

NOTES

Eats in an excessive manner – אוכל אכילה גסה: Tosafot Yeshanim point out that there are several levels of excessive eating. There is excessive eating in which one keeps eating when he is already full, and there is a further stage in which one eats so much that he gags on what he is eating (see Nimmukei Hayyim).

Excluding one who harms himself – פרט למזיק: Some commentaries explain that as such a person is not said to be eating but to be harming himself, the verse is not referring to him (Me'iri).

HALAKHA

Excessive eating on Yom Kippur – אכילה גסה ביום הכפורים: If one eats excessively on Yom Kippur, e.g., he finishes his meal on Yom Kippur eve and continues eating even though is too full to eat more, he is exempt. This ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Reish Lakish. If he ate tasty, fragrant food he is liable (Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 612:6, and in the comment of the Rema).

A non-priest who ate teruma in an excessive manner – זר שאכל תרומה אכילה גסה: One who eats teruma in an excessive manner does not pay an additional fifth, but only the principal. Such a person is considered to have damaged teruma rather than eaten it. This is also the rule for someone who chews raw barley, for this is not the usual way of eating (Rambam Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhot Terumat 10:8).

Perek VIII Daf 81 Amud a

NOTES

Who chews on barley of teruma – בוסס שעורים של תרומה: This is referring specifically to barley, which is normally considered to be animal food. One who eats unprocessed barley is not considered to have eaten. This is not the case with chewing wheat, which is considered the usual way of eating and should be preceded with a blessing. One who ate wheat of teruma pays the principal and a fifth (Siah Yitzhak; Gevurat Ari).

Food and drink do not combine – האוכל והשותה אין מצטרפין: The novel element in this halakha is understood by reading the following mishna: One who eats and drinks on Yom Kippur within one lapse of awareness is liable only for one sin-offering. Therefore, it is clear that eating and drinking are considered to be a single prohibition. They are both derived from the same verse, making them a single matter. Even so, they are treated as distinct here because they have different measures (Tosefot Rid).

Its type of ritual impurity and its measure – טומאתו ושיעורו: There are several distinct levels of ritual impurity. There are differences both in type of impurity, i.e., whether it is imparted by contact, carrying, or other means, and the severity of impurity, i.e., whether the impurity lasts only until evening or for seven days, or whether it renders only clothing impure. There are also distinctions in amounts required to transfer impurity: A dead creeping animal transmits impurity at the size of a lentil; an animal carcass does so at the size of an olive-bulk; and a corpse, depending on context, has various amounts in which it transmits impurity, from the size of a barley groat and upward. In order for two items to combine, they must be identical both in their type of impurity and their measure (see Rashi and Rambam).

אמר ריש לקיש: האוכל אכילה גסה ביום הכפורים פטור, מאי טעמא "אשר לא תעונה" בתיב, פרט למזיק.

אמר רבי ירמיה אמר ריש לקיש: זר שאכל תרומה אכילה גסה – משלים את הקרן ואינו משלים את החומש, "כי יאכל" – פרט למזיק. אמר רבי ירמיה אמר רבי יוחנן: זר

שבוסס שעורים של תרומה – משלים את הקרן ואינו משלים את החומש. "כי יאכל" – פרט למזיק.

אמר רב שזיבוי אמר רבי יוחנן: זר שבלע שזפין של תרומה, והקיאו, ואכלו אחר – ראשון משלים (את) קרן וחומש, שני אין משלים אלא דמי עצים לראשון בלבד.

"האוכל והשותה אין מצטרפין". מאן תנא? אמר רב חסדא: במחלוקת שנויה, ורבי יהושע היא. דתנן: כלל אמר רבי יהושע: כל שטומאתו ושיעורו שוה – מצטרף.

Reish Lakish said: One who eats in an excessive manner^N on Yom Kippur, to the degree that he forces himself to continue eating even when full is exempt,^H e.g., one who ate beyond being satiated on Yom Kippur eve and then ate something else as soon as the fast began. What is the reason for that? Because the Torah does not mention the prohibition of eating on Yom Kippur, but it was written "any soul which shall not be afflicted in that same day, he shall be cut off from his people" (Leviticus 23:29), excluding one who harms himself,^N e.g., one who does not enjoy his food at all.

