵא –
דְּלִית לִיה, וְכִינּוּ דְלִית לִיה – מִזְהָר זְהִיר
בְּהוּ.

אֵי תִּיבִי: מִדְּלִין בְּדִלִי טָמֵא, וְהוּא טָהוֹר.
וְאֵי אֵיכָא – נִגְזָר דְּלִמָּא אֲתֵי לְאַטְבִּילִיה
בְּעִינֵיה. שְׂאֵנִי הָתָם, מִתּוֹךְ שְׂלָא הוֹתֵרָה
לוֹ אֲלֵא עַל יְדֵי דְלִין – זְכוּר הוּא.

אֵי תִּיבִי: כְּלֵי שְׂנֵטְמָא מְעָרְב יוֹם טוֹב –
אֵין מִטְבִּילִין אוֹתוֹ בְּיוֹם טוֹב, בְּיוֹם טוֹב –
מִטְבִּילִין אוֹתוֹ בְּיוֹם טוֹב. וְאִם אֵיכָא –
נִגְזָר דְּיוֹם טוֹב אֵטוּ דְּעָרְב יוֹם טוֹב.
טוֹמְאָה בְּיוֹם טוֹב מְלִתָּא דְּלֵא שְׂכִיחָא
הִיא, וּמְלִתָּא דְּלֵא שְׂכִיחָא – לֹא גְזִירָה
בְּהַרְבְּנָן.

lest one come to pick up the vessel in his hand and carry it four cubits^N in the public domain to a ritual bath. Abaye said to Rabba: If one has a pit full of water of a ritual bath in his courtyard, so that this decree should not apply, what is there to say? Rabba said to him: The Sages issued a decree against immersing vessels even in a pit of water in one's own courtyard^N due to a pit situated in the public domain.

Abaye posed another challenge: This works out well with regard to Shabbat, but with regard to a Festival, when there is no prohibition against carrying from one domain to another, what is there to say? Rabba replied: The Sages issued a decree that it is prohibited to immerse a vessel on a Festival, due to the prohibition against immersing it on Shabbat.

The Gemara asks: And do we issue a decree in such a case? But didn't we learn in the mishna: And Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel both agree that one may bring ritually impure water into contact with ritually pure water in stone vessels in order to purify the water. However, one may not immerse the impure water in a ritually impure vessel in order to purify the vessel at the same time. And if it is so that such a decree was issued, let us also decree here that bringing ritually impure water into contact with ritually pure water is prohibited due to the prohibition against immersing^N a ritually impure vessel in a ritual bath.

The Gemara rejects this challenge: And how can you understand that there is substance to this question? If he has other good, ritually pure, water to drink, why do I need to bring this ritually impure water into contact with the ritually pure water? Rather, one must say that he does not have suitable drinking water, and since he does not have other water, he is particularly careful about this water, so that it not become impure. Therefore, perforce, this must be an exceptional case, as the water became impure despite the precautions that were taken; and the Sages did not apply their decrees to unusual cases.

Abaye raised an objection from the following *baraita*: One may draw water from a spring or a ritual bath on a Festival with a ritually impure pail,^H and the pail becomes ritually pure because while being filled with water, the bucket is completely immersed in the ritual bath. And if it is so that the Sages issued such a decree, let us also decree here that it is prohibited to draw water on Festival with a ritually impure pail lest one come to immerse the pail by itself. Rabba answered: It is different there; since it is permitted for him to immerse the pail only by drawing^N water with it, he remembers that it is prohibited to immerse a vessel by itself, and therefore there is no reason to issue a decree.

Abaye raised an objection from a different *baraita*, in which it was taught: With regard to a vessel that was rendered ritually impure on the eve of a Festival, one may not immerse it on the Festival; however, if it became impure on the Festival itself, one may immerse it on the Festival. And if it is so that the Sages issued such a decree, let us also decree here that it is prohibited to immerse a vessel that became impure on a Festival due to the prohibition against immersing a vessel that became impure on the eve of a Festival. Rabba answered: Contracting ritual impurity on a Festival, when all are ritually pure, is an uncommon occurrence, and the general principle is that in the case of an uncommon occurrence, the Sages did not issue a decree as a preventive measure.

