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? 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” (Isaiah 35:17). 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 was 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 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, he is permitted to wear shoes, since one need not put himself in danger.

The large date-bulk* 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? 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.
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The large date-bulk* 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? 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.
The Gemara clarifies: Food that has the volume of an egg-bulk is required to be eaten in a sukkah. If it should enter your mind to say that the volume of the large date that they spoke of is larger than the volume of an egg-bulk, there is a contradiction. Now, comparing the two episodes, it seems that two dates without their pits are not the volume of an egg. If so, can the volume of a large date and its pit be greater than that of an egg-bulk? Rav Yirmeya said: Yes, although two dates without their pits are not equal to an egg-bulk, the volume of a large date and its pit are larger than an egg-bulk, since date pits are very large. Rav Pappa said: This explains the folk saying that people say: In two kav of dates there is one kav and more of pits, meaning that the volume of the pit is larger than that of the fruit itself.

Rava said: This entire line of questioning has no basis: There, in the incident of the sukkah, this is the reason that the halakha permits eating the dates outside of the sukkah, due to the fact that dates are fruit, and fruit need not be eaten in a sukkah but may be eaten outside of a sukkah. The Gemara raises an objection. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: When we would learn Torah with Rabbi Elazar ben Shamua, they brought before us figs and grapes, and we ate them as a casual meal outside of the sukkah. The Gemara analyzes this: This implies that in the case of a casual meal, yes, it may be eaten outside of a sukkah; but a fixed meal may not be eaten outside of a sukkah. Therefore, a meal consisting of fruit must be eaten in a sukka.

Background

With this amount the mind is settled – Rav Yirmeyah. Although the Torah’s measures are halakhic transmitted to Moses from Sinai, the Gemara here suggests that the halakah only taught that there were different measures, and that it was up to the Sages to define the size of each measure. Therefore, the Gemara seeks a reason for this measure (Davar BeEruv).

The incident of Rabbi Tzadok – Rav Yirmeyah. This incident was brought to show the other side of these halakhot. Just as some Sages wished to show how stringent they were, Rabbi Tzadok wished to illustrate the decree to which the law could be lenient in certain circumstances.

He held it in a cloth – Rav Yirmeyah. Rav Yirmeyah explains that Rabbi Tzadok did not want to touch the food with his hands due to his great sensitivity. Tosafot, however, explain that he ate food only if he was pure enough to eat reumos. In order not to become impure, he avoided touching food with his hands.
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Fruit need not be eaten in a sukkah – Rabbi Akiva. One should eat and drink in the sukkah all seven days of the holiday. However, it is permitted to snack outside of a sukkah. For bread to be considered a snack, it must be less than the volume of an egg-bulk.

It is permitted to drink and to eat fruit outside of a sukkah, but it is praiseworthy to be stringent and eat all food inside the sukkah (Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 639:2).
The Gemara suggests: Let us say that this baraita supports Rava. It teaches: Therefore, if one completed consuming the amount that one is required to eat in the sukkah with types of sweets, he has fulfilled his obligation of sitting in the sukkah. If he should enter your mind to say that fruit is required to be eaten in a sukkah, then it should not say sweets; let it teach fruit. The Gemara rejects this proof: What do the words types of sweets mean? It means fruit. Therefore, this baraita is not a support for Rava’s opinion. And if you wish, say that this baraita is referring to a place where fruits are uncommon, and therefore other sweet foods are eaten, but fruit can similarly complete the requirement. Consequently, no support can be brought from here.

Until now, the Gemara has assumed that the volume of a large date is more than that of an egg. Rav Zevi disagreed with what was mentioned earlier and said: This is not so. Rather, the volume of a large date that they spoke of is less than an egg-bulk, as we learned in a mishna: Beit Shammai say: With regard to leaven, the sourdough used to make dough rise, ownership of the volume of an olive-bulk violates the prohibitions in the following verses stated regarding Passover: “And no leavened bread shall be seen with you” (Exodus 13:17) and “Seven days shall there be no leaven found in your houses” (Exodus 12:19). However, the amount of leavened bread that must be owned to violate the prohibition is the volume of a large date.

The Gemara continues. And we discussed it: What is the reason for the opinion of Beit Shammai? If both leaven and leavened bread had the same measure that determines liability, let the Merciful One write only: “Leavened bread,” and he would not need to write: “Leaven.” I would say, based on logic: If leavened bread, whose leavening ability is not as strong, is prohibited at an olive-bulk, all the more so should not leaven, whose leavening ability is strong because it causes dough to rise, be also prohibited at an olive-bulk? Since the Merciful One distinguishes between them and states both “leaven” and “leavened bread,” this taught you that the measure for one is not the same as the measure for the other. The measure that determines liability for leaven is an olive-bulk, like in the case of most prohibitions from the Torah, and the measure that determines liability for leavened bread, whose leavening ability is weaker, is the volume of a large date.

