

BACKGROUND

Warp and woof threads – חוט שתי וחוט ערב: Even when weaving is done evenly, and the warp threads, those attached to the loom, are of the same type of thread as the woof, they are still somewhat different because of how they are used. The warp threads are usually both slimmer and stronger than the woof threads.

אמר רבי פנחס משום רב הונא צפורא: מעין היוצא מבית קדשי הקדשים בתחילה דומה לקרני חגבים, כיון שהגיע לפתח היכל נעשה כחוט של שתי, כיון שהגיע לאולם נעשה כחוט של ערב כיון שהגיע אל פתח עזרה נעשה כפי פך קטן. והיינו דתנן, רבי אליעזר בן יעקב אומר: מים

The Gemara cites more *midrashim* about the river that will flow from the Holy of Holies. Rabbi Pinehas said in the name of Rav Huna of Tzipori: The spring that comes forth from inside the Holy of Holies is at first very narrow and resembles grasshoppers' antennae in width. Once it reaches the opening of the Sanctuary it becomes as thick as the thread of the warp; once it reaches the Entrance Hall of the Sanctuary, it becomes as thick as the thread of the woof,<sup>8</sup> which is wider than the warp thread. Once it reaches the opening of the Temple courtyard it becomes like the mouth of a small jug. This is as we learned in a mishna: Rav Eliezer ben Ya'akov says: Water,

Perek VIII Daf 78 Amud a

NOTES

From this point forward it will grow in strength – מכאן: This is a hint to the way the future redemption will take place. It will begin slowly, until the Messiah, the descendant of David, arrives. Then the salvation will bring about the resurrection of the dead and the nullification of the Angel of Death (*Iyyun Ya'akov*).

She must sit – שצריכה לישב: This is stated, since it has already been established that it is prohibited to stand in water that reaches the neck (see *Siah Yitzhak*). In the phrase “to the inhabitants of [*yoshvei*] Jerusalem” (*Zechariah* 13:1), *yoshvei* literally means “those who sit” and is an allusion to this (see *Ohel Moshe*).

HALAKHA

Crossing water on Shabbat – מעבר מים בשבת: It is permitted to cross water on Shabbat when wearing shoes, but not when wearing sandals. This is due to the concern that one may come to carry his sandals if they fall off (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 301:4).

BACKGROUND

Lecture [*pirka*] – פירקא: The *pirka* was generally a lecture given by a Sage to his colleagues and their students. There was obvious importance given to a lecture that the Exilarch attended and occasionally delivered. All of the Sages in the vicinity felt obligated to be present at such lectures.

מפכין עתידין להיות יוצאין מתחת מפתח הבית. מכאן ואילך היה מתגבר ועולה עד שמגיע לפתח בית דוד, כיון שמגיע לפתח בית דוד – נעשה כנחל שוטף, שבו רוחצין זבין וזבות נדות ויולדות, שנאמר: “ביום ההוא יהיה מקור נפתח לבית דוד וליושבי ירושלים לחטאת ולנדה.”

in the future, will bubble from under the threshold of the Temple. From this point forward, the spring will grow in strength<sup>n</sup> and rise until it reaches the opening of David's house, i.e., his grave, which is outside of Jerusalem. When it reaches the opening of David's house, it will become a flowing river in which *zavim* and *zavot*, menstruating women, and women after childbirth will bathe to purify themselves. As it is stated: “On that day there shall be a fountain opened for the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for purification and for sprinkling” (*Zechariah* 13:1).

אמר רב יוסף: מכאן רמו לנדה שצריכה לישוב עד צוארה במים. ולית הילכתא ברותיה.

Rav Yosef said: From here, there is an allusion that a menstruating woman must be able to sit<sup>n</sup> up to her neck in water, i.e., that this is the appropriate depth for waters of a ritual bath to purify. The Gemara comments: But the *halakha* is not in accordance with his opinion. Rather, the depth of the water is irrelevant. As long as the water can cover an entire adult body, the ritual bath is kosher.

(תינוח יום הכפורים דליכא מנעל) שבת דאיכא מנעל מאי? אמר נחמיה חתניה דבי נשיאה: אנה חזיתיה לרבי אמרי רבי אסי דמטו עורקומא דמיא, ועברוה, דרך מלבוש.

The Gemara investigates the permissibility of crossing water in order to fulfill a mitzva: It works out well that on Yom Kippur it is permitted because there are no shoes, and there is no problem going through water barefoot. However, on Shabbat,<sup>11</sup> when there are shoes, what is the *halakha*? Is one permitted to cross water wearing shoes? Is there a concern that his shoe might come off and he may pick it up, thereby violating the prohibition of carrying out? *Neḥemya*, the son-in-law of the *Nasi*, said: I saw Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi come to a pool of water that they had to cross on Shabbat, and they crossed it while wearing their shoes without removing them first.

תינוח מנעל, סנדל מאי איכא למימר? אמר רב ריחומי: אנה חזיתיה לרבינא דעבר דרך מלבוש. רב אשי אמר: סנדל לבתחלה לא.

