

**Eating while traveling** – אֲכִילָה בְּדֶרֶךְ – One who is traveling should not eat more than he would during a time of famine, in order to prevent intestinal disease (*Magen Avraham; Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 110:10*).

NOTES

**Bowels** – מַעֲיֵינָא: The commentary on the text follows Rabbeinu Hananel, who explains that this is a reference to diarrhea. If a traveler eats in his customary way, he is likely to suffer from stomach problems, which might prevent him from continuing his journey. Others suggest that if one who wishes to set out on a journey eats too much, his full stomach will weigh him down and make it difficult for him to travel as planned (Rabbeinu Gershom).

במתנתא תנא: אל תפסיעו פסיעה גסה, והכניסו חמה לעיר. אל תפסיעו פסיעה גסה, דאמר מר: פסיעה גסה נוטלת אחד מחמש מאות ממאור עיניו של אדם.

It is taught in a *baraita* that Joseph said to his brothers: **Do not take long strides and bring the sun into the city**, i.e., you should enter the city to spend the night there before the sun has set. The Gemara elaborates: **Do not take long strides, as the Master said: A long stride takes away one five-hundredth of a person's eyesight, and this loss is not worth the time saved.**

והכניסו חמה לעיר, כדרב יהודה אמר רב. דאמר רב יהודה אמר רב: לעולם יצא אדם ב"כי טוב" ויבנס ב"כי טוב", שנאמר: "הבקר אור, והאנשים שלחו".

The Gemara further explains: **And bring the sun into the city**, this is in accordance with a statement that Rav Yehuda said that Rav said. **As Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: A person should always leave the place where he has spent the night with "it is good"** (Genesis 1:4), i.e., after sunrise, as the Torah uses the expression "it is good" with regard to the creation of light. This goodness is manifest in the sense of security one feels when it is light. **And likewise, when one comes into an unfamiliar city he should enter with "it is good," before sunset, as it is stated: "As soon as the morning was light, the men were sent away"** (Genesis 44:3).

אמר רב יהודה אמר רבי חייא: המהלך בדרך אל יאכל יותר משני רעבון. מאי טעמא? הכא תרגימו: משום מעינא. במערבא אמרי: משום מזוני. מאי בינייהו? איכא בינייהו.

Similarly, Rav Yehuda said that Rabbi Hiyya said: **One who is walking along the road should not eat more each day than he would normally eat each day in a year of famine.**<sup>h</sup> The Gemara asks: **What is the reason for this? Here in Babylonia they interpreted that the reason is due to one's bowels.**<sup>n</sup> Since the exertion of traveling can damage full bowels, it is preferable to eat less than the normal amount. **In the West, Eretz Yisrael, they say that the reason is due to food**, i.e., if one eats too much, his food may not last the entire journey, and therefore he should ration his meals. The Gemara asks: **What is the practical difference between these two opinions? The Gemara answers: The practical difference between them**

Perek I  
Daf 11 Amud a

דתיב בארבא. אי נמי: דקאזיל מאונא לאונא.

is in a case **where he is sitting in a boat**. The traveler must be concerned about his food supply, but he need not worry that the jostling of the road might force him to exert himself, which has a tendency to cause digestive problems. **Alternatively**, the practical difference is in a case **where he is traveling from station [avnna]<sup>l</sup> to station**. Here the exertion of the road might cause digestive problems, but one need not be concerned about running out of food, as he can resupply along the way.

רב פפא כל פרסה ופרסה אכיל חדא ריפתא. קסבר: משום מעינא.

The Gemara relates that when Rav Pappa traveled, along **each and every parasang<sup>n</sup>** he would **eat one loaf of bread**. Rav Pappa did so because he **maintained** that the prohibition was **due to the bowels**, and as he was healthy he was not concerned that travel by road would irritate his digestion.

אמר רב יהודה אמר רב: כל המרעב עצמו בשני רעבון ניצל ממיתה משונה, שנאמר "ברעב פרוך ממות". מרעב מיבעי ליה! אלא, הכי קאמר: בשכר שמרעב עצמו בשני רעבון, ניצל ממיתה משונה.

Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: **Anyone who has food for himself but nevertheless starves himself in years of famine<sup>h</sup> will be saved from an unusual death, as it is stated: "In famine, He will redeem you from death"** (Job 5:20).<sup>n</sup> This is derived from the precise wording of the verse. According to its straightforward meaning, instead of "in famine," it **should have** said: **From famine**, as one is delivered from famine. **Rather, this is what the verse is saying: As a reward for starving himself in years of famine, Job will be saved from an unusual death.**

HALAKHA

**Anyone who starves himself in years of famine** – כָּל הַמְרַעֵב: In times of famine, one should eat less and allow himself to go hungry, in accordance with the opinion of Rav Yehuda. Furthermore, it is prohibited to engage in marital relations during a famine, except on the night the wife ritually immerses herself. However, couples who are as yet without children may engage in relations even in years of famine. Many

authorities rule leniently in this regard, in accordance with the opinion that refraining from sexual relations during years of famine is an act of piety, not a requirement (see *Sha'arei Teshuva*). Others note that these regulations are not limited to times of famine, but they apply whenever the community is faced with an impending calamity (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 574:4*, and in the comment of Rema).

LANGUAGE

**Station [avnna]** – אַוּנָא: From the Syriac word for station or inn, although some associate it with the Greek εὐνή, *eunē*, meaning bed.

NOTES

**Each and every parasang** – כָּל פְּרֶסָה וּפְרֶסָה: Some commentators suggest that Rav Pappa maintains that the advice to a traveler to eat sparingly was to help him avoid digestive problems that might result from the consumption of a heavy meal. He therefore divided his rations into small quantities that he ate every parasang, roughly every 4 km. In this way he ate a large number of small meals, rather than a single heavy meal (*Sefat Emet*).

**In famine, He will redeem you from death** – בְּרַעַב פְּרוּךְ: The fact that the verse does not state: He will redeem you from famine, but rather: He will redeem you from death, is an indication that you will be spared all types of unusual deaths (Maharsha).

And one of them separates himself – וּפִירֵשׁ אֶחָד מֵהֶן – One who separates himself from the community at a time of distress, when it is in his power to help the community in some way (*Magen Avraham*), will not merit to see its eventual consolation. Conversely, whoever participates in the community's suffering will merit seeing its consolation (*Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 574:5*).

