

This supports the opinion of – **מְסִייעַ לִיהָ לְ**: When the Gemara wishes to explore the possibility that the mishna it is analyzing can be cited as proof for the opinion of a Sage, it will typically state: This source supports the statement of that Sage.

They examine the affairs of the town – **מְעִינֵין בְּמִילֵי**: Some commentaries derive this requirement from the following verses: “Is not this the fast that I have chosen? To loosen the fetters of wickedness, to undo the bands of the yoke, and to let the oppressed go free, and that you break every yoke? Is it not to deal your bread to the hungry and that you bring the poor who are cast out to your house? When you see the naked, that you cover him; and that you do not hide yourself from your own flesh?” (Isaiah 58:6–7). These verses teach that God views favorably those fasts on which people examine their behavior and attend to the social injustices they find in their community (Vilna Gaon on *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 576:16). Others add that on communal fast days, the leaders gather to attend to the community’s problems and requirements, as well as to right any wrongs that the community as a whole may have inflicted on individuals (Rabbi Elyakim).

אִי מָה עֲצַרְתָּ מֵאוֹרְתָא, אֲף תַעֲנִית נָמִי מֵאוֹרְתָא! אָמַר רַבִּי זֵירָא: לְדִידִי מִפְּרָשָׁא לִי מִינֵיהּ דְּרַבִּי יִרְמְיָה בַר אָבָא: אָמַר קְרָא: “אֶסְפוּ זְקֵנִים”. דּוּמְיָא דְאַסְיַפְתָּ זְקֵנִים. מָה אֶסְיַפְתָּ זְקֵנִים בְּיוֹם, אֲף צוּם נָמִי בְּיוֹם. וְאִמָּא: מְטִיהָרָא! אָמַר רַב שִׁישְׁא בְּרִיהּ דְּרַב אִידִי: מְסִייעַ לִיהָ לְרַב הוּנָא, דְאָמַר מְצַפְרָא בִּינוּפְיָא.

The Gemara asks: If so, one could say: **Just as on a day of assembly it is prohibited to work from the previous evening, so too, on a fast it should be prohibited to work from the evening. Rabbi Zeira said: This was explained to me by Rabbi Yirmeya bar Abba himself: The verse states: “Sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly, gather the elders,”** indicating that a fast is similar to a gathering of elders: **Just as the gathering of elders is performed by day, so too, the time for a fast is also by day.** The Gemara asks: **But if so, one can say that the fast should begin from noon. Rav Sheisha, son of Rav Idi, said: This supports the opinion of^N Rav Huna, who said: The public gathering on fast days occurs in the hours of the morning.**

הֵיכִי עֲבָדִי? אָמַר אַבְיִי: מְצַפְרָא עַד פְּלֻגָּא דְיוֹמָא מְעִינֵין בְּמִילֵי דְמִתָּא. מִכָּאן וְאֵילָךְ, רַבְעָא דְיוֹמָא קְרִינַן בְּסַפְרָא וְאֶפְטְרָתָא. מִכָּאן וְאֵילָךְ, בְּעִינֵין רַחֲמֵי שְׁנַאמְר: “וַיִּקְוֹמוּ עַל עַמּוּדָם, וַיִּקְרְאוּ בְּסֵפֶר תּוֹרַת ה' אֱלֹהֵיהֶם רַבְעִית הַיּוֹם, וּרְבַעִת מֵתוֹדִים, וּמִשְׁתַּחֲוִּים לַה' אֱלֹהֵיהֶם.”

The Gemara asks: **How do they act on a fast day? Abaye said: From the morning until the middle of the day^N they examine the affairs of the town^N** by checking if there are any deficiencies or corruptions in the city, moral or otherwise, and attempt to fix them, as these problems may have been the cause of the Divine punishment. **From this point forward, for a quarter of the day they read a portion from the Torah and a portion from the Prophets [haftara]. From this point forward, they pray and petition for mercy, as it is stated: “And they stood up in their place and they read in the book of the Torah of the Lord their God a fourth part of the day; and another fourth part they confessed, and prostrated themselves before the Lord their God” (Nehemiah 9:3).**

HALAKHA

מְצַפְרָא עַד – מִבֹּרְחַן עַד הַמִּלְחָמָה: On communal fast days that are decreed to avert an impending calamity, the court judges and the community leaders gather in the synagogues from after the completion of the morning prayers until noon, to examine the conduct of the townspeople. They attempt to rectify any flaws in behavior that they might find, and they admonish wrongdoers and shame those who resort to violence to get their way. During the third quarter of the day, an appropriate section of the Torah

is read, as well as a portion from the Prophets related to the occasion. During the last quarter of the day, the congregation recites the afternoon prayer and offers special petitions and supplications. These practices have not been observed in recent generations, either because the courts no longer have the authority to correct the wrongs they find (*Arukh HaShulhan*), or because in general the customs concerning communal fasts are no longer observed in their entirety (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 576:16).

Perek I

Daf 13 Amud a

אִיפּוֹךְ אָנָּא! לֹא סָלְקָא דְעַתְדָּךְ, דְּכַתְיב: “וְאֵלֵי יֶאֱסָפוּ בְּל חָרָד בְּדַבְרֵי אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל עַל מַעַל הַגּוֹלָה” וְגו'. וְכַתְיב: “וּבְמַנְחַת הָעֶרֶב קָמְתִי מִתַּעֲנִיתִי... וְאֶפְרָשָׁה כַּפֵּי אֵל ה'.”

The Gemara asks: **I can reverse^N the order of events, so that the first half of the day is spent in prayer while the second half is focused on the concerns of the community.** The Gemara answers: **It should not enter your mind to say that, as it is written elsewhere: “Then were assembled to me^N everyone who trembled at the words of the God of Israel due to the faithlessness of them of the captivity and I sat appalled until the evening offering” (Ezra 9:4). And it is written in the next verse: “And at the meal-offering I arose from my fast, even with my garment and my mantle rent; and I fell on my knees and I spread out my hands to the Lord” (Ezra 9:5).** These verses indicate that first one must deal with the issues of the community, and only afterward engage in prayer.