Similarly, Rabbi Yirmeya said that Reish Lakish said: A non-priest who ate teruma in an excessive manner^H pays the principal, that which he took, and does not pay the additional fifth, which one who illegally eats teruma pays to the priest as a penalty. This is because it states about one who eats teruma: "And if a man eat of the sacred thing in error, then he shall add a fifth to it, and give the priest the sacred thing" (Leviticus 22:14). The word "eat" excludes one who is not eating but harming himself. He does, however, pay the principal, since he caused a loss to the priest. The fifth is only paid by one who eats normally, not excessively. Similarly, Rabbi Yirmeya said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: A non-priest

who chews on barley of teruma^N that has not been ground or baked pays the principal and not an extra fifth. The reason is that it states "eats" (Leviticus 22:14), which excludes one who harms himself. Consuming raw barley is considered self-harm, not eating.

Rav Sheizvi said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: In the case of a non-priest who swallowed plums of teruma^H whole and vomited them out, whereupon another person ate them, the first one pays the principal plus a fifth. When the first one benefited from the plums, he acquired them and must therefore pay for them, and the second one must pay their worth to the first one. Since they are only fit for fuel after the first one vomited them out, the second person is considered to have damaged their value as fuel. Therefore, he pays only the price of wood, i.e., fuel, to the first person.

It was taught in the mishna that food and drink do not combine.^N The Gemara asks: Who is the tanna who taught this? Rav Hisda said: This halakha is taught as a dispute, and the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua. As we learned in a mishna: Rabbi Yehoshua stated a general principle: Any item that is identical to another item in its type of ritual impurity, e.g., impurity that lasts only until evening, and its measure^{NH} for impurity, e.g., an olive-bulk, combines with the other item to reach one measure to render other items impure. Therefore, two half olive-bulk pieces of two corpses or of two animal carcasses, or two half lentil-bulk pieces from two creeping animals all combine to render other items impure.

HALAKHA

A non-priest who swallowed plums of teruma – זר שבלע וקיאו: If a non-priest swallows plums of teruma and vomits them out, and then another person comes and eats them, the first person pays the principal value plus a fifth, and the second person pays the value of the plums as fuel (Rambam Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhot Terumat 10:9).

Any item that is identical to another item in its type of ritual

impurity and its measure – כל שטומאתו ושיעורו שוה: If several items are identical with respect to their type of ritual impurity and the measure at which they impart impurity to other items, they combine with each other to impart impurity. If their type of impurity is the same but not their measure, or their measure is identical but not their type of impurity, then they do not combine even to assume the status of the more lenient one (Rambam Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Okhalin 4:11).

טומאתו ולא שיעורו, שיעורו ולא טומאתו, לא טומאתו ולא שיעורו – אין מצטרפין.

However, if one item is identical to another in **its ritual impurity but not its measure**, e.g., half a lentil-bulk of a creeping animal and half an olive-bulk of an animal carcass, which both impart impurity until nightfall; or if **its measure is identical but not its type of ritual impurity**, e.g., half an olive-bulk from a corpse, which imparts impurity for seven days, and half an olive-bulk from an animal carcass, which imparts impurity until nightfall; and all the more so, when **neither its ritual impurity nor its measure** are identical, then the items **do not combine**. Here, too, although both eating and drinking are prohibited on their own, they do not combine because they do not have the same measure that imparts impurity.

רב נחמן אמר: אפילו תימא רבנן. עד כאן לא קא אמרי רבנן התם אלא לענין טומאה – דשם טומאה חד היא. אבל הקא – משום יתובי דעתא הוא, והאי לא מיתבא דעתיה.

Rav Nahman said: Even if you say that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, until now we have heard the Rabbis say there that items with different measures combine only with respect to ritual impurity. Since the phenomenon of ritual impurity is one concept, different types combine. But here, in the case of Yom Kippur, the measure that determines liability is set due to settling the mind, and this combination of eating and drinking together does not settle the mind.