אָמַר רִישׁ לָקִישׁ: אִסּוּר לְאָדָם לְשַׁמֵּשׂ מִטָּוֶה בְּשָׁנֵי רָעָבוֹן, שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר: "וּלְיוֹסֵף יָלֵד שְׁנֵי בָנִים בְּטָרִם תִּבּוֹא שְׁנַת הָרָעָב". תֵּנָּא: חֲסוּכֵי בָנִים מְשַׁמְשִׁין מִטּוֹתֵיהֶן בְּשָׁנֵי רָעָבוֹן.

תְּנוּ רַבְנָן: בְּזִמְנֵי שִׁישְׂרָאֵל שְׂרוּיִין בְּצַעַר, וּפִירֵשׁ אֶחָד מֵהֶן, בְּאִין שְׁנֵי מַלְאָכֵי הַשָּׁרַת שְׂמַלְוִין לוֹ לְאָדָם וּמְנַחֲמִין לוֹ יְדִיהֶן עַל רֹאשׁוֹ וְאוֹמְרִים: פְּלוּנֵי זֶה, שִׁפְרִישׁ מִן הַצָּבוּר, אֵל יְרָאָה בְּנַחֲמַת צָבוּר.

תֵּנָּא אֵידִךְ: בְּזִמְנֵי שֶׁהַצָּבוּר שְׂרוּי בְּצַעַר, אֵל יֹאמַר אָדָם: "אֵלֶיךָ לְבִיתִי וְאוֹכֵל וְאֶשְׁתִּיה, וְשָׁלוֹם עֲלֶיךָ, נִפְשִׁי". וְאִם עוֹשֶׂה כֵן, עָלָיו הַכֶּתוּב אוֹמֵר: "וְהִנֵּה שֹׁשׁוֹן וְשִׂמְחָה, הֲרֹג בְּקָר וְשַׁחַט צֹאן, אֲכַל בֶּשָׂר וְשַׁתוּת יַיִן. אֲכֹל וְשַׁתוּ, כִּי מָחָר נָמוּת". מַה כְּתִיב בְּתַרְיָה? "וְנִגְלָה בְּאָזְנֵי ה' צְבָאוֹת: אִם יִכְפַּר הָעוֹן הַזֶּה לָכֶם עַד תָּמָתוֹן".

עַד כָּאֵן מִידַת בִּינוּנִים, אֲבָל בְּמִדַּת רְשָׁעִים מַה כְּתִיב? "אֲתֵינוּ, אֶקְחָה יַיִן, וְנִסְבָּאָה שָׂכָר, וְהָיָה כֹּהָ יוֹם מָחָר". מַה כְּתִיב בְּתַרְיָה? "הַצַּדִּיק אֲבָד וְאִין אִישׁ שָׁם עַל לֵב... כִּי מִפְּנֵי הָרָעָה נֶאֱסַף הַצַּדִּיק".

אֵלָּא, יִצְעַר אָדָם עִם הַצָּבוּר. שְׂכָן מְצִינוּ בְּמִשָּׁה רַבִּינוּ, שֶׁצִּיעַר עִצְמוֹ עִם הַצָּבוּר, שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר: "וַיְדִי מִשָּׁה בְּבָדִים וַיִּקְחוּ אֶבֶן וַיִּשְׂמוּ תַחְתָּיו וַיִּשָּׁב עָלֶיהָ", וְכִי לֹא הָיָה לוֹ לְמִשָּׁה כִּר אֶחָד אוֹ כֶּסֶת אַחַת לִישָׁב עָלֶיהָ? אֵלָּא, כִּדְ אָמַר מִשָּׁה: הוֹאִיל וַיִּשְׂרָאֵל שְׂרוּיִין בְּצַעַר, אִף אֲנִי אֶהְיֶה עִמָּהֶם בְּצַעַר. וְכָל הַמְצַעֵר עִצְמוֹ עִם הַצָּבוּר זוֹכֵה וְרוֹאָה בְּנַחֲמַת צָבוּר.

Similarly, Reish Lakish said: It is prohibited for a person to have conjugal relations in years of famine, so that children not be born during these difficult years. As it is stated: "And to Joseph were born two sons before the year of famine came" (Genesis 41:50). It was taught in a *baraita*: Nevertheless, those without children<sup>N</sup> may have marital relations in years of famine, as they must strive to fulfill the mitzva to be fruitful and multiply.

Likewise, the Sages taught in a *baraita*: When the Jewish people is immersed in distress, and one of them separates himself<sup>H</sup> from the community and does not share their suffering, the two ministering angels who accompany a person come and place their hands on his head, as though he was an offering, and say: This man, so-and-so, who has separated himself from the community, let him not see the consolation of the community.

A similar idea is taught in another *baraita*: When the community is immersed in suffering, a person may not say: I will go to my home and I will eat and drink, and peace be upon you, my soul. And if he does so, the verse says about him: "And behold joy and gladness, slaying oxen and killing sheep, eating flesh and drinking wine; let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we shall die" (Isaiah 22:13). And the prophecy continues with what is written afterward, in the following verse: "And the Lord of hosts revealed Himself in my ears: Surely this iniquity shall not be expiated by you until you die" (Isaiah 22:14).

The *baraita* comments: Up to this point is the attribute of middling people, who merely exclude themselves from the suffering of the community. However, with regard to the attribute of wicked people,<sup>N</sup> what is written about those who hope for more of these days? "Come, I will fetch wine, and we will fill ourselves with strong drink; and tomorrow shall be as this day, and much more abundant" (Isaiah 56:12). And what is written afterward? "The righteous perishes, and no man lays it to heart, and godly men are taken away, none considering that the righteous is taken away from the evil to come" (Isaiah 57:1). This verse teaches that righteous people suffer early death to prevent them from witnessing the harm that will befall these evil people.

The *baraita* continues: Rather, a person should be distressed together with the community. As we found with Moses our teacher that he was distressed together with the community, as it is stated during the war with Amalek: "But Moses' hands were heavy; and they took a stone, and put it under him, and he sat upon it" (Exodus 17:12). But didn't Moses have one pillow or one cushion to sit upon; why was he forced to sit on a rock? Rather, Moses said as follows: Since the Jewish people are immersed in suffering, I too will be with them in suffering, as much as I am able, although I am not participating in the fighting. The *baraita* adds: And anyone who is distressed together with the community will merit seeing the consolation of the community.