NOTES

שָׁמָא... יַעֲבִירֵנוּ אַרְבַּע אַמּוֹת – Rabba cites the same reason to explain the prohibitions against reading the *megilla*, blowing the *shofar* and picking up a *lulav* on Shabbat. The earlier authorities inquire why he does not say that the reason is that one might carry one of these items from a private to a public domain; see the answer of *Tosafot*. Some suggest that if he does not pick up the item with the intention to transfer it to another domain, there is no act of halakhic lifting, which is necessary if the transfer into another domain is to be prohibited by Torah law (see *Sefat Emet*). Others explain that Rabba merely mentioned one of two possible reasons. In any case, the common factor in all these decrees is that they were stated with regard to mitzvot, as one's love for a mitzva and his desire to fulfill it might lead him to forget and carry unwittingly (Rabbi Aharon HaLevi). This principle helps clarify some of the difficulties and answers suggested later in the Gemara.

גְּזִירָה בּוֹר בְּחִצְרוֹ – A decree against a pit in one's courtyard – In general, it can be said that even if one has a pit in which to immerse his vessels inside his own courtyard, his neighbor may not, which means the latter would have to enter his neighbor's courtyard in order to immerse his vessel, thereby performing a prohibited act of carrying out (Rabbi Aharon HaLevi). Some ask: Why did the Gemara not pose a similar question with regard to *shofar* or *megilla*? They answer that in those cases the concern is that one might take them to an expert in order to learn how to perform the mitzva, whereas with regard to a ritual bath, everyone knows how to perform immersion (*Meir*).

הַשְּׂקָה אֵטוּ – Bringing water into contact due to immersing – הַטְּבִילָה: Some authorities ask: Why does the problem with immersing not apply to bringing into contact [*hashaka*] as well? Some answer that as the immersion of vessels is a mitzva, one might consequently forget and come to carry a vessel, whereas the purification of water is not a mitzva (Rabbi Aharon HaLevi). Alternatively, the Gemara should indeed be understood as saying that one may not perform *hashaka* for the same reason that one may not immerse vessels (*Meiri*; *Shitta Mekubbetzet*).

לֹא הוֹתֵרָה לוֹ אֲלֵא – It is permitted for him only by drawing – עַל יְדֵי דְלִין: It is for this reason that the ruling in the Jerusalem Talmud is that it is permitted to employ an artifice in order to immerse small vessels: Since it looks as though he is drawing water, and he does not immerse the vessels in the typical manner of immersion, it is permitted (*Meiri*).

HALAKHA

מִדְּלִין בְּדִלִי – One may draw water with an impure pail – טָמֵא: It is permitted to draw water with a ritually impure pail on a Festival, even if the pail becomes pure in the process (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim*, *Hilkhot Yom Tov* 4:18).

A primary source of impurity [*av hatuma*] and a derivative source of impurity [*velad hatuma*] – אב הטומאה – בולד הטומאה: There are various levels of impurity, each with its own *halakhot* with regard to the ability of an impure object to impart impurity to a different object. Most sources of impurity specified by the Torah are primary ones, except for a corpse, which is the ultimate primary source of ritual impurity [*avi avot hatuma*]. Primary sources of ritual impurity impurify a person, vessels, and all types of food and drink with which they come into contact. A person or object defiled by a primary impurity is called a secondary source of impurity.

According to Torah law, a derivative source of impurity does not defile people or vessels, but only food and drink of *teruma* and consecrated items. The Sages decreed that it renders all kinds of drink impure as well. It likewise invalidates regular food, meaning that it renders it impure to a minor degree, in which the food cannot impart impurity to other items. An item rendered impure by a derivative source of impurity has second-degree impurity. It invalidates *teruma* that comes into contact with it and also renders consecrated food impure. Consequently, the impurity of a derivative source of impurity is relevant to priests, who eat *teruma* and consecrated food, but not to ordinary people.