וכן אמר ריש לקיש: במחלוקת שנייה, ורבי יהושע היא. דתנן: כלל אמר רבי יהושע בו, ורבי יוחנן אמר: אפילו תימא רבנן. עד כאן לא קאמרי רבנן התם אלא לענין טומאה, אבל הקא משום יתובי דעתיה הוא – והאי לא קא מיתבא דעתיה.

And similarly, Reish Lakish said: This question of whether food and drink combine to reach a measure that determines liability on Yom Kippur is taught as a dispute. The approach brought in the mishna that states that they do not combine is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua, as we learned in a mishna: Rabbi Yehoshua stated a general principle with regard to whether items with different types of impurity and measures combine, as Rav Hisda explained above. And Rabbi Yohanan said in accordance with the opinion of Rav Nahman: Even if you say that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, until now we have heard the Rabbis say there that items with different measures combine only with regard to ritual impurity. But here, in the case of Yom Kippur, the measure that determines liability is set due to settling the mind, and this combination of eating and drinking together does not settle the mind.

מתני' אכל ושתה בהעלם אחר – אינו חייב אלא חטאת אחת. אכל ועשה מלאכה – חייב (שני) חטאות. אכל אוכלין שאינן ראויין לאכילה, ושתה משקין שאינן ראויין לשתיה, ושתה ציר או מוריים – פטור.

MISHNA If one ate and drank unwittingly within one lapse of awareness,^H e.g., he forgot that it is Yom Kippur, he is liable to bring only one sin-offering. However, if he ate and performed labor unwittingly, he is liable to bring two sin-offerings, as by doing so he violated two separate prohibitions. If he ate foods that are not fit for eating,^H or drank liquids that are not fit for drinking, or drank fish brine or the briny liquid in which fish are pickled,^H he is exempt, as that is not the typical manner of eating or drinking.

גמ' אמר ריש לקיש: מפני מה לא נאמרה אזהרה בעינוי – משום דלא אפשר. היכי נכתוב? נכתוב רחמנא "לא יאכל" – אכילה בכזית, נכתוב רחמנא "לא תעונה" – קום אכול משמע.

GEMARA Reish Lakish said: Why is there no warning^N stated about affliction;^N why did the Torah not state explicitly that it is prohibited to eat and drink on Yom Kippur? It is because it was not possible to write it that way. The Gemara explains: How could the Merciful One write it? Let the Merciful One write: One shall not eat on Yom Kippur. The term eat prohibits eating the amount of an olive-bulk, whereas on Yom Kippur the actual prohibited measure is a large date-bulk. Let the Merciful One write: Do not be afflicted. That indicates the opposite of affliction, and would mean: Get up and eat. Therefore, it is written: "For whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted on that same day, he shall be cut off from his people" (Leviticus 23:29).

מתקיף לה רב הושעיא: נכתוב רחמנא "השמר פן לא תעונה"! אם בן נפשי להו לאוי.

Rav Hoshaya strongly objects to this: Let the Merciful One write it in this manner: Guard yourself lest you not be afflicted. The Gemara answers: If so, there would be too many negative mitzvot, as the following are all expressions of prohibition: Guard, lest, and not. One would then say that there are three prohibitions against eating.

HALAKHA

אכל – אכל אוכלין – אכל ושתה בהעלם אחר: If one ate and drank on Yom Kippur within one lapse of awareness, e.g., if he forgot it was Yom Kippur, he is obligated to bring only one sin-offering (Rambam Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Shegagot 6:5).

אכל אוכלין – אכל אוכלין שאינן ראויין לאכילה: If on Yom Kippur one ate foods that are not fit to be eaten or drank a beverage not fit to be drunk, he is exempt. However, it is prohibited to drink or eat such substances ab initio. One who does so receives lashes by rabbinic decree (Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shevitat Asor 2:5; Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 612:6).

Drank fish brine or the briny liquid in which fish are pickled – שותה ציר או מוריים: If on Yom Kippur one drank fish brine or the briny liquid in which fish are pickled, he is exempt (Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 612:9, and in the comment of the Rema).