NOTES

Those without [*hasukhei*] children – חֲסוּכֵי בָנִים: Most early authorities maintain that this expression is referring to couples without children, who are permitted to engage in marital relations even during years of famine. The early authorities and the later authorities dispute the precise meaning of the phrase, whether it refers solely to those who have no children at all (Meiri; *Taz*), or whether it includes those who have a son or a daughter, but not both, and who have therefore not yet fulfilled the husband's religious obligation to be fruitful and multiply (Rashi; Ran; Talmid HaRamban).

It is stated in the Jerusalem Talmud that even couples who are without children, whom the Gemara there calls: Those who are desirous of children, may engage in marital relations during years of famine only on the night when the wife ritually

immerses herself, when conception is most likely. The Ritva suggests an entirely different explanation of this passage, which he bases on a variant reading available to many of the early authorities: *Hashukhei banim*, those whose children's actions are dark. According to this opinion, those couples whose children are wicked, so-called children of dark deeds, are permitted to engage in marital relations during years of famine.

Middling people...wicked people – בִּינוּנִים...רְשָׁעִים: The commentaries suggest various explanations for the difference between those who are considered middling, i.e., neither righteous nor wicked, and those who are classified as wicked. The commentary on the text follows Rashi, who explains that

although the members of the middle group refuse to show sympathy toward those who are in distress, they do recognize that they themselves are in danger, whereas the wicked imagine that they are immune to the perils threatening the community.

Others suggest that although the members of the middle group withdraw from the community in its time of need, they do so only in private, whereas the wicked declare publicly that they are unaffected by the problems of others (Rabbi Elyakim). Yet other commentaries argue that although the members of the middle group are indifferent to the troubles suffered by the community, they repent when they themselves are struck by the same afflictions. By contrast, the wicked fail to repent even when suffering reaches their own doors (Ritva).

The school of Rabbi Sheila – דְּבִי רַבִּי שֵׁילָא – Rabbi Sheila was a Babylonian Sage in the transitional generation between the *tanna'im* and the *amora'im*. His school played an important role in Babylonia, as it was the only important academy there before Rav came. The major *amora'im* Rav and Shmuel, treated Rabbi Sheila with great respect, and when they established Torah centers they did so in other cities, so as not to detract from his honor.

Rabbi Sheila's academy apparently remained active for a considerable time after his passing, which is why there are statements delivered in the name of the school of Rabbi Sheila.

וְשָׂמָא יֹאמֵר אֶדָם: מִי מַעֲיֵד בִּי? אֲבָנֵי בֵּיתוֹ שֶׁל אֶדָם וְקוֹרוֹת בֵּיתוֹ שֶׁל אֶדָם מַעֲיֵדִים בּוֹ, שְׁנֵאמַר: "כִּי אֲבָן מִקִּיר תִּזְעַק, וְכַפֵּי מַעַץ יַעֲנֶנּוּ." דְּבִי רַבִּי שֵׁילָא אָמַר: שְׁנֵי מַלְאָכֵי הַשָּׁרֵת הַמְּלוּוִין לוֹ לְאֶדָם הֵן מַעֲיֵדִין עָלָיו, שְׁנֵאמַר: "כִּי מַלְאָכָיו יִצְוּהוּ לָךְ."

רַבִּי חִידְקָא אָמַר: נִשְׁמַתוּ שֶׁל אֶדָם הֵיא מַעֲיָדָה עָלָיו, שְׁנֵאמַר: "מִשְׁכַּבְתָּ חִיקָךְ שְׂמוֹר פְּתָחֵי פִיךָ." וַיֵּשׁ אֲמֹרִים: אֲבָרֵי שֶׁל אֶדָם מַעֲיֵדִים בּוֹ, שְׁנֵאמַר: "אַתֶּם עֵדֵי, נָאִם ה'."

"אֵל אֱמוּנָה, וְאֵין עוֹל." אֵל אֱמוּנָה: בְּשֵׁם שְׁנִפְרַעְתִּין מִן הַרְשָׁעִים לְעוֹלָם הַבָּא אֲפִילוֹ עַל עֲבִירָה קְלָה שְׁעוֹשִׂין. כִּךְ נִפְרַעְתִּין מִן הַצְדִּיקִים בְּעוֹלָם הַזֶּה עַל עֲבִירָה קְלָה שְׁעוֹשִׂין.

"וְאֵין עוֹל": בְּשֵׁם שְׁמִשְׁלָמִין שָׂכַר לְצְדִיקִים לְעוֹלָם הַבָּא אֲפִילוֹ עַל מִצְוָה קְלָה שְׁעוֹשִׂין, כִּךְ מִשְׁלָמִין שָׂכַר לְרָשָׁעִים בְּעוֹלָם הַזֶּה אֲפִילוֹ עַל מִצְוָה קְלָה שְׁעוֹשִׂין.

"צְדִיק וַיִּשָּׁךְ הוּא": אָמַר: בְּשֵׁעַת פְּטִירָתוֹ שֶׁל אֶדָם לְבֵית עוֹלָמוֹ, כֹּל מַעֲשָׂיו נִפְרָטִין לְפָנָיו, וְאֲמֹרִים לוֹ: כִּךְ וְכִךְ עָשִׂיתָ בְּמָקוֹם פְּלוֹנִי בְּיוֹם פְּלוֹנִי, וְהוּא אָמַר: הֵן וְאֲמֹרִים לוֹ: חֲתוּם, וְחֲתוּם, שְׁנֵאמַר: "בְּיַד כָּל אֶדָם יִחְתוּם." וְלֹא עוֹד, אֲלֵא שְׁמַצְדִּיק עָלָיו אֵת הַדִּין, וְאֲמַר לָהֶם: כִּפֹּה דְנַתוּנִי, לְקִיָּים מַה שְׁנֵאמַר: "לְמַעַן תִּצְדַּק בְּדַבְרְךָ."

The *baraita* further states: **And lest a person say, I have acted in secret; who will testify against me<sup>n</sup> on the Day of Judgment?** The *tanna* explains that the stones of a person's house and the beams of a person's house will testify against him, as it is stated: **"For a stone shall cry out from the wall, and a beam out of the timber shall answer it"** (Habakkuk 2:11). In the school of Rabbi Sheila<sup>p</sup> they say: **The two ministering angels who accompany a person will testify against him, as it is stated: "For He will give His angels charge over you, to keep you in all your ways"** (Psalms 91:11).