The Gemara clarifies: And if it should enter your mind to say: The volume of the large date that they spoke of is greater than an egg-bulk, since Beit Shammai are searching for the measure one size larger than an olive-bulk, as they proved that leavened bread must have a larger measure than an olive-bulk, and if the measure one size larger than an olive-bulk is an egg-bulk, then let them teach an egg-bulk and not a date. Alternatively, if they are exactly the same volume, and the volume of a large date has the same volume as an egg-bulk, they should have taught an egg-bulk, which is the more commonly used measure. Rather, must one not conclude from here that the volume of a large date is less than an egg-bulk?

Sweet foods, fruit — מִכַּזַּיִת fi, מִכַּבֵּיצָה fi. It seems that the Gemara maintains that the word fruit here is referring only to the seven species for which Eretz Yisrael is praised. According to this explanation, the Gemara’s claim that in some places fruit is uncommon is better understood, since, although some fruit is found everywhere, these seven species are not universally available (Tosafot Rav).

Leaven and leavened bread — מִכַּברָא fi. The Gemara where this discussion originally appears gives a reason for Beit Hillel’s approach. It raises an argument against Beit Shammai’s opinion that the prohibited volume of leaven should be smaller than the prohibited volume of leavened bread: Leaven is not edible but leavened bread is. However, the discussion here is not about the prohibition of consuming these foods on Passover, since according to both opinions one is liable for consuming the size of an olive-bulk of either leaven or leavened bread. Rather, the subject here is the following prohibition: It shall not be seen and it shall not be found. Therefore, the Gemara states that leaven, which has greater leavening ability than leavened bread, should have a smaller measure that determines liability (Tosefet Yom HaKippurim).

The measure one size larger than an olive-bulk — מִכַּבֵּיצָה fi. Tosafot point out that the Torah uses another measure, a dried fig-bulk, which is between the volume of an olive-bulk and a large date. Nevertheless, a dried fig-bulk is not a measure used with regard to prohibitions of eating. Therefore, the Gemara sought a measure most similar to that of an olive-bulk, either an egg-bulk, which is the amount required for satisfaction, or the volume of a large date, which is the amount required to settle one’s mind (see Tosafot Yeshananim).
The Sages altered the measure. From where is your proof? Perhaps I could actually say to you that the measure of the volume of a large date that they said is larger than an egg-bulk; however, the volume of a date of normal size is the same as an egg-bulk, and Beit Shammai were referring to a normal-sized date. Alternatively, say that the volume of a large date and an egg-bulk are equal, and the mishna chose to use one of them. Either way, there is no proof from here that the volume of a large date is greater than an egg-bulk.

Rather, it cannot be proven from here. Proof can be found from here: How much must one eat to obligate those with whom he ate in an invitation [zimmun] for Grace After Meals? An olive-bulk of food suffices to obligate those with whom they ate in a zimmun; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yehuda says: An egg-bulk is the minimum measure to obligate those with whom they ate in a zimmun. The Gemara clarifies: With regard to what do they disagree? Rabbi Meir holds that the verse “And you shall eat and be satisfied and bless the Lord your God” (Deuteronomy 8:10) should be understood as follows: “And you shall eat”; this is referring to eating. “And be satisfied”; this is referring to drinking. The definition of eating throughout the Torah is consuming an olive-bulk. Rabbi Yehuda holds: “And you shall eat and be satisfied” is referring to eating that causes satisfaction, and what is that? The volume of an egg-bulk. Less than that amount of food is not satisfying.

And if it should enter your mind to say that the volume of the large date that they spoke of is larger than an egg-bulk, the following question can be asked: Now that we have said that the volume of an egg-bulk satisfies, can we say that it does not settle the mind, and thereby remove the affliction of Yom Kippur? Rather, must one not conclude from this that the volume of a large date that they said is less than the size of an egg-bulk? Eating the larger amount of an egg-bulk satisfies a person, but eating the volume of a large date only settles his mind.

It was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says:

The measure for all prohibited foods in the Torah is the bulk of a medium-sized olive. This applies to transgressions punishable by lashes, karet, and death at the hand of Heaven. Excluded, however, are those cases where the verse employs unusual language (Rambam Sefer Kadishah, Hilkhot Malakhilot Assurot 1:1).