By a derivative source of impurity one may immerse the vessel – בולד הטומאה מטבילין: Rashi's explanation, that this is because he does not repair the vessel, incorporates Rava's reason cited later in the Gemara. However, many other commentaries explain that Rabba holds that since this impurity is not by Torah law, one will not feel that it is urgent for him to purify the vessel, and therefore he will not make the mistake of carrying the vessels (Rashba and others).

She may employ an artifice and immerse in her clothes – מערמת וטובלת בבגדיה: Some ask: Isn't it prohibited to soak a garment in water on Shabbat and Festivals, as this is regarded as the first stage of washing, which falls into the category of the prohibited labor of whitening? Several answers have been suggested (see *Tosafot*). Some explain that the principle that equates soaking and washing applies only to a garment that has a stain, but not to a clean one (Rabbi Aharon HaLevi).

It is permitted for her only by wearing them as garments – לא הותרה לה אלא על ידי מלבוש: Since it is unusual to immerse fully clothed, she will remember not to carry her garments. The same reasoning applies to Rav Yosef's opinion: It will serve as a reminder not to wring the clothes (Maharam Schiff).

HALAKHA

A menstruating woman...may employ an artifice and immerse – נדה...מערמת וטובלת: A menstruating woman who has no ritually pure clothes to wear after she purifies herself may employ an artifice and immerse herself on a Festival in her clothes (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Yom Tov* 4:18).

איתבייה: בלי שנטמא באב הטומאה – אין מטבילין אותו ביום טוב, בולד הטומאה – מטבילין אותו ביום טוב. ואם איתא, נגזור הא אטו הא.

ולד הטומאה היכי משפחת לה – גבי כהנים, כהנים וריזין הם.

תא שמע, דאמר רב חייא בר אשי אמר רב: נדה שאין לה בגדים – מערמת וטובלת בבגדיה. ואם איתא, נגזור דלמא אתי לאטבולי בעיניהו!

שאני התם. מתוך שלא הותרה לה אלא על ידי מלבוש – וכו' היא.

רב יוסף אמר: גזרה משום סחיטה.

אמר ליה אביי: תינתן כלים דבני סחיטה מנהו, כלים דלאו בני סחיטה מנהו מאי איכא למימר? אמר ליה: גזרה הני אטו הני. איתבייה כל הני תיובתא, ושני ליה בדשניני.

Abaye raised yet another objection from the following *baraita*: With regard to a vessel that was rendered ritually impure by a primary source of impurity, one may not immerse it on a Festival. However, if it was rendered impure only by a derivative source of impurity,^N meaning that the vessel came into contact with an object that was rendered impure by a primary source of impurity, so that the object has the status of first-degree ritual impurity and confers upon the vessel the status of second-degree ritual impurity, a type of impurity that applies to vessels only by rabbinic decree; in such a case, one may immerse the vessel^N on a Festival. And if it is so that the Sages issued such a decree, let us also decree here that it is prohibited to immerse this, a vessel rendered impure by a derivative source of impurity, due to the prohibition to immerse that, a vessel rendered impure by a primary source of impurity.

Rabba replied: Where do you find a case where people are particular about purifying a vessel that contracted ritual impurity from a derivative source of impurity? It is only in one situation, namely, with regard to priests, since they eat *teruma*, and *teruma* contracts ritual impurity even from a vessel that came into contact with only a derivative source of impurity. An ordinary person, who eats non-consecrated produce, does not go to the trouble of purifying such a vessel, since regular produce contracts ritual impurity only from a vessel that came into contact with a primary source of impurity, but not from a vessel that came into contact with a derivative source of impurity. And as for priests, the general principle is that priests are vigilant; they are careful not to allow their vessels to become impure. Therefore, impurity in the case of priests is considered a rare occurrence, with regard to which the Sages did not issue a decree.