The Gemara asks: It works out well that shoes are permitted, since one can tie them tightly, but what is there to say about sandals? Since they do not fit tightly on the foot, they might come off in the water. Rav Rihumi said: I saw Ravina cross a river while wearing sandals on his feet. Rav Ashi said: If he is wearing sandals, he should not cross the water *ab initio*, lest the sandal fall off his foot and he violate the prohibition of carrying on Shabbat by picking it up.

ריש גלותא איקלע להגרוניא לבי רב נתן. רפרם וכולהו רבנן אתו לפירקא, רבינא לא אתא. למחר בעי רפרם לאפוקי לרבינא מדעתיה דריש גלותא. אמר ליה: מאי טעמא לא אתא מר לפירקא? אמר ליה: הוה כאיב לי ברעאי. איבעי לך למיסם מסאני! גבא דכרעא הוה.

Incidental to this, the Gemara reports: The Exilarch came to deliver a lecture in Rav Natan's study hall in Hagronya. Rafram and all the Sages came to the lecture,<sup>8</sup> but Ravina did not come. The next day, when he came, Rafram wanted to remove any anger towards Ravina from the mind of the Exilarch, for missing the lecture. Rafram therefore asked Ravina: What is the reason that the Master did not come to the lecture? He said to him: My foot hurt. He said to him: You should have put shoes on. Ravina answered him: It was the back of the foot that hurt, so wearing shoes would have been hard for me.

Does the Master not hold with that which Rav Ashi said – לָא סָבַר לָהּ מַר לְהָא דְאָמַר רַב אֲשִׁי: The medieval commentaries point out that the Gemara earlier reported that Ravina himself crossed a river in sandals. Why does it seem that here he does not allow it? One solution to the apparent contradiction is that the Gemara is citing two different scholars named Ravina, Ravina the Elder and his nephew. Alternatively, perhaps Ravina made the statement to pacify the Exilarch (Tosafot Yeshanim). Or, it is possible that Ravina changed his opinion after hearing the position of Rav Ashi (Sifah Yitzhak).

By a baby [yanuka] – בֵּינְיָאָא: Commentaries explain that a baby was used because its skin is usually a little cold, or because one is permitted to bathe a baby to cool it off (Min HaAnavim). Others explain that yanuka is the name of a vessel with a long neck, and it is so named because one drinks from it by sucking [yenika] (ge'onim).

Slip [mizderiv] – מִזְדְּרִיב: The root of this word, zarav, is found in the Bible (Job 6:17). Its meaning is connected to the word for stealing.

You told us the opposite – אִיפְכָא אֲמַרְתְּ לָן: The rationale to be more stringent on the Ninth of Av is because the day is one of mourning and sorrow (Me'iri), or due to concern that people will disregard rabbinic mitzvot (Tosafot Yeshanim).

Permission from the Nasi – רִשּׁוּת מִן הַנָּשִׂיא: In the early generations, the Sages needed authority only to rule on monetary issues, not on halakhot concerning ritual. However, a reform was made requiring permission in that area too, in order to ensure that the student knew the material well enough to rule. In order to raise the stature of the Nasi, it was instituted that he would be the one to grant such permission.

Permitting firstborn animals – הַתֵּרַת בְּכוֹרוֹת: In the times of the Temple, all firstborn animals were given to the priests. Unblemished ones were slaughtered in the Temple. Their blood was sprinkled on the altar, and the meat was given to the priests to eat. Blemished animals were given directly to the priests to eat. After the destruction of the Temple, all firstborn animals were given to the priests, but the animals were permitted to be eaten only if they were blemished. Since the priests had to take care of the animals but were not allowed to benefit from them until they became blemished, priests were sometimes suspected of intentionally causing the animals to become blemished.

## HALAKHA

Cooling off on Yom Kippur – לְהִצְטַן בְּיוֹם הַכִּפּוּרִים: The prohibition of bathing on Yom Kippur does not include alternative ways of cooling off. One is therefore allowed to cool off using empty vessels, fruits, and babies. Cooling off using damp clay is prohibited, if the clay is wet enough to make something else wet by touching it. Furthermore, using a vessel that has water in it is prohibited, since it may spill and lead to bathing. It is prohibited to soak a cloth in water the day before and use it to cool off, since one may come to wring it out on Yom Kippur (Rema). However, if the cloth is dry and was already used the day before, one may wipe one's eyes with it on Yom Kippur (Mishna Berura; Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 613:9).

Cooling off with a cloth on the Ninth of Av – בְּתַשְׁעָה בְּאָב: The day before the Ninth of Av, one may soak a cloth in water and remove it from the water before the fast begins, in order to wipe oneself with it and cool off the next day (Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 554:14).

Permitting firstborn animals – הַתֵּרַת בְּכוֹרוֹת: A priest is not trusted to rule that a firstborn in his possession became blemished. Others, however, even a relative or another priest, are trusted to give such testimony (Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a 314:3).