NOTES

Punishment and warning – עונש ואזהרה: The Gemara here and in many other places attempts to locate warnings that express particular prohibitions. This is because there is a principle that a punishment may be administered only if there is a warning. However, if the punishment is written explicitly in the Torah, why should a warning be sought? The Rambam explains in Sefer HaMitzvot that when a special verse that contains a warning is found, it adds to the clarity of the verses. However, according to Tosafot, if a written warning cannot be found, there may be no punishment of lashes, because lashes are given only for the transgression of prohibitions.

מפני – מיהו לא נאמרה אזהרה בעינוי: The later commentaries discuss how to understand the words of Reish Lakish, as it seems that according to all opinions there is in fact a warning with regard to affliction on Yom Kippur. Various solutions have been offered, the main point being that Reish Lakish does not dispute the fact that there is a warning about affliction on Yom Kippur; rather, he explains why this warning is not stated in the Torah as a prohibition but is only hinted at. Alternatively, Reish Lakish held that the Torah relied on the verbal analogy rather than writing it explicitly (Tosefet Yom HaKippurim; Kashot Meyushavi).

מתקוף לה רב ביבי בר אבוי: נכתוב רחמנא
"השמר במצות עינוי!" אם כן השמר
דלאו - לאו, השמר דעשה - עשה. מתקוף
לה רב אשי: נכתוב: אל תסור מן העינוי!
קשיא.

ותנא מייתי לה מהכא: "ועניתם את
נפשותיכם וכל מלאכה לא תעשו" יכול
יהא ענוש על תוספת מלאכה - תלמוד
לומר: "וכל הנפש אשר תעשה כל מלאכה
בעצם היום הזה", על עיצומו של יום -
ענוש ברת, ואינו ענוש ברת על תוספת
מלאכה.

יכול לא יהא ענוש ברת על תוספת
מלאכה, אבל יהא ענוש ברת על תוספת
עינוי - תלמוד לומר: "כי כל הנפש אשר
לא תעונה בעצם היום הזה ונכרתה", על
עיצומו של יום - ענוש ברת, ואינו ענוש
ברת על תוספת עינוי.

יכול לא יהא בכלל ענוש, אבל יהא מוזהר
על תוספת מלאכה - תלמוד לומר: "וכל
מלאכה לא תעשו בעצם היום הזה" על
עיצומו של יום הוא מוזהר, ואינו מוזהר
על תוספת מלאכה.

יכול לא יהא מוזהר על תוספת מלאכה,
אבל יהא מוזהר על תוספת עינוי, ודין
הוא: ומה מלאכה שנוהגת בשבתות ויום
טוב - אינו מוזהר עליה, עינוי שאינו נוהג
בשבתות ויום טוב - אינו דין שלא יהא
מוזהר עליו?

אבל אזהרה לעינוי של יום עצמו לא למדנו
מניין. לא יאמר ענוש במלאכה - דגמר
מעינוי, ומה עינוי שאינו נוהג בשבתות
ויום טוב - ענוש ברת, מלאכה שנוהגת
בשבתות וימים טובים - לא כל שבין?
למה נאמר? מופנה להקיש ולדון ממנו
גזרה שוה: נאמר ענוש בעינוי, ונאמר ענוש
במלאכה. מה מלאכה - לא ענוש אלא
אם כן הזהיר, אף עינוי - לא ענוש אלא
אם כן הזהיר.

Rav Beivai bar Abaye strongly objects to this: Let the Merciful One write: Guard yourself in the mitzva of affliction. The Gemara rejects this: If so, there is a principle: If the words guard yourself are written about a prohibition, it is considered to be a prohibition; if the words guard yourself are written about a positive mitzva, it is considered to be a positive mitzva. Had the Torah written it that way, one would understand that there is a positive mitzva of affliction, but there is no element of prohibition. Rav Ashi strongly objects to this: Let the Merciful One write: Do not stray from afflicting yourself, which would imply a negative mitzva. The Gemara says: Indeed, this is difficult. The Gemara concedes that it could have been written in this manner.

§ With regard to the prohibitions against eating and labor, the Gemara says: And a *tanna* cites the prohibitions relating to affliction on Yom Kippur from here: It is stated: "And you shall afflict your souls, you shall do no manner of labor" (Numbers 29:7). The Gemara considers: One might have thought that performing labor during the extension of the period of prohibition of labor, added before Yom Kippur actually begins, is punishable by *karet*. Therefore, the verse states: "And whatsoever soul it be that does any manner of labor on that same day" (Leviticus 23:30), which teaches that performing labor on that very day is punishable by *karet*, but labor performed during the extension of the period of prohibition of labor is not punishable by *karet*.