NOTES

I can reverse – אִיפּוֹךְ אָנָּא: Although it stands to reason that the members of a community should first correct their ways and only afterward petition for mercy, the Gemara argues that there is good reason to reverse the order, as many of the *halakhot* of fasting and repentance are derived from the description of the penitence of the people of Nineveh. The *Ramat Shmuel* points out that the book of Jonah states that the inhabitants of Nineveh first petitioned God for mercy and only then attended to the wrongs committed in their community: “But let them be covered with sackcloth, both

man and beast, and let them cry mightily to God; and let them turn every one from his evil way, and from the violence that is in their hands” (Jonah 3:8).

Then were assembled to me, etc. – וְאֵלֵי יֶאֱסָפוּ וְגו': In other words, all those who feared God came to discuss “the faithlessness of the captivity,” i.e., the sins of the people of the Babylonian captivity who had ascended to Eretz Yisrael. This is referring to the correction of communal wrongs, as stated in the previous *halakha* (Rabbi Elyakim; Ran).

Rafram bar Pappa – רַפְרָם בַּר פַּפָּא: Rafram bar Pappa was an *amora* of the third and fourth generations in Babylonia. According to a tradition of the *ge'onim*, Rafram, a name shared by several Sages, is a shortened form of Rav Efrayim. Rafram bar Pappa was a close disciple of Rav H̲isda, and he is principally mentioned as the transmitter of his great master's statements. Rafram bar Pappa also knew Rav Huna, whose great deeds he related to Rava.

Rav Idi bar Avin – רַב אִידִי בַר אַבִּין: Rav Idi bar Avin belonged to the third and fourth generations of Babylonian *amora'im*. It is related that Rav Idi's father, Rav Avin the carpenter, was especially punctilious to observe the mitzva of lighting the Shabbat lamp, a pious practice that led Rav Huna to predict that his sons would become eminent scholars. Indeed, his sons were Rav H̲iyya bar Avin and Rav Idi bar Avin.

Although Rav Idi bar Avin was Rav H̲isda's student, he also quotes other Sages from the second generation of Babylonian *amora'im*. He was one of the greatest authorities of his generation, and many of his halakhic discussions with Abaye are recorded in the Gemara. Rav Idi bar Avin was the chief rabbinic authority of his city, Shekhantziv, where he apparently headed an academy. The most eminent scholars of the next generation, Rav Pappa and Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, were his disciples. Rav Idi bar Avin lived a long life and in his old age he liked to call his students his children. He too had two sons who became Sages, but little else is known of his deeds or his life.

NOTES

Prohibited both in hot water and in cold water – אָסוּר בֵּין בְּחַמְיָן בֵּין בְּצוּנָן: Elsewhere (*Pesahim* 54b), Rabbi Elazar rules that on the Ninth of Av, similar to Yom Kippur, one may not even put his finger into cold water. Some commentaries maintain that Rav H̲isda agrees with that ruling and that when he says that it is prohibited to bathe in cold water on the Ninth of Av and during the mourning period, he means that one may not wash even his face, hands, or feet in cold water (*Ritva*). By contrast, Talmid HaRamban argues that according to the opinion of Rav H̲isda, it is prohibited to bathe only one's entire body in cold water on the Ninth of Av and during a mourning period, but washing one's face, hands, and feet in cold water is permitted. This dispute has ramifications with regard to the Gemara's objections against Rav H̲isda's opinion below.

Immersion in hot water... it is drawn water – טְבִילָה בְּחַמְיָן... שְׂאוּבֵין מִיָּהוּ: Ritual immersion is performed in a spring, in the sea, or in water that has collected of its own accord, but not in water that has been drawn into vessels. Furthermore, in certain cases a ritual bath can be invalidated when drawn water falls into it.

Water used for bathing was typically heated by the addition of water that had been heated in large containers, as was performed for the benefit of a weak or elderly High Priest on Yom Kippur. Alternatively, the water was placed in a special pool where it could be heated from below, as in the Roman baths. Consequently, hot water could not be used for ritual immersion.

אָמַר רַפְרָם בַּר פַּפָּא אָמַר רַב חֲסֵדָא: כָּל שֶׁהוּא מְשׁוּם אֲבָל, כְּגוֹן תְּשַׁעָּה בָּבֵב, וְאֲבָל, אָסוּר בֵּין בְּחַמְיָן בֵּין בְּצוּנָן. כָּל שֶׁהוּא מְשׁוּם תְּעֵנוּג, כְּגוֹן תְּעֵנִית עֲבוּר, בְּחַמְיָן אָסוּר, בְּצוּנָן מוּתָר.

אָמַר רַב אִידִי בַר אַבִּין: אִךְ אֲנִי נִמְי תְּנִינָא: "וְנוֹעֲלִין אֶת הַמְרֻחְצָאוֹת." אָמַר לִיה אַבִּי: וְאִי בְּצוּנָן אָסוּר, סוֹכְרִין אֶת הַנְּהָרוֹת מִבְּעֵי לִיה לְמִיתָנִי?

אָמַר רַב שֵׁישָׁא בְרִיה דְּרַב אִידִי: אֲבָא הֲכִי קָשְׁיָא לִיה: מִכְּדִי תִנְן: אָסוּר בְּרַחֲצִיעָה, נוֹעֲלִין אֶת הַמְרֻחְצָאוֹת לְמָה לִּי? אֶלָּא לְאוֹ שְׂמַע מִיָּהוּ: בְּחַמְיָן אָסוּר; בְּצוּנָן מוּתָר?