אִיבְעִי לָךְ לְמַרְמָא סַנְדְּלָא. אָמַר לֵיהּ: עוֹרְקָמָא דְמֵינָא הוּא בְּאוֹרְחָא. אִיבְעִי לָךְ לְמַעְבְּרִיהּ דְרַךְ מִלְבוּשׁ. אָמַר לֵיהּ: לָא סָבַר לָהּ מַר לְהָא דְאָמַר רַב אֲשִׁי. סַנְדְּלָא לְכַתְחֻלָּהּ לָא?

Rafram said to Ravina: You should have worn sandals, which leave the heel exposed. He said to him: There was a pool of water on the way that I would have had to cross. He said to him: You should have crossed it wearing the sandals. He said to him: Does the Master not hold with that which Rav Ashi said:<sup>N</sup> One should not wear sandals when crossing a river on Shabbat, *ab initio*? From this conversation, the Exilarch understood that Ravina meant no disrespect in not attending the lecture.

§ The Gemara continues to discuss the laws of Yom Kippur: Yehuda bar Gerogarot taught: It is prohibited to sit on damp clay on Yom Kippur. Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: This prohibition applies only when the clay is dripping wet, when one feels its wetness when touching it. Abaye said in clarification: It must be dripping wet enough to make something else wet. Rav Yehuda said: One is permitted to cool off with fruit on Yom Kippur,<sup>H</sup> and it is not considered bathing. Similarly, when Rav Yehuda suffered from the heat on Yom Kippur he cooled off by putting a squash on himself.

Rabba cooled off by placing a baby [yanuka]<sup>N</sup> next to him, because a baby's body is cold. Rava cooled off with a silver cup. Rav Pappa said: If the silver cup is full, it is prohibited; however, if it is not full, it is permitted. With regard to a ceramic cup, both this and that are prohibited, since the water seeps through the cup, causing a violation of the prohibition of bathing. Rav Ashi said: A silver cup that is not full is also prohibited because it can slip [mizderiv]<sup>N</sup> from his hand and spill.

Ze'eira bar Hama, the host of the home where Rabbi Ami, and Rabbi Asi, and Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, and all the Sages of Caesarea stayed, said to Rav Yosef, son of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi: Son of a lion, come, I will tell you about a wonderful custom that your father used to perform. He had a cloth that he would prepare on the day before Yom Kippur by soaking it in water and wringing it out, making it almost like a dried cloth. And the next day he wiped his face, hands, and feet with it. On the day before the Ninth of Av, on which the prohibition of bathing is by rabbinic law and not Torah law, he would soak the cloth in water and the next day pass it over his eyes.

Similarly, when Rabba bar Mari came from Eretz Yisrael he said: The day before the Ninth of Av they bring one a cloth, and he may soak it in water<sup>H</sup> and place it under his head. The next day, when only some moisture remains, he may wipe his face, hands, and feet with it. On the day before Yom Kippur, they bring one a cloth, and he may soak it in water and wring it out to make it like a dried cloth. The next day, he may pass it over his eyes. Rabbi Ya'akov said to Rabbi Yirmeya bar Tahlfifa: You told us the opposite.<sup>N</sup> What you told us about Yom Kippur was really what he did on the Ninth of Av, and we objected to you with regard to the prohibition of wringing, since Yom Kippur has the same prohibition of wringing that Shabbat has.

§ Rav Menashya bar Tahalfifa said that Rav Amram said that Rabba bar bar Hana said: They asked Rabbi Elazar ben Pedat: Must an Elder who sits and studies Torah in a yeshiva receive permission<sup>N</sup> from the Nasi to permit him to render firstborn animals permitted,<sup>H</sup> like others who must get permission from the Nasi to render firstborn animals permitted,<sup>N</sup> or not? A firstborn animal may not be eaten until it has a blemish. Knowing which blemishes are permanent and permit the animal to be eaten and which are temporary is specialized knowledge.

תַּנִּי יְהוּדָה בַּר גֵּרוֹגָרוֹת: אָסוּר לַיִשֵּׁב עַל גְּבִי טִינָא בְּיוֹם הַכִּפּוּרִים. אָמַר רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן לֵוִי: וּבְטִינָא מְטַפַּחַת. אָמַר אַבְי: וּבְטַוּפַּח עַל מַנֵּת לְהִטְפִיחַ. אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה: מוֹתֵר לְהִצְטַן בְּפִירוֹת. רַב יְהוּדָה מְצַטֵּן בְּקָרָא.

רַבָּה מְצַטֵּן בִּינְיָאָא. רַבָּא מְצַטֵּן בְּכֶסֶף דְּכֶסֶפָא. אָמַר רַב פַּפָּא: כֶּסֶף דְּכֶסֶפָא, מְלֵא – אָסוּר, חֶסֶר – שְׂרִי. דְּפַחְרָא, אִידִי וְאִידִי – אָסוּר, מְשוּם דְּמִישְׁחַל שְׁחִיל רַב אָמַר: כֶּסֶף דְּכֶסֶפָא – חֶסֶר נִמְי אָסוּר, מְשוּם דְּמִזְדְּרִיב.