The Gemara further suggests: Come and hear a different proof, as Rav Hiyya bar Ashi said that Rav said: A menstruating woman who has no ritually pure clothes to wear after she immerses herself in a ritual bath to purify herself, as all her clothes had become impure, and it is Shabbat or a Festival, when she is unable to immerse them, may employ an artifice to circumvent the prohibition and immerse^H herself in her clothes.^N She is permitted to purify herself, and when she immerses herself while wearing her garments, they become purified at the same time. And if it is so that the Sages issued such a decree, let us also decree that it is prohibited for the woman to immerse herself in her clothes lest she come to immerse the clothes by themselves.

The Gemara answers: It is different there; since it is permitted for her to immerse the clothes only by wearing them as garments,^N she remembers that it is prohibited to immerse them by themselves and will not come to violate this prohibition.

Apropos Rabba's view that one may not immerse a vessel on Shabbat lest he come to carry it four cubits in the public domain, Rav Yosef said that it is prohibited to immerse a vessel on Shabbat for a different reason: It is a decree issued by the Sages as a preventive measure due to the prohibition against wringing. After immersing certain items, such as clothes, one might come to wring them, and this is prohibited on Shabbat and Festivals as a subcategory of the biblically prohibited labor of threshing.

Abaye said to Rav Yosef: This works out well with regard to vessels that are fit for wringing, such as clothes, but with regard to vessels that are not fit for wringing, what is there to say? Rav Yosef said to him: The Sages issued a decree against these vessels, which cannot be wrung, due to those vessels, which can be wrung. Abaye raised against Rav Yosef all of these objections that he had raised against Rabba, in an attempt to prove that the Sages did not issue such a decree, and Rav Yosef answered him as we answered in the name of Rabba.

Immersing vessels on a Festival – טְבִילַת כְּלִים בְּיוֹם טוֹב – If a vessel becomes impure on the eve of a Festival, it may not be immersed on the Festival, lest this leniency lead one to delay immersing the vessel until the Festival. However, if the vessel becomes impure as a result of contact with a derivative source of impurity, it is permitted to immerse it on the Festival because it is pure by Torah law. If a vessel becomes impure on a Festival, it may be immersed on the Festival (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Yom Tov* 4:17).

רַב בֵּיבַי אָמַר: גְּזֵרָה שְׂמָא יִשְׁהָא. תַּנְיָא כְּוֹתִינָה דְרַב בֵּיבַי: כְּלִי שְׁנִטְמָא מֵעֶרְבֵי יוֹם טוֹב – אֵין מְטַבֵּילִין אוֹתוֹ בְּיוֹם טוֹב, גְּזֵרָה שְׂמָא יִשְׁהָא.

Rav Beivai said a different reason: The prohibition against immersing a vessel on a Festival is a decree issued by the Sages lest one come to delay^N the immersion of his impure vessels. Were the Sages to permit him to immerse vessels on a Festival, he might delay immersing all of his impure vessels until the Festival, when he has more free time; and were he to leave ritually impure vessels in his possession for a lengthy period, he might come to defile items that must be kept ritually pure, such as *teruma*. The Gemara comments: **It is taught in a *baraita* in accordance with the opinion of Rav Beivai:**^N With regard to a vessel that became ritually impure on the eve of a Festival, one may not immerse it on a Festival, due to a decree lest he come to delay and keep impure vessels in his home in order to immerse them on the Festival.^H

רַבָּא אָמַר: מִפְּנֵי שְׁנִירָאָה כְּמַתְקֵן כְּלִי. אֵי הָכִי אָדָם נִמְי. אָדָם נִרְאָה כְּמִיקָר.

Rava said yet a different reason: It is prohibited to immerse a vessel on Shabbat because it looks as if he is repairing the vessel.^N Since the vessel was previously unfit for use, and the act of immersion renders it usable, this is similar to the repair of a vessel, which is Torah law proscribes on Shabbat and Festivals.^N The Gemara challenges this understanding: **If so, a person should likewise be prohibited to immerse himself, because it looks as if he is repairing himself through purification.** The Gemara answers: **A person undergoing immersion looks as if he is cooling himself.** Since it is not clearly evident that he is immersing in order to purify himself, as he might be bathing for his pleasure, there is no reason to prohibit the immersion.