Rabbi Hidka said: **A person's soul will testify against him, as it is stated: "Keep the doors of your mouth from her who lies in your bosom"** (Micah 7:5). **And some say: A man's limbs will testify against him, as it is stated: "You are My witnesses, says the Lord"** (Isaiah 43:10).

The *baraita* cites another verse that deals with judgment. **"A God of faithfulness and without iniquity, He is just and righteous"** (Deuteronomy 32:4). The *baraita* interprets "a God of faithfulness" to mean that **just as punishment is exacted from the wicked in the World-to-Come even for a light transgression that they commit, so too, punishment is exacted from the righteous in this world for a light transgression that they commit.** The righteous suffer their punishment in this world to purify them so they can enjoy the World-to-Come.

The *baraita* turns to the second section of the verse: **"And without iniquity."**<sup>n</sup> This teaches that **just as reward is paid to the righteous in the World-to-Come even for a minor mitzva that they fulfill, so too, reward is paid to the wicked in this world for even a minor mitzva that they fulfill,** to give the wicked all the reward they deserve for the performance of mitzvot in this world, and deprive them of any share in the World-to-Come.

With regard to the third section of the verse: **"He is just and righteous,"** the Sages said: **At the hour of a person's departure to his eternal home, all his deeds are enumerated before him and are rendered visible to him once again, and the deeds themselves say to him: You did such and such, in such and such a place, on such and such a day, and he says: Yes, that is exactly what happened. And they say to him: Sign a statement that this is correct, and he signs it, as it is stated: "He makes the hand of every man sign"** (Job 37:7). **And not only that, but after a one has been shown all his deeds, he justifies the judgment upon himself, and says to them: You have judged me well.** This response serves to fulfill that which is stated: **"That You may be justified when You speak and be right when You judge"** (Psalms 51:6).

## NOTES

**Who will testify against me – מי מעיד בי –** Some commentaries explain that this testimony should be understood in the sense of the disclosure of the truth (Rashba). The beams of a person's house, the angels who accompany him, his soul, and his very body will reveal his true behavior during those times when the community suffered distress. When the Gemara speaks of the beams of a person's house it is referring to his neighbors, who are aware of his actions in his own home, and who will share their knowledge with the rest of the community. The angels display a person's true character to the public when they withdraw from him the protection that had shielded him from calamity up to that point. A person's soul sheds light on his conduct when it receives fitting punishment in the World-to-Come. Lastly, one's own body reveals his true character when his organs are afflicted in this world.

**And without iniquity – ואין עול –** The early authorities cite different versions and interpretations of this passage. According to the standard talmudic text, the first part of the verse: "A God of faithfulness,"

teaches that punishment is exacted from the righteous in this world even for their slightest transgressions, while the second part of the verse: "And without iniquity," indicates that reward is paid to the wicked in this world for every small mitzva. Rashi explains in his commentary on the verse that both parts promise that one will ultimately be rewarded for his mitzvot. The phrase "a God of faithfulness" teaches that God will reward the righteous in the World-to-Come, while the expression "without iniquity" means that He will reward the wicked in this world.

Others commentaries prefer the version of the *Yalkut Shimoni*, according to which the first part of the verse is referring to all aspects of God's justice, the reward paid to the righteous and to the wicked, as well as the punishment meted out to both the righteous and to the wicked. The second part of the verse teaches the subsequent claim of the *baraita*, that when one dies all his deeds appear before him and remind him of all he did in the course of his lifetime. From the third part of the verse: "He is just and righteous," it is derived that when the deceased receives his punishment he accepts the judgment and confesses his sins (Maharsha).



PERSONALITIES

Rabbi Elazar HaKappar – רבי אלעזר הקפר: Rabbi Elazar HaKappar was a Sage from the last generation of *tanna'im*. A few of Rabbi Elazar HaKappar's rulings of *halakha* can be found in *baraitot* and halakhic midrash, while many of his moral statements and homiletic expositions of *aggada* are mentioned in the Mishna, the Gemara, and *midrashim*. We do not know any details of Rabbi Elazar HaKappar's life, apart from the fact that he had a son called Rabbi Eliezer. He was apparently active for a time in Lod, and Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi was his foremost disciple. It is unclear whether the moniker HaKappar is referring to the name of a place, or his occupation, as *fokarin* means wool. There are many theories concerning the relationship between Rabbi Elazar HaKappar and the Sage bar Kappara. An inscription was recently discovered on a doorpost in the Golan Heights that states: This is the study hall of Rabbi Elazar HaKappar.



Ancient engraving and sketch. The inscription reads: This is the study hall of Rabbi Elazar HaKappar.

BACKGROUND

The Great [*berabbi*] – ברבי: When the epithet *berabbi*, or *beribbi*, appears after the name of a Sage, this means that he was the son of a Rabbi only if a specific Rabbi is named, e.g., Rabbi Yosei *berabbi* Yehuda means Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda. Here, however, the term *berabbi* is simply an honorific, which literally means the son of great men, of rabbis and great scholars of the generation. Since it is an honorific expression, when *berabbi* appears by itself it does not indicate that the man to whom it is applied is actually the son of great Sages, but rather, that he is himself an important Sage of his generation.

אמר שמואל: כל היושב בתענית נקרא חוטא. סבר כי האי תנא, דתניא: רבי אלעזר הקפר ברבי אומר: מה תלמוד לומר: "וכפר עליו מאשר חטא על הנפש"? וכי באיזה נפש חטא זה? אלא, שציער עצמו מן היין.

והלא דברים קל וחומר? ומה זה, שלא ציער עצמו אלא מן היין, נקרא חוטא, המציער עצמו מכל דבר ודבר, על אחת כמה וכמה!

רבי אלעזר אומר: נקרא קדוש, שנאמר: "קדוש יהיה, גדל פרע שער ראשו". ומה זה, שלא ציער עצמו אלא מדבר אחד, נקרא קדוש, המציער עצמו מכל דבר, על אחת כמה וכמה!

ולשמואל, הא איקרי קדוש! ההוא אגידול פרע קאי. ולרבי אלעזר, הא נקרא חוטא! ההוא דסאיב נפשיה.