The *baraita* continues: One might have thought that performing labor during the extension of the period of prohibition of labor is not punishable by *karet*, but not afflicting oneself during the extension of the period of affliction is punishable by *karet*. Therefore, the verse states: "For whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted on that same day, he shall be cut off from his people" (Leviticus 23:29), which teaches that not afflicting oneself on that very day is punishable by *karet*, but not afflicting oneself during the extension of the period of affliction is not punishable by *karet*.

The *baraita* continues: One might have thought that one who performs labor during the extension would not be included in the punishment of *karet*, but he would be warned against performing labor during the extension of the period of prohibition of labor with a prohibition incurring the punishment of lashes; therefore, the verse states: "And you shall do no manner of labor on that same day" (Leviticus 23:28). That teaches that he is warned not to perform labor on that very day, but he is not warned against performing labor during the extension of the period of prohibition of labor, and therefore he is not liable to receive lashes for doing so.

The *baraita* continues: One might have thought: He would not be warned with regard to performing labor during the extension of the period of prohibition of labor that it is a prohibition that incurs lashes; but he would be warned with regard to not being in a state of affliction during the extension of the period of affliction that it is a prohibition that incurs lashes. However, that is incorrect, and it is learned from a logical derivation that it is not so: Just as with regard to labor, whose prohibition is observed on both *Shabbatot* and Festivals, one is not warned about the extension added to the day, is it not logical that with regard to affliction, which is not observed on *Shabbatot* and Festivals, he should not be warned about or liable to receive lashes for the extension?

The *baraita* comments: But the warning about lashes during the very day itself we have not learned. From where is it derived? The Torah need not state the punishment of *karet* for performing labor, since one can learn it by logical derivation from the punishment of not being in a state of affliction, as follows: Just as the requirement of affliction, which is not observed on *Shabbatot* and Festivals, is punishable by *karet* on Yom Kippur, with regard to the prohibition of labor, which is observed on all *Shabbatot* and Festivals, is it not all the more so? If so, why is the punishment for labor stated explicitly? It is available to compare and learn a verbal analogy from it: A punishment with regard to affliction is stated, and a punishment with regard to labor is stated. Just as with regard to labor one is punished only if he was warned first with a negative mitzva, so too, with regard to affliction, one is punished only if he was warned.

איכא למיפרך: מה לעינוי – שלא הותר
מכלל, תאמר במלאכה – שהותרה
מכללה!

אלא: לא יאמר עונש בעינוי, דגמר
ממלאכה: מה מלאכה שהותרה מכללה –
עונש ברת, עינוי שלא הותר מכלל – לא
כל שכן?! למה נאמר? מופנה להקיש
ולדון ממנה גזירה שוה: נאמר עונש בעינוי
ונאמר עונש במלאכה, מה מלאכה – עונש
והזהיר, אף עינוי – עונש והזהיר.

איכא למיפרך: מה למלאכה – שכן נוהגת
בשבתות וימים טובים, תאמר בעינוי –
שאינו נוהג בשבתות וימים טובים!

אמר רבינא: האי תנא "עצם" "עצם" גמר.
מופנה, דאי לא מופנה – איכא למיפרך
בדפרינן.

לאיי אפנוי מופנה. חמשה קראי כתיבי
במלאכה, חד לאזהרה דיממא, וחד
לאזהרה דליליא, וחד לעונש דיממא, וחד
לעונש דליליא, וחד לאפנוי למגמר עינוי
ממלאכה בין דיממא בין דליליא.

רבי ישמעאל תנא: נאמר כאן עינוי, ונאמר
להלן עינוי, מה להלן – לא עונש אלא אם
בן הזהיר, אף כאן לא עונש אלא אם
בן הזהיר. רב אחא בר יעקב אמר: יליף "שבת
שבתון" משבת בראשית, מה להלן – לא
עונש אלא אם בן הזהיר, אף כאן – לא עונש
אלא אם בן הזהיר.