הָא תִּינַח מִים יָפִים, מִים רְעִים מֵאֵי אֵיכָא לְמִימֵר? אָמַר רַב נַחֲמָן בַּר יִצְחָק: פְּעָמִים שְׂאָדָם בָּא

The Gemara challenges this explanation: This works out well in a case where he immerses himself in good, clean water, in which it would be a pleasure to bathe; but if he immerses himself in bad, murky water, as the water of a ritual bath is not always sufficiently clean, **what is there to say? Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said:** Even in that case, his actions do not prove that his intention is to purify himself, as **sometimes a person comes home**

NOTES

A decree lest one come to delay – גְּזֵרָה שְׂמָא יִשְׁהָא: Rashi explains that this could lead to one becoming liable to be stoned, as *teruma* and similar foods might be rendered impure as a result of his actions. Others explain that it is prohibited because it looks like he is planning to do the work of immersing vessels on the Festival (*Meiri* and others). Furthermore, he might neglect to purify himself before a Festival, and enter into the Festival in a ritually impure state (Rabbi Aharon HaLevi; see *Shitta Mekubbetzet*).

The opinion of Rav Beivai – שְׂטִית רַב בֵּיבַי: According to many commentaries, Rav Beivai is referring only to a Festival and not to Shabbat, and therefore most of the difficulties raised against Rabba and Rav Yosef do not apply to his approach, as he is not issuing one decree due to another (*Tziyyun LeNefesh Hayya*). Others explain that Rav Beivai accepts Rabba's reasoning with regard to Shabbat but gives a different reason concerning Festivals, which explains why the Rambam cites Rav Beivai's reason in the *halakhot* of Festivals but offers a different justification with regard to the *halakhot* of Shabbat (Maharsha; *Kikkayon DeYona*; see Maharshal and *Rishon LeTziyyon*).

Because it looks as if he is repairing the vessel – כְּמַתְקֵן כְּלִי: Even Rava agrees that it is not considered full-fledged repairing; rather, it was prohibited because people

might consider it an act of repairing and will proceed to repair vessels in a full-fledged manner on a Festival. Therefore, they did not prohibit a person from immersing, as it is possible that he is not immersing himself for the purpose of purification (*Tziyyun LeNefesh Hayya*). According to the view that Rava is concerned about the full-fledged repair of a vessel, it is possible that in the case of an item that contracted impurity from a primary source of impurity, immersion is prohibited in all cases, and in the case of an item that contracted impurity from a derivative source of impurity, immersion is permitted only if it contracted impurity on the Festival itself (Rabbi Aharon HaLevi).

The reasons for the prohibition against immersion – הִטְעָמִים לְאִיסוּר טְבִילָה: The various authorities adopted one or two of the four reasons suggested by Rabba, Rav Yosef, Rav Beivai, and Rava for the prohibition against immersing. The Rif cites the statements of Rav Yosef and Rav Beivai, while the Rambam rules in accordance with the opinion of Rav Beivai with regard to Festivals and that of Rava concerning Shabbat. The main practical difference involves the immersion of new vessels acquired from gentiles, which is prohibited according to many authorities, in keeping with Rabba's reasoning. Those who permit it, whether *ab initio* or after the fact, follow Rav Beivai's approach (see *Yam Shel Shlomo* and *Shulhan Arukh* and its commentaries).

NOTES

On Yom Kippur what is there to say – ביום הכפורים מאי – איכא למימר: It must be understood that at this stage the Gemara does not know of the *baraita* that permits immersing on Yom Kippur. Therefore, its question is a form of: If you assume, meaning that according to this approach, it should be prohibited on Yom Kippur, although it has not yet been established that this is the case (Rashba).

Is there anything – מי איכא מידי – According to the letter of the law, it is permitted to immerse, as this does not fall into the category of washing that is prohibited on Yom Kippur. The fact that it might appear similar to repairing is not sufficient reason to prohibit the action, as the Sages minimized their decrees and enactments as much as possible (Rabbi Aharon HaLevi).