זַעֲיָרָא בַּר חַמָּא אוֹשְׁפִיזְכֵּינֵן דְּרַבִּי אַמִּי וְרַבִּי אַסִּי וְרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן לֵוִי וְדְכוּלְהוּ רַבְנֵי דְקַיסְרֵי הוּוּ, אָמַר לֵיהּ לְרַב יוֹסֵף בְּרִיהּ דְרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן לֵוִי: בַּר אֲרִיאֵ! תָא אִימָא לָךְ מִלְתָּא מְעֻלְיָתָא דְהָהוּ עֵבִיד אַבְדָּךְ, מְטַפַּחַת הָיָה לּוֹ בְּעָרְבַיּוֹם יוֹם הַכִּפּוּרִים וְשׁוֹרָה אוֹתָהּ בְּמֵים וְעוֹשָׂה אוֹתָהּ כְּמֵין בְּלִים נְגוּבִין, וְלִמְחָר מְקַנְחָ בָּהּ פְּנִיּוֹ יְדָיו וְרַגְלָיו. עָרַב תַּשְׁעָה בְּאָב שׁוֹרָה אוֹתָהּ בְּמֵים, וְלִמְחָר מְעַבְרָה עַל גְּבִי עֵינָיו.

וְכֵן כִּי אֲתָא רַבָּה בַּר מְרִי אָמַר: בְּעָרְבַיּוֹם תַּשְׁעָה בְּאָב מְבִיאִין לוֹ מְטַפַּחַת וְשׁוֹרָה אוֹתָהּ בְּמֵים, וּמְנִיחָה תַּחַת מְרַאשׁוֹתָיו, וְלִמְחָר מְקַנְחָ פְּנִיּוֹ יְדָיו וְרַגְלָיו. בְּעָרְבַיּוֹם הַכִּפּוּרִים מְבִיאִין לוֹ מְטַפַּחַת וְשׁוֹרָה אוֹתָהּ בְּמֵים, וְעוֹשָׂה אוֹתָהּ כְּמֵין בְּלִים נְגוּבִין, וְלִמְחָר מְעַבְרָה עַל גְּבִי עֵינָיו. אָמַר לֵיהּ רַבִּי יַעֲקֹב לְרַבִּי יִרְמְיָה בַּר תַּחְלִיפָא: אִיפְכָא אֲמַרְתְּ לָן, וְאוֹתֵיבְנָךְ סַחִיטָה.

אָמַר רַב מְנַשְׂיָא בַּר תַּחְלִיפָא אָמַר רַב עֲמֵרָם אָמַר רַבָּה בַּר בַּר חָנָה, שְׂאֵלוּ אֶת רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר: זְקֵן וְיוֹשֵׁב בִּישְׁבֵּיהּ צְרִיךְ לִישׁוֹל רִשׁוּת לְהַתִּיר בְּכוֹרוֹת אוֹ אִינוּ צְרִיךְ?

BACKGROUND

Was given to the house of the Nasi – הניחו להם לבי – נשיאה: Based on the Sages who were involved in this discussion, it seems that it took place during the period of Rabbi Yehuda Nesia, the grandson of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. In those generations, the leadership position was an honor inherited by the descendants of Hillel the Elder. However, most of the Nes'im were not prominent Torah scholars; they served primarily as liaisons with the Romans and the true religious leaders were the heads of the yeshivot. Despite this, in order to give honor to their ancestors and to maintain the honor of the office of the Nasi, the Nasi was given honorary tasks such as granting the Sages the authority to rule in certain matters of halakha.

The testimony of Rabbi Tzadok ben Haluka addressed the comparative status of Rabbi Yosei ben Zimra and Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, both of whom lived two generations earlier. Although Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi was one of the greatest scholars of his time, Rabbi Yosei ben Zimra was considered to be greater than him both in years and in wisdom. Nevertheless, he asked permission from Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi.

מאי קא מיבעי להו? הכי קא מיבעי להו: כי הא דאמר רב אידי בר אבין: דבר זה הניחו להם לבי נשיאה כדי להתגדר בו – צריך לישול רשות, או דילמא בין דנקו ויושב בישיבה – אין צריך? עמד רבי צדוק בן חלוקה על רגליו ואמר: אני ראיתי את רבי יוסי בן זימרא, שזקן ויושב בישיבה היה, ועמד במעלה מוקנו של זה – ונטל רשות להתיר בכורות.

אמר ליה רבי אבא: לא כך היה מעשה, אלא כך היה מעשה: רבי יוסי בן זימרא באו היה, והכי קא מיבעיא ליה: הלכה ברבי מאיר דאמר: החשוד בדבר לא דנו ולא מעידו, או דילמא הלכה ברבן שמעון בן גמליאל, דאמר: נאמן הוא על של חבירו ואינו נאמן על של עצמו. ופשט ליה: הלכה ברבן שמעון בן גמליאל.