לִימָא מְסִייע לִיה: כָּל חֲטִיבֵי טְבִילוֹת טוֹבְלִין כְּדָרְכָן, בֵּין בְּתַשַׁעָּה בָּבֵב בֵּין בְּיוֹם הַכְּפּוּרִים. בְּמַאי אִילִימָא בְּחַמְיָן, טְבִילָה בְּחַמְיָן מִי אִיכָא? שְׂאוּבֵין מִיָּהוּ!

Rafram bar Pappa^p said that Rav H̲isda said: Anything that is prohibited due to mourning, for example, bathing on the Ninth of Av,^h or prohibited for a private mourner, is prohibited both in hot water and in cold water.^{nh} Anything that is prohibited due to pleasure, for example, bathing on a communal fast, is prohibited in hot water, but is permitted in cold water,^h provided one washes for the sake of cleanliness.

Rav Idi bar Avin^p said: We, too, learn^b this in the mishna: And they lock the bathhouses. This phrase indicates that only bathing in hot water is prohibited. **Abaye said to Rav Idi bar Avin: And if it were also prohibited to wash in cold water, should the mishna have taught: They dam the rivers?** Since it is impossible to dam the rivers to stop people from bathing altogether, the statement of the mishna is insufficient proof that only bathing in hot water is prohibited. Perhaps bathing in cold water is also prohibited but there is no way to prevent it.

Rav Sheisha, son of Rav Idi, said, in explanation of his father's opinion: With regard to my father, the following poses a difficulty to his ruling: Since we already learned in the mishna that one is prohibited to engage in bathing, why do I need the tanna to state: They lock the bathhouses? Practically speaking, what does this clause add? **Rather, isn't it correct to conclude from this that bathing is prohibited in hot water but permitted in cold water?**

The Gemara proposes: **Let us say that the following baraita supports Rav H̲isda's ruling that it is prohibited for a mourner to bathe himself even in cold water: All who are obligated in immersions immerse themselves in their usual manner,^h both on the Ninth of Av and on Yom Kippur.** The Gemara clarifies this *baraita*: **In what do they immerse themselves? If we say that they immerse themselves in hot water, is there such a concept as ritual immersion in hot water?^h Hot water is necessarily drawn water,ⁿ as the water has been placed in vessels for heating, and drawn water is invalid for a ritual bath.**

HALAKHA

Bathing on the Ninth of Av – רְחִיעָה בְּתַשַׁעָּה בָּבֵב: Bathing on the Ninth of Av is prohibited, both in hot water and cold water, in accordance with the opinion of Rav H̲isda. One may not even insert his finger into water for the purpose of washing (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim* 554:7).

A mourner is prohibited both in hot water and in cold water – אֲבָל אָסוּר בֵּין בְּחַמְיָן בֵּין בְּצוּנָן: A mourner may not bathe his entire body, even in cold water. It is prohibited for him to wash his face, hands, and feet in hot water; however, he may wash them in cold water. If he is extremely dirty, he is permitted to wash himself in the ordinary manner, in accordance with the opinion of Rav H̲isda, as explained in the Gemara below. Some commentaries note that strictly speaking, these prohibitions apply only during the first seven days of mourning, although it is customary for mourners to refrain from bathing for thirty days (*Rema*). In places where this custom prevails, one should not deviate from it (*Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 381:1).

A communal fast is prohibited in hot water but permitted in cold water – תְּעֵנִית עֲבוּר בְּחַמְיָן אָסוּר בְּצוּנָן מוּתָר: On the more severe communal fasts decreed in times of drought, when eat-

ing is prohibited from sundown, one may not bathe his entire body in hot water. However, it is permitted to wash one's face, hands, and feet, even in hot water, and it is likewise permitted to wash one's entire body in cold water, in accordance with the opinion of Rav H̲isda (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim* 555:3).

All obligated in immersions immerse themselves in their usual manner – כָּל חֲטִיבֵי טְבִילוֹת טוֹבְלִין כְּדָרְכָן: If the day designated for one's ritual immersion occurs on the Ninth of Av or on Yom Kippur, he is permitted to immerse himself on that day. Nowadays, however, there is no obligation to immerse on a precise date, and therefore one may not immerse himself on the Ninth of Av or on Yom Kippur (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim* 554:8).

Immersion in hot water – טְבִילָה בְּחַמְיָן: Some authorities maintain that it is prohibited to pour hot water into a ritual bath to heat its water, whereas others permit it. In Europe, with its severe winters, it was customary to rule leniently in this regard, especially if hot water was not actually poured into the ritual bath, and only the waters of the ritual bath itself were heated (*Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 201:75).

BACKGROUND

We, too, learn – אִךְ אֲנִי נִמְי תְּנִינָא: This expression is used in the Gemara when proof is adduced for the ruling of an *amora* from a statement of a mishna or a *baraita*. Typically, the tannaic quotation will not deal directly with the subject at hand, as *amora'im* do not usually issue a halakhic ruling

that had already appeared in a mishna. Instead, the proof is usually more complex, i.e., if one were to examine the source closely he would reach the same conclusion as the *amora*, despite the fact that he did not base his ruling on the mishna.

The hot springs of Tiberias – תמי טבריא: The hot springs of Tiberias consist of mineral-rich water heated by geothermal energy. During the Roman period, public baths were erected in Tiberias and the second-largest bath complex in the entire Roman Empire was built in the vicinity. Some baths still function today, e.g., the baths at Hamat Gader.