ומי אמר רבי אלעזר הכי? והאמר רבי אלעזר: לעולם ימוד אדם עצמו

The Gemara returns to the primary topic of the tractate, the issue of fasts. **Shmuel said: Whoever sits in observance of a fast is called a sinner,**<sup>N</sup> as it is inappropriate to take unnecessary suffering upon oneself. The Gemara comments: **Shmuel holds in accordance with the opinion of the following *tanna*, as it is taught in a *baraita*: Rabbi Elazar HaKappar<sup>P</sup> the Great<sup>B</sup> says: What is the meaning when the verse states, with regard to a nazirite: "And he will atone for him for that he sinned by the soul [*nefesh*]" (Numbers 6:11). But with what soul did this nazirite sin? Rather, the nazirite sinned by the distress he caused himself when he abstained from wine, in accordance with the terms of his vow.**

**And are these matters not inferred *a fortiori*? And if this nazirite, who distressed himself by abstaining only from wine, is nevertheless called a sinner and requires atonement, then with regard to one who distresses himself by abstaining from each and every matter of food and drink when he fasts, all the more so should he be considered a sinner.**

Conversely, **Rabbi Elazar says: One who accepts a fast upon himself is called sacred, as it is stated with regard to the nazirite: "He shall be sacred, he shall let the locks of the hair of his head grow long"** (Numbers 6:5). Here too, one can apply an *a fortiori* inference: **And if this nazirite, who distressed himself by abstaining from only one matter, wine, is nevertheless called sacred, then with regard to one who distresses himself by abstaining from every matter, all the more so should he be considered sacred.**

The Gemara asks: **And according to the opinion of Shmuel, the nazirite is indeed called sacred, as stated by Rabbi Elazar.** The Gemara answers: **That verse is referring to the sanctity of the growth of the locks,**<sup>N</sup> as the nazirite's hair does possess an element of sanctity, but it does not refer to the nazirite himself. The Gemara reverses the question: **And according to the opinion of Rabbi Elazar, the nazirite is called a sinner.** The Gemara answers: **That verse refers specifically to a nazirite who rendered himself ritually impure by coming into contact with a dead body, an act that is prohibited for him. This particular nazirite must bring an offering to atone "for that he sinned by the soul."**

The Gemara asks: **And did Rabbi Elazar actually say this, that fasting is a virtuous act? But didn't Rabbi Elazar say: A person should always consider himself**

NOTES

כל – Whoever sits in observance of a fast is called a sinner – כל: The early and later authorities discuss at length the broader issues of the place of fasting and asceticism in Judaism. *Tosafot* attempt to reconcile the seemingly contradictory talmudic sources and argue that although one who observes a fast is called a sinner, the righteous deed he performs by fasting outweighs the sin he commits by voluntarily undergoing bodily suffering.

Others distinguish between a fast observed as an act of penance and one that serves as a means of attaining sanctity. One who fasts for atonement is called a sinner, not due to the fast, but due to the transgressions that made the fast necessary. When he observes the fast, he acts correctly, but this does not transform him into a sacred or pious man. By contrast, one who fasts to purify his soul is indeed considered a sacred individual, as his purpose is to reach a state of sanctity and closeness to God (Meiri).

Yet others argue that one is called a sinner only if he fails to repent for his sins even after observing his fast. In addition

to the sins he committed in the past, he is now guilty of the additional sin of causing his body distress. However, if he sincerely repents he is certainly considered sacred, as he has thereby purified himself of his sins (Rabbi Yoshiya Pinto).

הוא אגידול פרע – That is referring to the growth of the locks – קאי: The commentators disagree over whether this phrase means that the nazirite's hair itself is sacred, or whether the nazirite's act of letting his hair grow is the sacred act of a nazirite, not his abstention from wine. Several early commentaries say that this verse should be read: That is referring to his purification of his soul. A nazirite is called sacred, not because he refrains from drinking wine, but due to the fact that he purifies his soul by avoiding contact with the dead, in accordance with the reading of the verse: "And he will atone for him for that he sinned by the dead [*nefesh*]" (Numbers 6:11), as *nefesh* can mean dead as well as soul (see Rabbeinu Hananel and Rabbeinu Gershon).

כֵּאִילוֹ קְדוֹשׁ שְׂרוּי בְּתוֹךְ מֵעוֹ, שְׁנֵאמַר "בְּקִרְבְּךָ קְדוֹשׁ וְלֹא אָבוֹא בְּעִירִי!" לֹא קִשְׂיָא. הָא דְמַצִּי לְצַעֲרוֹי נִפְשִׂיהּ; הָא דְלֹא מַצִּי לְצַעֲרוֹי נִפְשִׂיהּ.

רִישׁ לְקִישׁ אָמַר: נִקְרָא חֲסִיד, שְׁנֵאמַר: "גִּמְלָה נִפְשׁוֹ אִישׁ חֲסִיד, וְעַכְרֵי שְׂאֵרוֹ" וְגו'. אָמַר רַב שֵׁשֶׁת: הָאִי בִּרְבִי רַב דִּיתִיב בְּתַעֲנִיתָא, לִיכּוֹל בְּלָבָא לְשִׁירוּתֵיהּ.

אָמַר רַב יְרֵמְיָהּ בְּרַב אָבָא: אֵין תַּעֲנִית צִיבוֹר בְּבָבֶל אֶלָּא תַשְׁעָה בָּאָב בְּלִבְדָּ. אָמַר רַב יְרֵמְיָהּ בְּרַב אָבָא אָמַר רִישׁ לְקִישׁ: אֵין תַּלְמִיד חָכֵם רְשָׁאי לְיֹשֵׁב בְּתַעֲנִית, מִפְּנֵי שְׁמַמְעֵט בְּמִלְאֶכֶת שְׁמַיִם.

as though a sacred object is immersed in his bowels, which he may not damage, as it is stated: "The sacred is in your midst,<sup>N</sup> and I will not come into the city" (Hosea 11:9). This statement indicates that it is prohibited to take a fast upon oneself. The Gemara answers: This is **not difficult**. This first ruling, that one who fasts is sacred, is referring to a case where he is able to **distress himself<sup>H</sup>** without causing bodily harm. That second ruling, that one may not overly burden his body, deals with a situation when he is **unable to distress himself** while avoiding all harm, and he proceeds to fast nevertheless.