רב פפא אמר:

The Gemara rejects this: This comparison can be refuted. How so? Whereas affliction has no permitted exceptions from its general prohibition, as the mitzva to afflict oneself applies to all the Jewish people, what can you say with regard to labor, which has permitted exceptions from its general prohibition? It is permitted to perform the Temple services on Yom Kippur, which include prohibited labors, e.g., slaughtering animals and offering incense. Consequently, there is no proof that the mitzva of affliction is more lenient than the prohibition of labor.

Rather, say as follows: The Torah need not say the punishment for not being in a state of affliction, since one can learn it from the punishment for performing labor through an *a fortiori* inference. How so? Just as labor, for which exceptions from the general prohibition are permitted, e.g., performing the Temple service on Yom Kippur, and yet labor is punishable by *karet*, with regard to not being in a state of affliction, which has no permitted exceptions from its general prohibition, is it not all the more so that one who does not afflict himself should be liable to receive *karet*? If so, why is it nevertheless stated? It is available to compare and learn a verbal analogy: Punishment is stated with regard to affliction, and punishment is stated with regard to labor. Just as for labor the Torah punished and warned, so too, for affliction the Torah punished and warned.

The Gemara rejects this: This comparison can be refuted, and one might say the opposite: Whereas the prohibition of labor is observed on *Shabbatot* and Festivals, can you say the same about affliction, which is not observed on *Shabbatot* and Festivals?

Ravina said: We did not properly understand the teaching of this *baraita*, as this *tanna* derived a verbal analogy from the words "on that same day" (Leviticus 23:29) stated with regard to affliction, and "on that same day" (Leviticus 23:28) stated with regard to labor. The Gemara comments: We must say that it is available, meaning that in both places, the phrase "on that same day" is unnecessary within its own context and comes only to teach this verbal analogy; as, if it were not available, it could be refuted, as we refuted it above.

The Gemara responds: No, it is certainly available, and we may learn from it, as five verses are written with regard to the prohibition of labor on Yom Kippur. One to teach a warning with regard to the prohibition of labor on the day of Yom Kippur itself; and one for a warning with regard to labor on the night of Yom Kippur;ⁿ and one for the punishment of *karet* for performing labor on the day; and one for the punishment for performing labor at night; and one verse to be available to derive the requirement of affliction from the prohibition of labor, both during the day and night, using a verbal analogy.

The school of Rabbi Yishmael taught an alternative verbal analogy for the derivation: "Affliction" is stated here, with regard to Yom Kippur, and "affliction" is stated later, with regard to a man who rapes a woman: "Because he has afflicted his neighbor's wife" (Deuteronomy 22:24). Just as there, in the case of rape, the Torah did not punish unless there was prior warning, so too here, in the case of Yom Kippur, the Torah did not punish unless there was prior warning. Rav Aha bar Ya'akov said a different proof: Derive a verbal analogy from the words "Shabbat of solemn rest" (Leviticus 16:31) written with regard to Yom Kippur from the words "Shabbat of solemn rest" (Exodus 31:15, 32:5; Leviticus 23:3) written with regard to the weekly Shabbat, which commemorates the Shabbat of Creation. Just as there, in the case of Shabbat, the Torah did not punish unless there was prior warning, so too here, in the case of Yom Kippur, the Torah did not punish unless there was prior warning.

Rav Pappa said:

NOTES

חד ליממא חד – ליליא: Tosafot Yeshanim point out that with regard to *Shabbat* and Festivals there is never a need to find a verse implying separate prohibitions for the night and for the day. In that case, why is it necessary for Yom Kippur? The suggested solution is that the term "on that same day" is stated explicitly several times with regard to Yom Kippur. Therefore, it seems that the whole mitzva relates to the daytime. Consequently, there was a need to cite special verses to show that the prohibition applies at night as well. Other commentaries have added that in fact it is the day of Yom Kippur, and not the night, that facilitates atonement (*Mishmerot Kehuna*).

HALAKHA

Extension of the period of affliction – תוספת עינוי – With regard to affliction on Yom Kippur, it is a mitzva to sanctify and append from non-sacred time to sacred time, both at the beginning of the holiday and at its end (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhoh Shevitat Asor* 1:6; *Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim* 608:1).