Roman bath in Hamat Gader, near Tiberias

NOTES

What, is it not the case that all these *halakhot* refer to all of them – מאי לאו אכולהו: The early authorities dispute the meaning of the objection raised here. Some commentaries maintain that the Gemara is citing this *baraita* as an objection to Rav H̄isda's first ruling that it is prohibited to bathe on the Ninth of Av as well as during the week of mourning, whether in hot or cold water (Rabbeinu Gershom; *Tosafot*; Ritva). This is because the *baraita* states that a mourner is governed by the same *halakhot* that apply on a communal fast, when it is prohibited to bathe the entire body, but permitted to wash one's face, hands, and feet. However, the early authorities disagree as to how the *baraita* contradicts Rav H̄isda's ruling. Some argue that it is because the term bathing generally denotes washing in hot water, which indicates that a mourner is permitted to bathe in cold water (Rabbeinu Gershom). Alternatively, the reason might be that the *baraita* states that washing one's face, hands, and feet is permitted, whereas Rav H̄isda maintains that this too is prohibited (Ritva).

In contrast, other commentaries claim that the *baraita* is cited to disprove Rav H̄isda's second ruling, that on communal fasts bathing is prohibited only in hot water, not cold water (Rashi; *Shita Mekubbetzet*; Rabbi Akiva Eiger). This difference in interpretation depends in part on variant readings of this passage, as well as the different interpretations of Rav H̄isda's opinion.

HALAKHA

If one's mourning periods succeeded – כשתכפוהו אבלי: One who observes more than one period of mourning in succession is permitted to wash in cold water, in accordance with the custom of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Hanina (*Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a 381:4*).

If his hair grew heavy, he may lighten it with a razor – הכביד שערו מיקל בתער: If someone is observing two periods of mourning, one immediately after the other, and his hair grows long, he may trim it with a razor, but not with scissors. Furthermore, he may do so only in private (*Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a 390:3*, and in the comment of Rema).

And he may wash his garment in water – ומכבס כסותו: If one is observing two periods of mourning, one immediately after the other, he may unobtrusively wash his clothes in water. However, he may not use soap or sand, in accordance with the opinion of Rav H̄isda (*Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a 389:1*).

אלא לאו בצונן וחיובי טבילות, אין איניש אחרינא, לא? אמר רב חנא בר קטינא: לא נצרכה אלא לחמי טבריא.

Rather, isn't the *baraita* referring to cold water, and it teaches that those obligated in immersions, yes, they are permitted to use cold water, but another person, who is not obligated to immerse, no, he may not wash even in cold water. Rav Hana bar Ketina said: This is no proof, as the ruling of the *baraita* was necessary only for the hot springs of Tiberias,⁸ which are warm without having been drawn, and in which it is possible to immerse.

אי הכי, אימא סיפא: אמר רבי חנינא סגן הכהנים: כדי הוא בית אלהינו לאבד עליו טבילה פעם אחת בשנה. ואי אמרת: בצונן מותר, ורחץ בצונן! אמר רב פפא: באתרא דלא שכיח צונן.

The Gemara objects: If so, say the latter clause of that same mishna: Rabbi Hanina, the deputy High Priest, said: The mourning for the House of our God, the Holy Temple, is worthy of the loss of a ritual immersion once a year. And if you say that it is permitted to immerse in cold water, why does Rabbi Hanina the deputy High Priest say that he loses his immersion? Let him bathe in cold water, without having to neglect his immersion or transgress the prohibitions of a fast day. Rav Pappa said: It could be argued that the *baraita* is referring to a place where cold water is not available, but only hot springs. In this case there is no choice but to wait until the following day to immerse.

תא שמע: כשאמרו אסור במלאכה, לא אמרו אלא ביום, אבל בלילה מותר. וכשאמרו אסור בנעילת הסנדל, לא אמרו אלא בעיר, אבל בדרך מותר. הא ביצד? יוצא לדרך, נועל; נכנס לעיר, חולץ. וכשאמרו אסור ברחיצה, לא אמרו אלא כל גופו, אבל פניו, ידיו, ורגליו מותר. וכן אתה מוצא במנוחה ובאבל.

The Gemara proposes: Come and hear: When they said that one is prohibited in working on fast days, they said so only about working during the day, but at night it is permitted to work. And when they said that one is prohibited to engage in wearing shoes, they said so only in a city, but on the road it is permitted. How so? When one goes out on the road he wears shoes, but at the end of his journey, when he enters the town, he removes them. And when they said that one is prohibited to engage in bathing, they said this only with regard to bathing his entire body, but washing his face, his hands, and his feet is permitted. And similarly, you find that this ruling applies in the case of one who is ostracized, i.e., placed under a formal ban, and in the case of a mourner, who is also prohibited to engage in bathing, smearing, and wearing shoes.

מאי לאו אכולהו? ובמאי עסקינן? אילימא בתמין, פניו, ידיו, ורגליו מי שרו? והאמר רב ששת: אבל אסור להושיט אצבעו בתמין. אלא לאו בצונן?

The Gemara explains the proof from this *baraita*: What, is it not the case that all these *halakhot* refer to all of them,⁹ including one who is ostracized and one who is in mourning? And with what form of bathing are we dealing here? If we say that the *baraita* is referring to bathing in hot water, are bathing his face, his hands, and his feet permitted? But didn't Rav Sheshet say: It is prohibited for a mourner to insert even his finger into hot water for the purpose of washing. Rather, is it not correct to say that the *baraita* is dealing with cold water? If so, it is prohibited on a communal fast to wash one's entire body even in cold water, which contradicts the opinion of Rafram bar Pappa, citing Rav H̄isda, who permits washing in cold water on those days for the sake of cleanliness.

לא. לעולם בתמין. ודקא קשיא לך, וכן אתה מוצא במנוחה ובאבל, אשארא קאי.

The Gemara rejects this argument: No, actually the *baraita* is referring to bathing in hot water. And with regard to what posed a difficulty for you, the phrase: And similarly, that you find in the case of one who is ostracized and in the case of a mourner, does not refer to bathing; rather, it is referring to the rest of the prohibitions, e.g., working and wearing shoes. Consequently, it can be claimed that the *baraita* refers specifically to hot water, as this clause does not refer to a mourner but only to a communal fast, and bathing in cold water is permitted on communal fasts.