Reish Lakish said: One who fasts is called pious, as it is stated: "The pious man does good [*gomei*] to his own soul;<sup>N</sup> but he who troubles his own flesh is cruel" (Proverbs 11:17). The verb *gomei* can also mean weaning, or abstaining from unnecessary pleasure. Accordingly, Reish Lakish derives from this verse that one who abstains from food is called pious. Similarly, Rav Sheshet<sup>P</sup> said: This student of a Torah academy who sits in observance of a fast has let a dog eat his portion.<sup>N</sup> Since his fast weakens him and prevents him from studying Torah, it is considered as though a dog ate his meal, as the student derived no benefit from it.

Rav Yirmeya bar Abba said: There is no completely stringent communal fast in Babylonia,<sup>NH</sup> except for the Ninth of Av alone. All other fasts, even those which are fixed and routine for the community, are treated as individual fasts, with regard to both the customs of the fast itself and the *halakhot* of who is obligated to fast. Rav Yirmeya bar Abba said that Reish Lakish said: A Torah scholar is not permitted to sit in observance of a fast,<sup>H</sup> due to the fact that his fasting reduces his strength for the heavenly service of Torah study and mitzvot.

#### HALAKHA

**Where he is able to distress himself** – דְּמַצִּי לְצַעֲרוֹי נִפְשִׂיהּ: One who observes a fast when he is able to do so without causing himself bodily harm is considered sacred. However, one who does so when he is weak or ill is called a sinner, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elazar. The ruling applies only to one who observes the fast as an act of piety. However, one who knows that he has committed a transgression is required to fast, even if he is weak or ill (*Taz*). The authorities associated with the moralistic *musar* movement have suggested a variety of alternatives to fasting for those who seek atonement for their sins. These include refraining from eating certain foods, refraining from speech, and secluding oneself for private reflection (see *Shenei Luhot HaBerit* and *Magen Avraham*; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 571:1).

**Communal fast in Babylonia** – תַּעֲנִית צִיבוֹר בְּבָבֶל: All fasts in Babylonia, or anywhere else outside Eretz Yisrael, are

treated as individual fasts, apart from the Ninth of Av and Yom Kippur. This means that outside Eretz Yisrael the Ninth of Av and Yom Kippur are the only time when work is prohibited and the fast starts in the evening. Even fasts decreed upon the community are treated as individual fasts outside Eretz Yisrael (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 568:6, 575:10).

**A Torah scholar is not permitted to sit in observance of a fast** – אֵין תַּלְמִיד חָכֵם רְשָׁאי לְיֹשֵׁב בְּתַעֲנִית: It is prohibited for a Torah scholar to accept a fast upon himself, as it diminishes his capacity to study Torah. However, if the entire community is fasting he should do so as well, so as not to separate himself from the community. Whoever spends all his time studying Torah is called a Torah scholar for the purposes of this *halakha*, even nowadays (*Magen Avraham*). Teachers of schoolchildren are also considered Torah scholars, as explicitly stated in the Jerusalem Talmud (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 571:2).

#### PERSONALITIES

**Rav Sheshet** – רַב שֵׁשֶׁת: Rav Sheshet was a famous Babylonian *amora* of the second and third generations, a colleague of Rav Nahman and Rav Hisha. He was outstanding in his knowledge of the Mishna and of *baraitot*, acquiring it through exceptional diligence, despite his blindness.

With regard to his disputes with Rav Nahman, the *ge'onim* rule that the *halakha* is in accordance with Rav Sheshet's opinion in all matters of ritual law. Many *amora'im* of the third and fourth generations were his disciples, including Rava.

#### NOTES

**The sacred is in your midst** – בְּקִרְבְּךָ קְדוֹשׁ: Rashi explains that one should always consider himself as though something sacred were immersed in his bowels. According to this interpretation, the verse is to be understood as follows: Since the sacred object inside you is suffering distress because you are fasting, I will not come into the city. Conversely, *Tosafot* explain that the word sacred in the verse is a reference to God Himself. According to this interpretation, the rest of the verse is superfluous in this context, and indeed the phrase: And I will not come into the city, is missing in certain manuscripts.

**Does good [*gomei*] to his own soul** – גִּמְלָה נִפְשׁוֹ: Rashi explains that Reish Lakish, like Shmuel and Rabbi Elazar, is referring to one who voluntarily observes a fast. This individual, Reish Lakish argues, is pious, as the verse indicates: One who weans his soul by abstaining from food is a pious person. *Tosafot* claim that Reish Lakish is speaking of one who refrains from fasting. According to this interpretation, *gomei* means: One who acts kindly, in this case to his own soul, by sustaining it.

**Let a dog eat his portion** – לִיכּוֹל בְּלָבָא לְשִׁירוּתֵיהּ: Rashi explains that a Torah scholar who observes a fast gains nothing, and therefore he is likened to one who refrains from eating because a dog has consumed his meal. Some commentaries interpret Rav Sheshet's remark as a curse: As for a Torah scholar who observes a fast, may a dog eat his meal (*Shita Mekubbetzet*).

**There is no communal fast in Babylonia** – אֵין תַּעֲנִית צִיבוֹר בְּבָבֶל: Various reasons have been suggested for this principle. Some say it is because there is no need to pray for rain in Babylonia, where the land is watered by rivers (*Tosafot*). Others claim that as most inhabitants of Babylonia were poor, the Sages did not want to prevent them from working (*Ra'avad*). Yet others state, based on the Jerusalem Talmud, that a communal fast can be declared only in a place where there is a *Nasi* and a Sanhedrin (*Ramban*).

BACKGROUND

Ginzak – גינזק: The commentaries identify Ginzak with the biblical Gozan (I Chronicles 5:26), but the location of this city is unclear. Some maintain that it is the ancient city of Ganzak, which is southeast of Lake Urmia. Others claim that it lies south of the Caspian Sea, while yet others suggest that Ginzak is near Nahrawan. In any case, this Jewish community was apparently isolated from the main Jewish centers of Babylonia, but was important enough for several noteworthy Sages and leaders to visit.

PERSONALITIES

Mar Ukva – מר עוקבא: Mar Ukva was the Exilarch during the first and second generations of *amora'im* in Babylonia. He was famous not only for his elevated position but also for his learning and piety. Mar Ukva was very close to Shmuel, who respected him greatly. He was also renowned for his generous donations to charity and for his great modesty. According to various traditions, Mar Ukva was called Natan Detzutzita, which refers to an incident in which an angel grabbed him by the hair [tzitzit] of the head. He was also a famous penitent in his generation. Mar Ukva apparently had two sons who were also Sages.