We learned it with regard to one who sips and spits out – מגמגע ופולט תנן: According to this, the mishna should be understood as follows: One may dip in the usual manner, and similarly, it is permitted to sip, as that is considered a manner of eating (*Shitta Mekubbetzet*).

And if it is so let him say, since – נמא הואיל – The Ramban holds that the principle of: Since, which aims at ensuring the uniformity of the enactments of the Sages, is generally invoked in order to render a permitted action prohibited rather than the opposite. In the case of Yom Kippur, however, the logic is that all the obligatory immersions on Shabbat throughout the year should not be disallowed due to the single day of Yom Kippur. Therefore, the case of vinegar should be understood as follows: Since sipping vinegar is prohibited after dipping, it should be prohibited beforehand as well (Rabbi Aharon HaLevi; *Milhamot Hashem*).

BACKGROUND

Treating teeth with vinegar – חומץ לשיניים – One who suffers from tooth decay, and especially when a nerve is exposed, will find drinking vinegar to be painful, as the Bible states: “Like vinegar to the teeth” (Proverbs 10:26). If, however, the pain comes from the gums, or if it is caused by pressure due to accumulation of liquids in cavities, the application of vinegar can relieve the symptoms by lowering the osmotic pressure.

HALAKHA

One who is concerned about pain in his teeth... on Shabbat – החושש בשיניו בשבת – One who has a toothache on Shabbat may not treat it by sipping vinegar and spitting it out. He may, however, sip vinegar and swallow it, or dip his bread into vinegar and eat it in his usual manner. If he is in great pain, to the extent that he suffers generalized weakness, he may administer all types of medicine (*Taz*), or perform rabbinically prohibited treatments by means of a gentile (*Shulhan Arukh HaRav*). Some permit one to perform even Torah prohibitions by means of a gentile, and allow a Jew to perform them in an unusual manner (*Mishna Berura*; *Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim* 328:32).

בשרב, ורוחץ אפילו במי משרה.

תנינח בימות החמה, בימות הגשמים מאי איכא למימר? אמר רב נחמן בר יצחק: פעמים שאדם בא מן השדה מלוכלך בטיט ובצואה, ורוחץ אפילו בימות הגשמים.

תנינח בשבת, ביום הכפורים מאי איכא למימר?

אמר רבא: מי איכא מידי דבשבת שרי וביום הכפורים אסור? אלא, הואיל ובשבת שרי ביום הכפורים נמי שרי.

ומי אית ליה לרבא “הואיל?” והתנן: החושש בשיניו לא יגמגע בהן את החומץ, אבל מטביל הוא כדרכו, ואם נתרפא – נתרפא. ורמינן עלה: לא יגמגע ופולט, אבל מגמגע ובוֹלע.

ואמר אביי: כי תנן נמי מתניתין – מגמגע ופולט תנן. ורבא אמר: אפילו תימא מגמגע ובוֹלע, ולא קשיא: כאן – קודם טבול, כאן – לאחר טבול.

ואם איתא, נמא: הואיל וקודם טבול שרי – לאחר טבול נמי שרי. הדר ביה רבא מההיא.

on a hot day and washes himself even in putrid water in which flax was soaked, because the heat has made him so uncomfortable.

The Gemara raises another objection: This works out well in the summer season; however, in the rainy season, when people do not usually immerse themselves in water in order to cool off, what is there to say? Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said: Sometimes a person comes home from the field soiled with mud and excrement and washes himself even in the rainy season.

The Gemara continues with another objection: This works out well and explains why it is permitted for one to immerse himself on Shabbat, when it is permitted to wash, and therefore it can be argued that it is not clearly evident that he is immersing in order to purify himself; but on Yom Kippur, when all bathing apart from ritual immersion is prohibited, what is there to say?^N His actions prove that his intention is to purify himself, and this should be prohibited because it looks as though he is repairing himself through purification.