תא שמע, דאמר רבי אבא הכהן משום רבי יוסי הכהן: מעשה ומתו בניו של רבי יוסי בן רבי חנינא, ורחץ בצונן כל שבעה! התיב כשתכפוהו אבלי הוה. דתניא: תכפוהו אבלי בזה אחר זה, הכביד שערו, מיקל בתער, ומכבס כסותו במים.

The Gemara proposes yet another proof. Come and hear a statement of a *baraita*, as Rabbi Abba the priest said in the name of Rabbi Yosei the priest: An incident occurred in which the sons of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Hanina, died, and he bathed in cold water all seven days of mourning. This indicates that a mourner is in fact permitted to bathe. The Gemara rejects this argument: There it was a case where his mourning periods came one after the other, as his sons died in quick succession, and this leniency is as it is taught in a *baraita*: If one's mourning periods immediately succeeded¹⁰ each other and his hair grew heavy, then even though it is generally prohibited for a mourner to cut his hair, he may lighten it with a razor,¹¹ and he may likewise wash his garment in water.¹²

BACKGROUND

Natron [neter] – נֵטֶר: Neter is probably natron which is a naturally occurring mixture of sodium carbonate, Na₂CO₃·10H₂O, found in desert plains. In antiquity it was produced from algae. Natron is easily soluble in water and has a strong basic reaction that releases Na₂, a substance that breaks up fats. Consequently, it was used as a detergent even in biblical times.



Natural natron deposit

אָמַר רַב חֲסִידָא: בְּתַעַר, אָבֵל לֹא בְּמַסְפְּרִים. בְּמֵיִם, וְלֹא בְּנֵטֶר וְלֹא בְּחֹל.

With regard to this *baraita*, Rav Hisda said: One who is obligated to observe periods of mourning in quick succession may trim his hair with a razor, but not in the normal manner, with scissors. Likewise, he may wash his garment in water, but not with natron,⁸ a type of soap, nor with sand.

אָמַר רַבָּא: אָבֵל מוֹתֵר לְרַחוּץ בְּצוּיֵן כָּל שִׁבְעָה, מִיַּי דְּהוּה אַבְשָׂרָא וְחִמְרָא. מִתִּיבִי:

Rava said: A mourner is permitted to bathe in cold water all seven days of mourning, despite the fact that he derives a certain degree of enjoyment from the cold bath, just as it is permitted for him to eat meat and wine.⁹ The Gemara raises an objection:

NOTES

Just as it is permitted to eat meat and wine – מִיַּי דְּהוּה – מִיַּי דְּהוּה: During the period of acute mourning, which lasts from the time of the death of a close relative until after the funeral, it is prohibited for a mourner to eat meat or drink wine. However, in the period of regular mourning following

the funeral, meat and wine are permitted to the mourner. Likewise, Rava maintains that bathing in cold water is permitted during the seven-day period of mourning following burial, despite the fact that it is prohibited during the period of acute mourning (Rabbi Elyakim).

Perek I Daf 13 Amud b

NOTES

A grown woman is not permitted – אֵין הַבּוֹגֶרֶת רְשָׂאָה: Tosafot maintain that in this context the term: Not permitted, actually means that she is obligated to wash. Other commentaries provide support for the opinion of Tosafot by citing various examples in the Gemara where the term permitted is referring to an obligation (*Gevurat Ari*). In contrast, some commentaries claim that here too, the term is used in its original meaning: A grown woman is not permitted to render herself unattractive when she is in mourning, lest she repel potential suitors. If she renders herself unattractive, she must be admonished (Meiri).

HALAKHA

A grown woman is not permitted – אֵין הַבּוֹגֶרֶת רְשָׂאָה: It is permitted for a grown woman to paint her eyes and dye her hair when she is in mourning, including the first seven days of mourning (*Arukh HaShulhan*). However, it is prohibited for a young woman to do so (*Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'at* 381:6).

LANGUAGE

Dyeing [*pirkus*] – פִּירְכּוּסִים: Of uncertain origin, especially as this term is often exchanged with the root *p-k-s*, although it is spelled with the letter *kuf* rather than a *kaf*; it probably means to apply rouge. Some maintain that *pirkus* is from the Greek root *περικάζω*, *perkazo*, meaning to dye black, to darken, particularly to darken hair.

אֵין הַבּוֹגֶרֶת רְשָׂאָה לְנוֹל אֶת עֵצְמָהּ בְּיַמֵּי אָבֵל אֲבִיהָ. הֲאֵי נַעֲרָה רְשָׂאָה.

A grown woman, i.e., a girl over twelve and a half, who is old enough to be married, is not permitted¹⁰ to render herself unattractive during the days of mourning for her father, as this would adversely affect her chances of marriage. The Gemara infers that this *halakha* applies only to a grown woman, whereas a young woman, a girl between the ages of twelve and twelve and a half, who is not yet old enough to be married, is permitted to render herself unattractive.

מֵאֵי לָאוּ בְּרַחֲיִצָּה? וּבְמֵאֵי אֵילִימָהּ בְּחֻמִּין, אֵין הַבּוֹגֶרֶת רְשָׂאָה? וְהָאָמַר רַב חֲסִידָא: אָבֵל אֲסוּר לְהוֹשִׁיט אֶצְבָּעוֹ בְּחֻמִּין! אֵלָּא לָאוּ בְּצוּיֵן? לֹא. אֲכִיחֹל וּפִירְכּוּסִים.

The Gemara analyzes this *halakha*: What, is it not referring to the prohibition against bathing? And in what kind of water may a grown woman bathe? If we say that the *baraita* is referring to hot water, is a grown woman not permitted to render herself unattractive by refraining from washing in hot water? But didn't Rav Hisda say: It is prohibited for a mourner to insert even his finger into hot water for the purpose of washing. Rather, is it not the case that it is permitted for a grown woman to bathe in cold water, from which it may be inferred that it is not permitted for a young woman to bathe even in cold water. The Gemara answers: No, the *baraita* is not speaking of bathing at all. Rather it is referring to painting the eyes and dyeing [*pirkus*]¹¹ one's hair, which it is permitted for a grown woman to do during mourning.