The Gemara asks: What are they asking? What is the basis of the question? The Gemara explains: This is what they are asking, like this statement of Rav Idi bar Avin, who said: This matter, the authority of the Nasi to grant permission, was given to the house of the Nasi<sup>b</sup> to raise its stature. Therefore, must permission be received, since the request itself honors the Nasi? Or, perhaps because the individual in question is an Elder who sits and studies Torah in a yeshiva, there is no need. Rav Tzadok ben Haluka rose to his feet and said: I saw Rabbi Yosei ben Zimra, who was an Elder who sat in the yeshiva and who stood before the grandfather of this current Nasi, ask permission from him to permit firstborn animals.

Rabbi Abba said to him: The way you described it was not how the incident was. Rather this was the incident: Rabbi Yosei ben Zimra was a priest, and he raised the following dilemma: Is the halakha in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, who said: One who is suspect in a certain area may not judge it and may not testify about it? Priests are suspected of inflicting blemishes on firstborn animals because after the destruction of the Temple, even priests may not benefit from a firstborn animal until it becomes blemished. The question was not one of seeking permission from the Nasi, but it was a question of halakha. Are priests who are Torah scholars also suspected of inflicting blemishes? Or perhaps the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, who said: One who is suspect is believed about his fellow but is not believed about himself. He resolved the question for him: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel.

קא מיבעיא להו: מהו לצאת בסנדל של S They raised another dilemma before them, the same Sages mentioned: What is the halakha with regard to going out in sandals made of

Perek VIII Daf 78 Amud b

BACKGROUND

Cork – שעם: It seems that the cork mentioned here is the bark of the cork tree, from which corks are made nowadays. Though this tree naturally grows in the western basin of the Mediterranean Sea, it was brought to Israel and nearby countries as early as the time of the Gemara. The custom was to use cork on the soles of sandals.

HALAKHA

Wearing shoes on Yom Kippur – נעילת הסנדל ביום – הקפויים: It is prohibited to wear sandals or shoes made from leather on Yom Kippur, even if they are only covered in leather. However, shoes made of straw, cloth, or any other type of material are permitted. Some authorities prohibit shoes made from other materials if one does not feel afflicted by wearing them, but most authorities disagree with that ruling (see Mishna Berura; Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 614:2). The usual custom is to be lenient.

Wearing shoes on a communal fast – נעילת הסנדל – בתענית צבור: Wearing leather shoes is prohibited on the Ninth of Av. If the shoes are made from cloth or other materials, they are permitted, as stated in the Gemara (Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 554:16). The same halakha applies to any communal fast day decreed when there is drought. However, nowadays there are no longer such communal fast days.

שעם ביום הכפורים. עמד רבי יצחק בר נחמני על רגליו ואמר: אני ראיתי את רבי יהושע בן לוי שיצא בסנדל של שעם ביום הכפורים, ואמינא ליה: בתענית צבור מאי? אמר ליה: לא שנא. אמר רבא בר בר חנה: אני ראיתי את רבי אלעזר דמן נגוה שיצא בסנדל של שעם בתענית צבור, ואמינא ליה: ביום הכפורים מאי? אמר ליה: לא שנא. רב יהודה נפיק בדהיטני, אביי נפיק בדהויצי, רבא נפיק (בדביל). רבא בר רב הונא כריך סודרא אכרעיה ונפיק.

cork<sup>b</sup> on Yom Kippur?<sup>H</sup> Is it considered a shoe, and therefore it may not be worn on Yom Kippur, or not? Rabbi Yitzhak bar Nahmani stood on his feet to testify and said: I saw that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi went out on Yom Kippur in cork sandals, and I said to him: What is the law on a communal fast<sup>HN</sup> that is decreed in a time of drought, when shoes are similarly prohibited? Are reed sandals permitted? He said to me: It is no different, and such sandals are permitted even on a communal fast day. Rabba bar bar Hana said: I saw Rabbi Elazar from Nineveh go out in cork sandals on a communal fast day, and I said to him: What is the law on Yom Kippur? He said to me: It is no different, and it is permitted. The Gemara reports: Rav Yehuda went out on Yom Kippur in reed sandals. Abaye went out in sandals made of palm fiber. Rava went out in sandals braided with reeds. None of these sandals are considered to be shoes. Rabba bar Rav Huna wrapped a scarf around his feet and went out.

NOTES

Yom Kippur and a communal fast – יום הכפורים ותענית צבור: There are separate reasons to be stringent on each of these days. One must suffer on a communal fast, and therefore certain afflictions are required. However, the wearing of shoes is permitted. It is prohibited specifically on Yom Kippur because of a scriptural allusion. On the other hand, since the wearing of shoes on Yom Kippur is based on a scriptural allusion perhaps it includes even non-leather shoes (Sifah Yitzhak).

**A prosthetic leg on Shabbat – קב הקיטע בשבת** – Since a prosthetic leg is used just to provide the appearance of a leg, it is prohibited to walk into the public domain wearing one on Shabbat, lest it fall off and be carried. This follows Rabbi Yosei's opinion (*Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim* 301:15).

**A prosthetic leg on Yom Kippur – קב הקיטע ביום הכפורים** – If a prosthetic leg is covered in leather it is considered a type of shoe, and it may not be worn on Yom Kippur (*Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim* 614:2).