Rava said: It is impossible to prohibit immersion on Yom Kippur alone, as is there anything^N that is permitted on Shabbat and the very same act is prohibited as labor on Yom Kippur? In fact, the prohibition against labor is more stringent on Shabbat than on Yom Kippur. Rather, since it is permitted on Shabbat, it is also permitted on Yom Kippur. The Sages did not issue decrees with regard to Yom Kippur that would make it more stringent than Shabbat. Therefore, since they allowed a person to immerse on Shabbat because it looks as if he is doing so for pleasure, to escape the heat or to remove dirt, and not necessarily in order to purify himself, they permitted it on Yom Kippur as well, even though it is evident in that situation that his immersion is for the purpose of achieving purity.

The Gemara asks: Does Rava accept the principle of: Since? But didn't we learn in a mishna: One who is concerned about pain in his teeth may not sip vinegar through them^B on Shabbat^H in order to alleviate his toothache; however, he may dip his food in vinegar in his usual manner during the meal and eat it, and if he is healed by the vinegar, he is healed. And we raised a contradiction to this mishna from the following *baraita*: One may not sip vinegar and immediately spit it out, as this is clearly done for medicinal purposes; however, one may sip the vinegar and swallow it, since it looks as though he is drinking it. This indicates that there is a permitted way to use vinegar even without dipping his food into it.

And Abaye said: Also when we learned this ruling in the mishna, we learned it with regard to the case of one who sips and spits it out.^N Rava said: Even if you say that the mishna prohibits sipping vinegar even in a case where one sips and swallows it, it is still not difficult: Here, the *baraita* permits sipping vinegar before dipping one's food in it, as he appears to be doing so for pleasure. There, the mishna prohibits sipping the vinegar after dipping his food in it, when it is clear that one is doing so for medicinal purposes only.

The Gemara completes its question: And if it is so that Rava accepts the principle of: Since, let him say: Since^N it is permitted to sip vinegar before dipping, it is also permitted to do so after dipping. The Gemara answers: Rava retracted that statement with regard to vinegar and accepted Abaye's resolution of the difficulty, along with the principle of: Since.

And from where can it be determined that he retracted that – וממאי דמההיא הדר ביה – Tosafot ask: How does this prove that he retracted in that case? Perhaps he changed his mind with regard to the reason he gave for the prohibition against immersing vessels. They answer that it is preferable to say this than to suggest that he retracted two opinions. However, it has been pointed out by other early authorities that an argument of this kind should have been stated explicitly by the Gemara, as is typical when the Gemara explains the need to change a reading of the text or an opinion.

Some explain that because the *baraita* that permits immersing on Yom Kippur must be understood as employing the argument of: Since, Rava must have retracted from the other case (see *Meiri* and others). Others suggest, according to the Maharshah, that all four *amora'im*, Rabba, Rav Yosef, Rav Beivai, and Rava, accept the reason of repairing, and consequently, they must accept the principle of: Since, as well (*Hatam Sofer*). Some explain that it is preferable to minimize disputes when explaining the reasoning behind different views; without this answer, it would have been necessary to explain why Rava suggested an explanation that is different from that of Abaye (*Minhat Aharon*).

Yet others claim that the fact that Rava made two contradictory statements with regard to the principle of: Since, indicates his indecision over this matter, whereas his opinion with regard to repairing was stated unequivocally. Therefore, it is more likely that he changed his mind with regard to the subject about which he was ambivalent (*Rishon LeTziyyon*; see Rabbi Aharon HaLevi).

אין – One may not immerse a vessel on account of its water – וממאי דמההיא הדר ביה: The early authorities note that Shmuel's statement is in keeping with the first option suggested later by the Gemara, that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. The commentaries on the Rambam and others address the issue of why the Rambam follows the second answer of the Gemara despite Shmuel's statement.

לא רבי ולא רבנן – Not Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi nor the Rabbis: In the Jerusalem Talmud a different version of the *Tosefta* is cited that makes it clear that the mishna here is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis rather than that of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi.

וממאי דמההיא הדר ביה, דלמא מהא הדר ביה? לא סלקא דעתך. דתנאי: כל חייבי טבילות טובלין בדרבן, בין בתשעה באב בין ביום הכיפורים.