לֵימָא מְסִייע לֵיה: דָּאָמַר רַבִּי אַבְבָּא הִבְהִין מִשּׁוּם רַבִּי יוֹסֵי הַבְּהִין: מַעֲשָׂה וַיִּמְתּוּ בָּנָיו שֶׁל רַבִּי יוֹסֵי בְּרַחֲמֵינָא. וְרַחֲץ בְּצוּיֵן כָּל שִׁבְעָה!

The Gemara proposes: Let say that the aforementioned *baraita* supports Rava's ruling. As Rabbi Abba the priest said in the name of Rabbi Yosei the priest: An incident occurred in which the sons of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Hanina, died, and he bathed in cold water all seven days of mourning. This ruling apparently indicates that a mourner is permitted to bathe in cold water.

Iceplant [ahal] – אָהַל – There are several plants referred to as *ahal* which are indigenous to Eretz Yisrael. One of them is crystalline iceplant, *Mesembryanthemum crystallinum* L., an annual plant that grows on rocks and walls facing the ocean in the Sharon region and the coastal plain. It is called crystalline iceplant due to its glistening vesicles that resemble crystals. This plant contains a considerable amount of soda, which was used for laundry and bathing.



Crystalline iceplant

HALAKHA

מאי – In what way is this different from meat and wine – מאי שְׁנָא מִבֶּשֶׂר וַיֵּין: After the deceased is buried, the mourner is permitted to eat meat and drink a small amount of wine during his meal. However, he should not drink heavily (*Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a 378:8*).

אָבֵל אָסוּר – It is prohibited for a mourner to wash laundry – בְּתַבְבוּסָתָא: During the seven-day period of mourning, it is prohibited for a mourner to launder his clothes, both during the day and at night (Rema), in accordance with the opinion of Rav H̄isda (*Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a 380:1*).

With regard to smearing, even any minimal amount is prohibited – לְפָנָיו אֶפִּילוּ כֵּל שְׂהוּא אָסוּר – During the seven-day period of mourning, it is prohibited for a mourner to smear any of his body with oil, if he does so for pleasure. However, it is permitted to smear oil to remove dirt or for a medicinal purpose (*Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a 380:2*).

NOTES

To relieve his anxieties – לְפָנָיו פְּחָדִיהָ – Eating and drinking helps the mourner cope with his sorrows, whereas washing is a form of pleasure and consequently remains prohibited (*Shita Mekubbetzet*).

That is to say, it is prohibited for a mourner to wash laundry all seven days of mourning – **אֵת אוֹמֶרֶת אָבֵל אָסוּר בְּתַבְבוּסָתָא** – Rashi explains that Rav H̄isda derived the *halakha* that it is prohibited for a mourner to launder clothes during the entire seven-day period of mourning from the previous statement that a girl in mourning may not paint her eyes or dye her hair. See Rabbi Akiva Eiger in *Gilyon HaShas*, who notes several difficulties with this explanation. Other commentators connect Rav H̄isda's statement with the aforementioned *baraita* concerning one who observes two consecutive periods of mourning. Since the *baraita* allows him to wash his soiled clothing in water, it follows that under ordinary circumstances it is prohibited for a mourner to launder his clothes. For this reason, some commentaries transpose Rav H̄isda's statement so that it appears immediately after the citation of that *baraita*. Others argue that it is common for the Gemara to conclude its discussion of a particular topic and subsequently draw inferences that are not directly related to that issue from one of the sources cited in the course of the discussion (see *Divrei Shlomo*, Rabbi Akiva Eiger, and Rashash).

אָמְרֵי הַתָּם בְּשִׁתְּכֻמוֹהוּ אֲבָלְיוֹ זֶה אַחַר זֶה. דְּתַנְיָא: תְּכַפּוּהוּ אֲבָלְיוֹ בְּזֶה אַחַר זֶה, הַכְּבִיד שְׁעָרוֹ, מִיִּקַּל בְּתַעַר, וּמִכִּבֵּס בְּסוּתוֹ בְּמִים. אָמַר רַב חֲסֵדָא: בְּתַעַר, אֲבָל לֹא בְּמַסְפְּרִים. בְּמִים, וְלֹא בְּנִתָּר וְלֹא בַחֹל וְלֹא בַאֲהַל.

The Gemara responds: This is not a proof, as they say: **There** it is referring to a case where **his mourning periods** came immediately **one after the other, as it is taught in a baraita: If one's mourning periods** came immediately **one after the other and his hair grew heavy, he may lighten it with a razor, and he may wash his garment in water.** And Rav H̄isda said: He may trim his hair with a razor, but not with scissors. Likewise, he may wash his garment in water, but not with natron, nor with sand, and nor with iceplant.^B

אֵיכָא דְאָמְרֵי אָמַר רַבָּא: אֲבָל אָסוּר בְּצוּנָן כֹּל שִׁבְעָה. מֵאֵי שְׁנָא מִבֶּשֶׂר וַיֵּין? הַתָּם לְפָנָיו פְּחָדִיהָ הוּא דְעָבִיד.

The foregoing is one version of Rava's opinion and the ensuing discussion. **Some say** a different version of this debate. **Rava said: It is prohibited for a mourner to bathe in cold water all seven days of mourning.** The Gemara asks: In what way is this case **different from eating meat and drinking wine,**^H which a mourner is permitted to do? The Gemara responds: **There, he acts to relieve his anxieties.**^M Since a mourner is typically distressed over the death of a close relative, the Sages permitted him to fortify himself with strong food and drink.