**Young children on Yom Kippur – תינוקות ביום הכפורים** – Young children are permitted to eat, drink, bathe, and smear oil on Yom Kippur; but they are not allowed to wear leather shoes, as a single day without wearing shoes will not cause children to suffer unduly. This ruling applies only to a child old enough to understand the mitzvot somewhat; a very young child may wear shoes. During times when children are not bathed or smeared with oil every day, it is appropriate to refrain from these activities on Yom Kippur (see *Mishna Berura; Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim* 616:1).

## NOTES

**The prosthetic leg is impure – הקב טמא** – According to the *halakhot* of ritual purity and impurity, raw materials other than food and drink can become impure only if they are fashioned into vessels. Depending on the material, there is a range of definitions as to what constitutes a vessel in this area of law. For example, wooden utensils can become impure only if they have a hollow space in them; completely flat objects cannot be impure. Consequently, a prosthetic leg with a hollow space into which rags are placed is subject to impurity.

**Young children are permitted to perform all of them – תינוקות מותרין בכלן** – There are different opinions within the *halakha* with regard to young children. Children who have not reached the age of maturity are not obligated to fulfill mitzvot by Torah law. However, even before children reach this age, they must be educated by their parents, little by little, to follow *halakha*. Even so, there is no obligation to force very young children to keep the mitzvot.

In some situations, it is prohibited for adults to directly enable children to violate the *halakha*. For example, a parent may not directly feed a child non-kosher food. With regard to Yom Kippur, there is a question as to whether parents are permitted to do things for their children that they may not do for themselves. Since there is a fear of endangering the child through abstinence, the Gemara concludes that not only are children permitted to eat and drink, but that adults must make sure that they do so.

**Cracked ceramic vessels – מאני גזיזי** – Rabba's statement teaches about the prohibition against wanton destruction. Rabba bought his children pieces of broken pottery to smash rather than allowing them to break whole and usable utensils.

## PERSONALITIES

**My mother told me – אמרה לי אם** – Abaye quotes the wisdom of his mother throughout the Gemara. However, this woman was not his biological mother, since it is known that she died during his birth. It seems that the woman he called mother was the wife of his uncle, Rabba bar Nahmani, who raised him. Abaye cites much of her advice for daily life and rearing children.

## BACKGROUND

**Kutaha – כותחא** – In Hebrew this is *kutah*, a dip used in Babylonia. It was made mostly from bread crumbs and sour milk, with additional spices sprinkled in.

מתלב רמי בר חמא: הקיטע יוצא בקב שלו, דברי רבי מאיר. ורבי יוסי אוסר. ותני עלה: ושיון שאסור לצאת בו ביום הכפורים! אמר אביי: התם דאית ביה כתייתין, ומשום תענוג.

אמר ליה רבא: ואי לא מנא הוא – כתייתין משוי ליה מנא?! ועוד: כל תענוג דלאו מנעל הוא, ביום הכפורים מי אסור?! והא רבה בר רב הונא הוה פריך סודרא אכרעיה ונפיק. ועוד: מדקתני סיפא אם יש לו בית קבול כתייתין טמא, מפלל דרישא לאו בדאית ליה כתייתין עסקינן!

אלא אמר רבא: לעולם דכולי עלמא מנעל הוא, ובשבת בהא פליגי. מר סבר: גזרינן דילמא משתמיט ואיתי לאתויי ארבע אמות, ומר סבר: לא גזרינן.

תנו רבנן: תינוקות מותרין בכלן, חוץ מנעילת הסנדל. מאי שנא נעילת הסנדל – דאמרי: אינשי עבדו ליה. הנהך נמי אמרי: אינשי עבדו ליה. רחיצה וסיכה – אימר מאתמול עבדי ליה!

סנדל נמי אימר מאתמול עבדי ליה. סנדל לא אפשר דמאתמול עבדי ליה, דאמר שמואל: האי מאן דבעי למיטעם טעמא דמיתותא – ליסכים מסאני וליגני.

והא מותרין לכתחלה קתני! אלא: הנהך דלאו רביתיהו – גזרו בהו רבנן, הנהך דרביתיהו הוא – לא גזרו בהו רבנן. דאמר אביי אמרה לי אם: רביתיה דיעניקא – מנא חמימי ומשחא. גדל פורתא – בינתא בכותחא, גדל פורתא – תבורי מאני. כי הא דרבה זבין להו מאני גזיזי דפחרא לבניה, ומתברר להו.

**Rami bar Hama raised an objection:** We learned that an amputee may go out with his wooden prosthetic leg on Shabbat,<sup>h</sup> since it is like a shoe; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. But Rabbi Yosei prohibits it. And a *baraita* was taught in that regard as an addendum to that mishna: And they agree that it is prohibited to go out wearing it on Yom Kippur.<sup>h</sup> As this indicates that even wooden shoes are prohibited, the materials worn by the aforementioned *amora'im* should also be prohibited. Abaye said: There, in the case of Yom Kippur, it is prohibited because there are rags in the prosthesis. The prohibition is not due to the shoes but due to the pleasure of the comfort, which is prohibited on Yom Kippur.