HALAKHA

An individual who took a fast upon himself, even if he ate and drank the entire night – יחיד שקיבל עליו תענית, אפילו אכל – וישתה כל הלילה: With regard to one who took a fast upon himself in the afternoon service of the previous day, he is permitted to eat during the entire night. Similarly, if one commits to fast for several days in a row, he is permitted to eat and drink on each of the intervening nights. Some authorities add that on each of the days one has committed himself to fast he inserts the *Aneinu* prayer in the afternoon *Amida* (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 575:7*, and in the comment of Rema).

Slept in his fast – לן בתעניתו: If one obligated himself to fast the following day, and at the conclusion of the fast continued to fast through the next night, the second day is not considered to be a fast for him. This is because he did not take the fast upon himself beforehand. However, the accepted ruling is that he does recite the *Aneinu* prayer, although some authorities disagree (*Magen Avraham; Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 575:9*).

Jars belonging to gentiles – קנקנין של נכרים: Any vessel that has served for the storage of non-kosher wine may be used after a twelve-month period, as by that time it certainly contains no traces of wine (*Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a 135:16*).

“אוכלין ושותין משחשיכה” כו'. אמר רבי זעירא אמר רב הונא: יחיד שקיבל עליו תענית, אפילו אכל ושתה כל הלילה, למחר הוא מתפלל תפילת תענית. לן בתעניתו, אינו מתפלל של תענית.

אמר רב יוסף: מאי קסבר רב הונא? סבירא ליה אין מתענין לשעות? או דלמא, מתענין לשעות, והמתענה לשעות מתפלל תפילת תענית. ושאני הכא, דאיכא שעות דליליא דלא קביל עליה מעיקרא.

אמר ליה אביו: לעולם קסבר רב הונא מתענין לשעות, והמתענה לשעות מתפלל תפילת תענית. ושאני הכא, דאיכא שעות דליליא דלא קביל עליה מעיקרא.

מר עוקבא איקלע לגינזק. בעו מיניה: מתענין לשעות, או אין מתענין לשעות? לא הוה בידיה, קנקנין של נכרים אסורין או מותרין? לא הוה בידיה. במה שימש משה כל שבעת ימי המלוואים? לא הוה בידיה.

The mishna taught that during the first set of fasts they eat and drink from after dark, and begin fasting in the morning. Rabbi Zeira said that Rav Huna said: With regard to an individual who took a fast upon himself,<sup>N</sup> even if he ate and drank the entire night,<sup>H</sup> on the following day he prays in the *Amida* the prayer of a fast, which begins: Answer us on the day of our fast. If after completing his fast he slept in his fast,<sup>H</sup> i.e., he continued fasting throughout the night, he does not pray the prayer of a fast the next morning.

Rav Yosef said: What does Rav Huna maintain in this regard? Does he hold that one does not fast for only a few hours,<sup>N</sup> i.e., that fasts that do not last from daybreak until nightfall are not considered fasts at all, and therefore these extra hours of the night are not part of his fast, or perhaps he holds that one does fast for a few hours,<sup>N</sup> but one who fasts for a few hours does not pray the prayer of a fast?

Abaye said to Rav Yosef: Actually, Rav Huna holds that one does fast for hours, and one who fasts for a few hours does pray the prayer of a fast. But it is different here, as there are hours of the night that he did not take upon himself at the outset. Since one must take an individual fast upon himself beforehand, if he merely continues his fast into the night, these extra hours are not part of his obligation, and therefore he does not add the special prayer for a fast, *Aneinu*, on the following morning.

The Gemara relates: Mar Ukva<sup>P</sup> happened to come to the city of Ginzak.<sup>B</sup> The inhabitants of Ginzak, among other matters, asked him three questions to which he did not know the answer: First, does one fast for hours, or does one not fast for hours? Mar Ukva did not have an answer readily available. Second, are the clay jars belonging to gentiles,<sup>H</sup> which have been used for storing wine, permanently prohibited, or can they be rendered permitted? He did not have an answer readily available. Thirdly, in what garments did Moses serve<sup>N</sup> all seven days of inauguration, as the acting priest when Aaron and his sons were initiated into the priesthood? Once again, he did not have an answer readily available.

NOTES

An individual who took a fast upon himself – יחיד שקיבל עליו תענית: Rashi explains that the Gemara is referring to one who has committed himself to fast for a single day. Rav Huna teaches that he is permitted to eat and drink all night before the fast, and the next day he inserts in the *Amida* the special prayer for a fast, *Aneinu*. However, if he continues his fast the following night, he does not recite that prayer the next day, as he did not declare that day a fast for himself in advance.

Many commentaries have a different reading, according to which the Gemara is referring to a person who commits himself to fast on two successive days (Rif; Rambam). Rav Huna is saying that even if he eats and drinks during the intervening night, he still recites the *Aneinu* prayer on the second day of his fast, as he committed himself to two consecutive fast days from the outset. Conversely, if he obligated himself in only one day of fasting but continued to fast for a second day, he does not recite the prayer for a fast on the second day. Some commentators claim that this dispute has ramifications with respect to the question of whether or not the *Aneinu* prayer is included in the evening *Amida*, which is a matter of dispute between the early authorities.

Does he hold that one does not fast for hours – סבירא ליה: The Gemara apparently concludes that it is indeed possible to observe a fast that lasts only a few hours. Rashi explains the question as follows: If one undertakes a fast of several hours, is he required to refrain from eating during that

period or not? Some commentaries object: Why shouldn't one be required to fulfill a personal obligation, despite its unusual form? After all, the undertaking of a fast is considered a vow, and all vows must be fulfilled (Ritva).

The Ritva explains that although a fast is indeed regarded as a vow, it is not simply a vow by which one renders prohibited something that is ordinarily permitted to him. If a fast is simply a vow to prohibit something that is ordinarily permitted, then it would be obvious that one can render eating prohibited to him, even for no more than a minute. Instead, the acceptance of a fast is considered a vow to perform a meritorious deed, as fasting leads to submission to God and to true contrition. Consequently the Gemara's question is as follows: If someone commits to fast for a few hours, has he vowed to perform a meritorious deed? If so, the vow is binding. Conversely, it is possible that a fast that applies for less than a full day is an insignificant matter and not a meritorious deed, in which case the vow is not binding and he may eat even during those hours in which he had committed to fast.