לִימָא מְסִיעָה לִיה: אֵין הַבּוֹגֶרֶת רִשְׁאָה לְנוּוֹל עֲצָמָה. הָא נַעֲרָה רִשְׁאָה. בְּמֵאֵי? אֵילִימָא בְּתַמִּין, אֵין הַבּוֹגֶרֶת רִשְׁאָה? וְהָאֵמַר רַב חֲסֵדָא: אֲבָל אָסוּר לְהוֹשִׁיט אֲצַבְעוֹ בְּחַמִּין! אֵלֵא לָאוּ בְּצוּנָן? לֹא. אֲבִיחֹל וּפִירְכּוּס.

The Gemara proposes: **Let say that** the following *baraita* supports Rava's ruling. **A grown woman is not permitted to render herself unattractive** during the days of mourning for her father. As above, the Gemara infers that this *halakha* applies only to a grown woman, but a **young woman is permitted** to render herself unattractive. **In what kind of water may a grown woman bathe? If we say that this is referring to hot water, is a grown woman not permitted to refrain from washing in hot water? But didn't Rav H̄isda say: It is prohibited for a mourner to insert his finger into hot water for the purpose of washing. Rather, is it not the case that the baraita is referring to bathing in cold water?** The Gemara answers: **No;** the *baraita* is speaking of **painting the eyes and dyeing the hair.**

אָמַר רַב חֲסֵדָא: זֹאת אוֹמֶרֶת: אֲבָל אָסוּר בְּתַבְבוּסָתָא כֹּל שִׁבְעָה. וְהִלְכְתָּא: אֲבָל אָסוּר לְרוּחֹץ כֹּל גּוּפוֹ בֵּין בְּחַמִּין וּבֵין בְּצוּנָן כֹּל שִׁבְעָה. אֲבָל פָּנָיו, יָדָיו, וְרַגְלָיו בְּחַמִּין אָסוּר, בְּצוּנָן מוּתָר. אֲבָל לְפָנָיו, אֶפִּילוּ כֵּל שְׂהוּא אָסוּר. וְאִם לְעֵבֵר אֵת הַזּוּהָמָא, מוּתָר.

Rav H̄isda said: **That is to say, i.e.,** as the *baraita* states that it is permitted for a grown woman who observes successive periods of mourning to paint and dye her hair, the same *halakha* evidently applies to laundry, from which it may be inferred that in an unexceptional case it is **prohibited for a mourner to wash laundry**^H all seven days of mourning.^N The Gemara concludes: **And the practical halakha is: It is prohibited for a mourner to bathe his entire body both in hot water and in cold water all seven days of mourning.** However, with regard to **his face, his hands, and his feet,** although it is **prohibited to bathe them in hot water, in cold water it is permitted.** However, with regard to **smearing with oil, even any minimal amount of smearing is prohibited.**^H **But if one does so to remove the dirt, it is permitted.**

צְלוּתָא דְתַעֲנִיתָא הֵיכִי מְדַבְּרִינָן? אֲדַבְּרִיהָ רַב יְהוּדָה לְרַב יִצְחָק בְּרִיה, וְדַרְשׁ: יְחִיד שְׂקִיבֵל עָלָיו תַּעֲנִית מִתְּפִלָּל שֶׁל תַּעֲנִית. וְהֵיכֵן אוֹמֶרֶת? בֵּין גּוֹאֵל לְרוּפָא.

S The Gemara returns to the discussion of the *Aneinu* prayer, recited on fast days. **The prayer of a fast, how does one mention it?** Rav Yehuda granted his son Rav Yitzhak general permission to expound publicly, while instructing him in the substance of what he should say, and Rav Yitzhak taught: **An individual who took a fast upon himself prays the prayer of a fast. And where in the Amidah does he recite this additional prayer? Between the seventh blessing of the Amidah: Who redeems, and the eighth blessing: Who heals.**

מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַב יִצְחָק: וְכִי יְחִיד קוֹבֵעַ בְּרַכָּה לְעַצְמוֹ? אֵלֵא אָמַר רַב יִצְחָק: בְּשׁוּמַע תְּפִלָּה. וְכֵן אָמַר רַב שְׁשֶׁת: בְּשׁוּמַע תְּפִלָּה.

Rav Yitzhak strongly objects to this: **But may an individual establish a blessing for himself, in addition to the fixed blessings of the Amidah?** Rather, Rav Yitzhak said: One mentions his fast in the blessing: **Who listens to prayer,** in accordance with the general principle that an individual may insert private requests into this general plea for the acceptance of prayers, including matters outside the scope of the established blessings. **And similarly, Rav Sheshet said: One recites the prayer for a fast day in the blessing: Who listens to prayer.**

The only difference between an individual and a community – אין בין יחיד לצבור אלא – An individual who is fasting inserts the *Aneinu* prayer in the blessing: Who listens to prayer, whether he is observing an individual fast or fasting together with the community. Some commentaries note that even when one is observing an individual fast, he should recite the phrase: On the day of our fast. The common practice is that an individual who on a communal fast is not fasting does not recite the *Aneinu* prayer (*Arukh HaShulhan; Mishna Berura; Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 565:1*).

NOTES

That this one prays eighteen blessings – שנה מתפלל שמונה עשרה: Rashi notes that the *Amida* prayer, the main element of the daily service, is also called the *Shemoneh Esreh*, meaning eighteen, despite the fact that it consists of nineteen blessings, as originally only eighteen blessings were included in the prayer. The nineteenth blessing, against heretics, was added at a later stage by Shmuel HaKatan (see *Berakhot 28b–29a*).

Other commentaries discuss the issue at length, and point out that Shmuel HaKatan added the blessing against heretics in the period soon after the destruction of the Second Temple. Consequently, later tannaitic sources would be expected to reflect the fact that the daily *Amida* prayer is comprised of nineteen blessings (Rid). Based on the *Tosefta* and the Jerusalem Talmud, the Rid argues that according to the original custom observed in Eretz Yisrael, the *Amida* prayer consisted of only eighteen blessings even after the addition of the blessing against the heretics, as the request for the reestablishment of the Davidic Kingdom and the prayer for the rebuilding of Jerusalem were originally incorporated into a single blessing.