**Rava said to him:** And if the prosthetic leg is not a garment, meaning that it is not a shoe, do the rags make it into a garment? Only shoes are forbidden, not other garments. And furthermore, any other kind of pleasure that is not the pleasure of wearing shoes, is it prohibited on Yom Kippur? Only certain afflictions are mandated on Yom Kippur; activities that are not specifically restricted by those afflictions are permitted. And Rabba bar Rav Huna would wrap a scarf on his feet and go out, demonstrating that the comfort provided by rags is permitted on Yom Kippur. Furthermore, the continuation of the *baraita* contradicts your explanation that the prohibition is due to the comfort provided by the rags. From the fact that it teaches in the latter clause: If the prosthetic leg has a receptacle designed for rags it is susceptible to ritual impurity like all wooden utensils which have receptacles,<sup>n</sup> it may be inferred that in the first clause we are not dealing with a prosthetic leg that has a hollow space designed for rags. Abaye's position is thereby rejected.

Rather, Rava said: Actually, according to everyone, a prosthetic leg is considered to be a shoe, and with regard to Shabbat this is what they disagree about: One Sage, Rabbi Yosei holds that we decree a prohibition of wearing a prosthetic leg on Shabbat lest the leg slip off and one come to carry it four cubits in the public domain; and one Sage, Rabbi Meir, holds that we do not decree such a rule.

**The Sages taught:** Young children<sup>h</sup> are permitted to perform all of the prohibited activities on Yom Kippur,<sup>n</sup> except for wearing shoes. The Gemara asks: What is different about wearing shoes? It is because observers who see a child wearing shoes will say that adults did this for him, i.e., put them on for him, since he cannot do it for himself. But if that is the reason, with regard to those other prohibitions also, like bathing and smearing oil, they will say that adults did this for him, and children should be prohibited from those activities as well. The Gemara explains: With regard to bathing and smearing oil, they could say that they did this for him yesterday, since one cannot be certain when the child was bathed.

The Gemara asks: If so, we could say this with regard to shoes as well. They could say that they did this for him yesterday. The Gemara answers: In the case of shoes, it is impossible to say an adult did it for him yesterday, since the child would not have worn shoes at night. As Shmuel said: He who desires a taste of death should put on shoes and go to sleep.

The Gemara asks: But the mishna is teaching that they are permitted to wear shoes *ab initio*. If so, it is permitted for an adult to perform these acts for a child even on the day of Yom Kippur, and the observer will not think that the adult has done anything wrong. Rather, we must explain the mishna as follows: The Sages decreed against performing those actions that are not necessary for the child's growth, but the Sages did not decree against performing those actions that are necessary for the child's growth. As Abaye said: My mother told me:<sup>p</sup> A child's growth requires hot water and oil for smearing. When he grows a little, he must eat egg with *kutaha*,<sup>b</sup> a pickled dip made with milk. When he grows a little more, he must have vessels to break, since he will enjoy breaking them. This is like Rabba who bought cracked ceramic vessels<sup>n</sup> for his children, and they broke them for their enjoyment.

NOTES

**Who is the *tanna* of the mishna – מתניתין מני** – This question should not be understood as the usual attempt to clarify which Sage composed a specific mishna, since here Rabbi Eliezer is clearly identified as the author of the mishna. Rather, the issue here is whether all the views in the mishna with regard to the king, bride, and new mother are the opinion of only Rabbi Eliezer, or whether the Rabbis agree with Rabbi Eliezer in the first two cases. The Gemara therefore brings proof from the *baraita* that all three cases are the opinion only of Rabbi Eliezer and that the Rabbis argue with him on each issue (*Siah Yitzhak*). Furthermore, although the mishna is clearly the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, the Gemara clarifies that it also is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Hananya ben Teradyon.

**The king in his beauty – מלך ביופיו** – It is a positive mitzva to instate a king who holds the people in awe. If the king's appearance is not impressive, this will detract from the fear he can instill in his subjects (*Sefer HaHashlama*).

HALAKHA

**We do not prevent the bride from wearing perfumes – אין מונעין תבשיתין הכלה** – A single woman may not adorn herself during her entire period of mourning, but a married woman is prohibited from adorning herself only during the first seven days of mourning. A bride who lost a close relative within thirty days of her wedding may adorn herself even during the first seven days of mourning. This follows the opinion of the Rosh, as stated in his commentary on tractate *Ketubot* (*Be'er Hagola; Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a 381:6*).

**Due to the danger of scorpions – מחמת סכנת עקרב** – One is permitted to wear shoes to protect himself from scorpions or similar dangers and even to avoid getting dirty from mud (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 614:4*, and in the comment of the Rema).

”המלך והכלה ירחצו את פניהם.”  
מתניתין מני – רבי חנניא בן תרדיון  
היא. דתניא: המלך והכלה לא ירחצו  
את פניהם. רבי חנניא בן תרדיון אומר  
משום רבי אליעזר: המלך והכלה ירחצו  
את פניהם. החיה לא תנעול את הסנדל.  
רבי חנניא בן תרדיון אומר משום רבי  
אליעזר: החיה תנעול את הסנדל.