The Gemara asks: **And from where can it be determined that he retracted thatⁿ teaching? Perhaps he retracted this statement** with regard to immersion in a ritual bath on Yom Kippur. The Gemara answers: **This cannot enter your mind** that he retracted his view in that case, as it is taught in a *baraita*: **All who are obligated in immersions^h immerse in their usual manner, both on the Ninth of Av and on Yom Kippur**, even though it is prohibited to wash on these days. Rava would certainly have aligned his opinion with the explicit ruling of a *baraita*.

”ושוין שמשקין את המים בכלי אבן” וכו'. מאי “אבל לא מטבילין”? אמר שמואל: אין מטבילין את הכלי על גב מימיו לטהרו ביום טוב.

It was taught in the mishna: **And Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel both agree that one may bring ritually impure water into contact with ritually pure water in stone vessels** in order to purify the water. However, one may not immerse the impure water. The Gemara asks: **What is the meaning of the mishna's statement: However, one may not immerse the impure water? Shmuel said: One may not immerse an impure vessel on account of its waterⁿ in order to purify it on a Festival.** The Sages allowed impure water to be purified through contact with ritually pure water only in a stone vessel or in another vessel that does not contract impurity, but not in an impure vessel that would itself become purified through this immersion.

ממי מתניתין? לא רבי, ולא רבנן. דתנאי: אין מטבילין את הכלי על גב מימיו לטהרו, ואין משקין את המים בכלי אבן לטהרו, דברי רבי. ורבנן: מטבילין כליו על גב מימיו לטהרו, ומשקין את המים בכלי אבן לטהרו.

The Gemara asks: If that is its meaning, in accordance with **whose opinion is the mishna?** It is **not** in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi **nor** with that of **the Rabbis.**ⁿ **As it is taught in the Tosefta: One may not immerse an impure vessel on account of its water** in order to purify the vessel, **and one may not bring impure water into contact with pure water in a stone vessel** in order to purify the water; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. **And the Rabbis say: One may immerse an impure vessel on account of its water** in order to purify the vessel, **and one may bring impure water into contact with pure water in a stone vessel** in order to purify the water.

ממי? אי רבי – קשיא השקיה, אי רבנן – קשיא הטבילה!

If so, in accordance with **whose opinion is the mishna?** If it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, then the ruling with regard to **bringing impure water into contact with pure water in a stone vessel is difficult**, as in the *Tosefta* Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi prohibits doing so, whereas the mishna permits it; and if it is in accordance with the opinion of **the Rabbis**, then the ruling with regard to the **immersion** of an impure vessel on account of its water is **difficult**, as in the *Tosefta* the Rabbis permit this, while the mishna, as explained by Shmuel, prohibits it.

איבעית אימא רבי, איבעית אימא רבנן. אי בעית אימא רבי: רישא דברייתא ביום טוב, וסיפא בשבת, ובילה מתניתין ביום טוב.

The Gemara answers: **If you wish, say** that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi; and **if you wish, say** instead that it is in accordance with the opinion of **the Rabbis**. How so? **If you wish, say** that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi and explain that the **first clause** of that *baraita*, i.e., the first part of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's statement in the *Tosefta*, deals with a **Festival**; it is in that case that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi prohibits immersing an impure vessel on account of its water, but bringing impure water into contact with pure water in a stone vessel would be permitted. **And the latter clause**, which extends the prohibition to bringing impure water into contact with pure water, is referring to the more stringent case of **Shabbat**. **And the entire mishna** is referring to a **Festival**, when it is permitted to purify impure water by bringing it into contact with pure water in a stone vessel.

HALAKHA

All obligated in immersions – כל חייבי טבילות – Fundamentally, all those obligated to immerse may do so in the usual manner, both on the Ninth of Av and on Yom Kippur, provided that the immersion is performed at the proper time. Nowadays, when there are almost no cases where immersion is carried out at the proper time, immersion

is not done on these days. Even a menstruating woman may not immerse on these days; rather, she washes her hair and bathes on the day before the Ninth of Av or Yom Kippur and immerses after the fast has ended (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhhot Shevitat Asor* 3:2; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 554:8).