One does fast for hours – מתענין לשעות: The question with regard to a fast of several hours is whether this vow, which is certainly valid, belongs to the category of fasting, or whether it is considered an act of private self-mortification. In essence, the issue is whether a fast is defined as refraining from food and drink for at least a day, or if a shorter time period is included in the same category. This problem also has bearing on the

recital of the *Aneinu* prayer included in the *Amida* on a fast day. If someone is fasting for no more than a few hours, does he recite that prayer?

In what did Moses serve – במה שימש משה: The commentary on the text follows the explanation of Rashi here and in tractate *Avoda Zara* (34a), that Moses could not have worn the priestly garments during the seven days of inauguration, as those garments were designated exclusively for Aaron and his sons, and Moses was not a priest.

*Tosafot* objects (*Avoda Zara* 34a) that Moses could indeed have worn the priestly garments, as the Gemara states elsewhere (*Zevachim* 101b) that during the forty years the Jews spent in the wilderness, Moses had the status of a High Priest. According to *Tosafot*, the Gemara here is asking specifically about Moses' clothes during the seven days of inauguration, as at that time the priestly garments had not yet been consecrated. Some commentaries suggest that even if the priestly garments had already been consecrated, Moses could not have worn them during the seven days of inauguration, as at that time the Tabernacle had the status of an improvised altar, and the priestly garments are not meant to be worn for the service of an altar of this kind (Rabbi Ya'akov of Orleans). Yet others maintain that it is obvious to the Gemara that Moses wore priestly garments during the seven days of inauguration. The question is only whether he wore the eight garments of a High Priest or the four garments of a common priest.



אָז וְשָׂאֵל בֵּי מִדְּרָשָׁא. אָמְרוּ לֵיהּ:  
הַלְבַתְּתָא: מִתְעַנֵּין לְשָׁעוֹת, וּמִתְפַּלְלִין  
תְּפִלַּת תְּעִנִּית. וְהַלְבַתְּתָא: קִנְקֻנִין  
שֶׁל נְבָרִים לְאַחַר שְׁנַיִם עָשָׂר חֳדָשׁ  
מִוִּתְרֵין. בְּמָה שִׁימַשׁ מֹשֶׁה כָּל שִׁבְעַת  
יָמֵי הַמְלוּאִיִּים? בְּחֻלּוֹק לְבָן. רַב כְּהָנָא  
מְתִיב: בְּחֻלּוֹק לְבָן שָׂאֵין לוֹ אֵימְרָא.

Mar Ukva went and asked these questions in the study hall. They said to him: The *halakha* is: One fasts for hours, and he even prays the prayer of a fast. And the *halakha* is that the jars belonging to gentiles are permitted after they have not been used at all for twelve months. Finally, in what garments did Moses serve all seven days of inauguration? He did not serve in his own clothes, nor in the regular priestly garments, but in a special white cloak. Rav Kahana taught: Moses served in a white cloak that does not have a hem.<sup>N</sup>

אָמַר רַב חִסְדָּא: Rav Hisda said:

#### NOTES

In a white cloak that does not have a hem [*imra*] – בְּחֻלּוֹק לְבָן שָׂאֵין לוֹ אֵימְרָא: According to most early authorities, the term *imra* is referring to the border of a hem at the bottom of a garment. The white shirt that Moses wore during the seven days of inauguration did not have a border, neither a folded hem nor an additional piece of material sewn to the bottom of the garment. Rashi explains that the shirt was made without a hem so that people could not suspect Moses of illicitly removing money consecrated for the Tabernacle in the folds of his garment. Elsewhere (*Avoda Zara* 34a), Rashi himself rejects this explanation, arguing that by the time the Tabernacle was inaugurated the money donated for its construction had already been spent.

*Tosafot* (*Avoda Zara* 34a) suggest that Moses' shirt was

made without a hem so that it would be clear to all that it was new and had never been worn before. Alternatively, this was to prevent people from thinking that some defect had been found in Moses when they saw that he was replaced by Aaron at the end of the seven days of inauguration. Since the shirt that Moses wore lacked a hem, it would be apparent to all that it had been intended from the outset to be worn for only a short time. *Tosafot* also cite an alternative explanation, that *imra* means wool. The priestly garments were made of wool and linen, a combination that is ordinarily prohibited as diverse kinds. According to this explanation, Rav Kahana is saying that as the cloak worn by Moses was not a priestly garment, it was made of linen without any admixture of wool.

Perek I

Daf 12 Amud a

הָא דְאָמַרְתָּ מִתְעַנֵּין לְשָׁעוֹת – וְהוּא  
שָׂלָא טַעַם בְּלוֹם עַד הָעֶרֶב. אָמַר לֵיהּ  
אֲבִי: הָא תְּעִנִּית מִעֲלִייתָא הִיא! לֹא,  
צְרִיכָא דְאֵימְלֶךְ אֵימְרוּבֵי.

The *halakha* is that which you said, that one may fast for a few hours,<sup>H</sup> provided that one took a fast of a few hours upon himself, and that he fasted and did not taste anything until the evening. Abaye said to Rav Hisda: This ruling is obvious, since it is a full-fledged fast, as one ultimately fasts the entire day. Rav Hisda answered: No, it is necessary to say this *halakha* in a case where he changed his mind, i.e., he began the day without intending to fast, but for various reasons he did not eat, and halfway through the day he decided to continue fasting for another few hours until nightfall. Rav Hisda maintains that this kind of fasting for hours is considered a fast.

#### HALAKHA

One may fast for hours – מִתְעַנֵּין לְשָׁעוֹת: One may observe a fast for a few hours, provided that in practice he does not eat the entire day. How so? If one is immersed in his daily activities, and does not eat in the morning, and subsequently decides that he wants to fast for the remainder of the day, he is allowed to do so, and should then insert the *Aneinu* prayer into the *Amida*. However, some authorities maintain that even one who observes a fast for only a few hours needs to have

taken it upon himself the previous afternoon. If one obligates himself to fast for the first part of a day, and then eats, or conversely, if he has eaten during the first part of the day and subsequently takes upon himself a fast for the rest of the day, he is not considered to be observing a fast that requires the recital of the *Aneinu* prayer. However, he is required to observe the terms of his obligation (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 571:10–11).