מאי טעמא מלך – משום דכתב: ”מלך  
ביפיו תחזינה עיניך.” בלה מאי טעמא –  
כדי שלא תתגנה על בעלה. אומר ליה  
רב לרבי חייא: בלה עד כמה? אומר ליה,  
כדתניא: אין מונעין תבשיתין מן הכלה  
כל שלשים יום.

החיה תנעול את הסנדל – משום צינה.

אמר שמואל: אם מחמת סכנת עקרב –  
מותר.

”האוכל כבותבת הגסה.” בעי רב פפא:

§ We learned in the mishna that according to Rabbi Eliezer, the king and the bride may wash their faces on Yom Kippur. The Gemara asks: **Who is the *tanna* of the mishna?**<sup>N</sup> The Gemara answers: It is the opinion of Rabbi Hananya ben Teradyon, as it was taught in a *baraita*: **The king and the bride may not wash their faces on Yom Kippur. Rabbi Hananya ben Teradyon says in the name of Rabbi Eliezer: A king and a bride may wash their faces.** The Rabbis said: **A new mother may not wear shoes on Yom Kippur. Rabbi Hananya ben Teradyon says in the name of Rabbi Eliezer: A new mother may wear shoes.**

The Gemara asks: According to Rabbi Eliezer's opinion, **what is the reason that the king may wear shoes? Because it is written: “Your eyes shall see the king in his beauty”<sup>N</sup> (Isaiah 33:17).** A king should always look regal before his nation. **What is the reason that a bride may wash her face? So that she should not appear repulsive to her husband.** Since it is only the beginning of their marriage, her husband may be disgusted at seeing her otherwise. **Rav said to Rabbi Hiyya: For how long after her wedding is a woman considered a bride? He said to him: As it was taught in a *baraita*: If she becomes a mourner, we do not prevent the bride from wearing perfumes<sup>H</sup> during the entire first thirty days of her marriage.** This shows that for the first thirty days, her appearance is most critical.

**A new mother may wear shoes.** What is the reason for this? **Due to the cold** there is concern that she will become ill, as she is weak from the birth.

**Shmuel said: If a man is worried about walking barefoot on Yom Kippur due to the danger of scorpions,<sup>H</sup> he is permitted to wear shoes, since one need not put himself in danger.**

§ We learned in the mishna: On Yom Kippur, **one who eats food the volume of a large date is liable.** Rav Pappa asked:

Perek VIII

Daf 79 Amud a

HALAKHA

**Volume of a date-bulk – שיעור כותבת** – A date-bulk is slightly less than an egg-bulk. The *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Rav Ashi, that a large date-bulk is equivalent to the volume of a large date including its pit (see *Bah; Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 612:1*).

כבותבת שאמר בגרעינתה או בלא  
גרעינתה? בעי רב אשי: עצם בשעורה,  
בקליפתה או בלא קליפתה, בלחה או  
ביבשה? רב אשי לא מבטא ליה הא  
דרב פפא – גסה איתמר, כל כמה דגסה.  
רב פפא לא מבטא ליה הא דרב אשי:  
לחה – שבולת מיקרי, שלא בקליפתה –  
אושלא מיקרי.

**The large date-bulk<sup>H</sup> that they said** is the measure that determines liability for eating on Yom Kippur, does this refer to the volume of a large date **with its pit or without its pit?**<sup>N</sup> Rav Ashi asked a similar question: The mishna that states that a **bone** that is a **barley-grain-bulk** imparts ritual impurity, does this refer to the volume of a barley grain **with its husk or without its husk?** And is that referring to a **wet kernel or a dry one?** The Gemara clarifies: **Rav Ashi did not ask the question that Rav Pappa asked, regarding the size of the date-bulk on Yom Kippur because the answer was clear to him. Since it is stated in the mishna: Large, it means as large as possible, which must include the pit. Conversely, Rav Pappa did not ask the question that Rav Ashi asked regarding the size of the barley-grain-bulk because the answer was clear to him. Wet barley is called *shibbolet* and not barley; without its shell it is no longer called barley but is called *ushla*. Therefore, the mishna must be referring to dry barley within its shell.**

NOTES

**Volume of a large date and the volume of its pit – שיעור כותבת הגסה ושיעור גרעינתה** – *Tosafot* ask why the Gemara poses this question when the mishna explicitly states that the pit is included. The commentator explains that the conjunctive *va*, translated here as the word and, might actually mean or, so that the mishna does not read: The date and its pit, but rather: The date or its pit. In other words, the volume is the amount of food

equal to a large date or its pit, which are roughly the same size. Rav Nissim Gaon, cited in the *Arukh*, explains this differently: Since a date has three parts, the fruit, the pit, and the space between them, the Gemara is asking whether just the fruit and the pit are measured, or whether the space between them is included as well. This issue is also discussed in the Jerusalem Talmud, but a different conclusion is reached there (see *Bah*).