Appending from non-sacred time to sacred time on Shabbatot and Festivals – מחול על הקודש – Some commentaries write that the mitzva to sanctify and append non-sacred time to sacred time on *Shabbat* and Festivals is a rabbinic law, contrary to Rambam's opinion (see *Maggid Mishneh*; Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhoh Shevitat Asor* 1:6; *Beit Yosef, Oraḥ Ḥayyim* 261). However, most *halakhic* authorities consider it a positive mitzva by Torah law, and therefore one should refrain from labor both at the start and the end of the day. This additional time lasts from sunset to twilight. Although any amount of added time fulfills the obligation, one may treat the entire span as sacred. Practically speaking, the custom is to begin this extra time just before sunset to fulfill all opinions. There are different customs with respect to how much to add and whether the entire community adds time. For example, in Jerusalem, women have the custom to add more time and light candles earlier than in other locations (see *Mishna Berura; Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim* 261:2).

הוא גופיה שבת איקרי, דכתב
"תשבתו שבתכם". בשלמא רב פפא
לא אמר ברב אחא בר יעקב – דקרא
דכתב בגופיה עדין. אלא רב אחא
בר יעקב מאי טעמא לא אמר ברב
פפא?

מיבעי ליה לכדתניא: "ועניתם את
נפשותיכם בתשעה לחודש", יכול
יתחיל ויתענה בתשעה – תלמוד לומר
"בערב". אי בערב – יכול משתחשך –
תלמוד לומר "בתשעה". הא כיצד?
מתחיל ומתענה מבעוד יום. מכאן
שמוסיפין מחול על הקודש.

ואין לי אלא בכנסתו, ביציאתו מנין?
תלמוד לומר "מערב עד ערב". ואין
לי אלא יום הכפורים, (ימים טובים)
מנין? תלמוד לומר "תשבתו". אין
לי אלא (ימים טובים, שבתות) מנין?
תלמוד לומר "שבתכם". הא כיצד?
כל מקום שנאמר שבות – (מכאן ש)
מוסיפין מחול על הקודש.

ותנא ד"עצם" "עצם", האי "בתשעה
לחודש" מאי עביד ליה? מיבעי ליה
לכדתני חייא בר רב מדיפתי. דתני
חייא בר רב מדיפתי: "ועניתם את
נפשותיכם בתשעה" וכי בתשעה
מתענין? והלא בעשור מתענין!
אלא לומר לך: כל האוכל ושותה
בתשיעי – מעלה עליו הכתוב כאילו
התענה תשיעי ועשירי.

Yom Kippur itself is called "Shabbat," as it is written: "From evening until evening, you shall rest on your Shabbat" (Leviticus 23:32). The Gemara compares the various opinions. **Granted, Rav Pappa did not say as Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov did because a verse that is written about the matter itself is preferable to a verbal analogy. But what is the reason that Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov did not state his opinion in accordance with the opinion of Rav Pappa?**

The Gemara answers: **He requires this verse of "keep your Shabbat" for that which was taught in a baraita:** The verse states: "And you shall afflict your souls on the ninth day of the month at evening, from evening until evening, you shall rest on your Shabbat" (Leviticus 23:32). One might have thought that one should start to afflict oneself on the ninth of Tishrei; therefore, the verse states "at evening." If the Torah had stated only "at evening," one might have thought that the fast starts only when darkness falls; therefore, the verse states "on the ninth," implying that one begins to fast on the ninth of Tishrei. **How can these verses be reconciled? One begins to fast while it is still daytime; from here it is derived that one sanctifies and extends from the non-sacred weekday to the sacred day of Yom Kippur.**^H