The tanna taught and omitted – תנא ושייר: Occasionally, when a conclusion is based on an omission of a certain case from a list in a mishna or a *baraita*, the Gemara will claim that the list is incomplete, as the *tanna* did not see the need to mention all the relevant cases, and therefore no inference can be drawn from the omission of a specific case. Generally, the Gemara will continue with the question: What else did the *tanna* omit that he omitted this case? In other words, the *tanna* of the mishna or *baraita* would not have left out only a single case, and therefore it must be demonstrated that at least one other case was omitted as well.

Several commentators point out that there are in fact other differences between the first three and the middle three fasts. For example, the first three fasts begin at dawn and bathing is permitted, whereas the middle three fasts begin the previous evening and bathing is prohibited for the duration of each fast, as stated in the mishna. If so, it is evident that the *tanna* of the *baraita* left out certain differences. It has been suggested that this *baraita* is not cited in its entirety, and that the differences mentioned in the mishna are also stated in that portion of the *baraita* omitted by the Gemara. It was therefore necessary for the Gemara to find additional differences between the two series of fasts, to justify its claim that there is a difference between them with regard to the number of blessings that must be recited (*Gevurat Ari; Keren Ora*).

מתניב: אין בין יחיד לצבור אלא שנה מתפלל שמונה עשרה וזה מתפלל תשע עשרה. מאי יחיד ומאי צבור? אילימא: יחיד ממש, וצבור שליח צבור, הני תשע עשרה? עשרין וארבע הו!

אלא לאו הכי קאמר: אין בין יחיד דקבל עליו תענית יחיד ליחיד שקבל עליו תענית צבור, אלא שנה מתפלל שמונה עשרה וזה מתפלל תשע עשרה. שמע מינה: יחיד קובע ברכה לעצמו!

לא. לעולם אימא לך שליח צבור. ודקא קשיא לך שליח צבור עשרין וארבע מצלי בשלש תעניות ראשונות דליכא עשרים וארבע.

ולא? והא אין בין קתני: אין בין שלש ראשונות לשלש אמצעיות, אלא שבאלו מותרין בעשיית מלאכה ובאלו אסורין בעשיית מלאכה. הא לעשרים וארבע, זה וזה שוין!

תנא ושייר. מאי שייר דהאי שייר? ותו, והא אין בין קתני! אלא. תנא באיסורי קא מיירי, בתפלות לא מיירי. ואי בעית אימא: באמצעיותא נמי לא מצלי עשרים וארבע.

ולא? והתנא: אין בין שלש שניות לשבע אחרונות, אלא שבאלו מתריעין ונועלין את החנויות. הא לכל דבריהן, זה וזה שוין! וכי תימא הקא נמי תנא ושייר, והא אין בין קתני!

ותסברא אין בין דוקא?

The Gemara raises an objection from a *baraita*: The only halakhic difference between an individual and a community¹ is that this one, an individual, prays eighteen blessings^N in his *Amida*, and that one, a community, prays nineteen blessings. The Gemara analyzes this statement: What is an individual and what is a community in this context? If we say that an individual means an actual individual, and community is referring to the communal prayer leader, are there really only nineteen blessings in the communal *Amida* of a fast? There are twenty-four blessings. As will be explained, six additional blessings are added on communal fast days.

Rather, is it not the case that this is what the *baraita* is saying: The only halakhic difference between an individual who took an individual fast upon himself and an individual who took a communal fast upon himself, is only that this one prays eighteen blessings, as he mentions his fast in the blessing: Who listens to prayer, and that one prays nineteen blessings. Learn from this statement that an individual may establish an individual blessing for himself.

The Gemara rejects this contention: No, actually I could say to you that this mention of a community is referring to the prayer leader. And with regard to what poses a difficulty for you, that the prayer leader prays twenty-four blessings, the *baraita* is referring to the first three fasts, in which there are not twenty-four blessings, but only the usual eighteen blessings, plus one additional blessing for fast days.

The Gemara questions this resolution: And are the six additional blessings not recited on the first series of communal fasts? But with regard to this issue, a *baraita* taught the instructive phrase: The only difference between them, as follows: The difference between the first three fasts and the middle three fasts is only that on these first fasts it is permitted to perform work, and on these middle fasts it is prohibited to perform work. This indicates that with regard to reciting all twenty-four blessings, both this and that are identical.

The Gemara rejects this argument: The *tanna* taught some of the differences between the fasts, and omitted^N some of them. The Gemara asks: What else did the *tanna* omit that you can justifiably claim that he omitted this case? In other words, it is possible for the *tanna* to have omitted a few examples, but he would not have omitted a single case. And furthermore, the *baraita* does not merely offer a list of differences, as it teaches: The difference between them is only. This phrase indicates that this is the only difference. Rather, the *tanna* is speaking of the various prohibitions of fast days, but he is not speaking of other differences, such as those that involve the details of prayers. And if you wish, say instead that on the middle three fasts too, the prayer leader does not pray twenty-four blessings, as the six additional blessings are recited only during the last series of fasts.

The Gemara expresses surprise at this: And does the prayer leader not recite all twenty-four blessings during the middle three fasts? But isn't it taught in a *baraita*: The difference between the second set of three fasts and the last seven fasts is only that in these they sound the alarm and lock the stores. This indicates that with regard to all their other matters, both this and that are identical. And if you say that here, too, he taught and omitted, but it teaches: The difference between them is only indicating that there is no other difference.

The Gemara asks: And how can you understand it that way? Does the phrase: The difference between them is only, specifically mean that there is only a single difference between the cases?