I have derived only that one must add time at the beginning of Yom Kippur. From where do I derive that one adds time at the conclusion of Yom Kippur? The verse states: "From evening until evening"^N (Leviticus 23:32), implying that one adds at the end as well, just as he does at the beginning. And I have derived only the mitzva of adding to Yom Kippur; from where is it derived that one must also sanctify and append time before and after Festivals? The verse states: "You shall rest" (Leviticus 23:32), to teach that this rule applies even to Festivals, on which one is commanded to rest. I have derived only that one adds an extension to Festivals; from where do I derive that one must also sanctify and append to *Shabbatot*? The verse states: "Your Shabbat" (Leviticus 23:32). **How so? Every place the term: Rest [shevut] is stated, it teaches from here that one sanctifies and appends from the non-sacred weekday to the sacred.**^H

The Gemara asks: **And the tanna** who learns a verbal analogy from the words "that same day," "that same day," what does he do with the phrase: "On the ninth day of the month"? The Gemara answers: **He requires it, in accordance with that which Ḥiyya bar Rav of Difti taught. As Ḥiyya bar Rav of Difti taught:** It states: "And you shall afflict your souls on the ninth day of the month" (Leviticus 23:32). **But does one afflict oneself on the ninth of Tishrei? Doesn't one in fact afflict oneself on the tenth of Tishrei? Rather, the verse comes to tell you: Anyone who eats and drinks on the ninth of Tishrei and then fasts on the tenth, the verse ascribes him credit as though he fasted on both the ninth and the tenth.**^N The verse alludes to this when it states that the fast is on the ninth.

NOTES

From evening until evening – מערב עד ערב: It seems that the author of the *baraita* learned in accordance with the principle that "until" means: Up to and including. Therefore, the phrase "until evening" includes part of the evening as well (see *Gevurat Ari*).

As though he fasted on the ninth and the tenth – כאילו התענה: In explaining this matter, some simply say that since there is a mitzva to afflict oneself by fasting, one who prepares to fast by eating and drinking on the ninth also fulfills a mitzva (Rashi; *Me'iri*). Others explain that one who eats a great deal on

the ninth has a harder time fasting the next day, and therefore eating the day before is also considered affliction (*Eliya Rabba*). A third approach suggests that Yom Kippur is a Festival, and it would have been appropriate to eat and drink; however, since such activity is prohibited on the tenth, one creates a Festival by eating on the ninth. A final theory states that on the ninth, one is obligated to appease anyone he has injured and to make peace with all people. One with a full stomach will have an easier time being accommodating and less likely to engage in disputes, which is why it is a mitzva to eat on the ninth (*Sefat Emet*).

Pepper in Eretz Yisrael – פלפלין בארץ ישראל – This may refer to peppercorn, also called black pepper. The natural location for cultivation of this pepper is in tropical lands, and it is usually imported from India. However, there are isolated locations in Eretz Yisrael whose climate makes it possible to grow pepper.

The ginger plant and its flowers – צמח הונגביל ופרחו – Ginger, *Zingiber officinale*, is a perennial tropical grass from the ginger family, Zingiberaceae. Its height reaches 30–90 cm, and it has a thick aromatic rhizome. The plant originated in India, and it spread from there to other lands. The dried rhizomes are used as a spice for cakes, wines, and various types of liquor. It is also used as a medicine, and it is sometimes held in the mouth to relieve bad breath.



Ginger plant

Cooked ginger [himalta] – הימלתא – This is apparently a candy made from young ginger roots steeped in sugar. It is also called *zangvila retiva* in the Talmud.

LANGUAGE

Ginger [zangvila] – זנגבילא – The origin of the plant's name is Indian. In Sanskrit the spice is called *singavera*, which became *zangvil* via the common interchange of the letters *lamed* and *reish*.

HALAKHA

Chewing pepper and ginger on Yom Kippur – כְּסִיקַת פְּלִפְלִי וְזַנְגְבִיל בְּיוֹם הַכִּפּוּרִים – זְנוּגְבִיל בְּיוֹם הַכִּפּוּרִים: One who chews pepper or dried ginger on Yom Kippur is exempt. If they are moist and suitable for eating, one is liable (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 612:8*).

Cooked ginger – הימלתא – One recites the blessing: Who creates the fruit of the ground, over ginger that is prepared for eating (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 203:6*).

Leaves of reeds and grapevine shoots – עֲלֵי קָנִים וְלוּלָבִי – קָנִים: One who eats reed leaves on Yom Kippur is exempt. One who eats grapevine shoots is exempt if they sprouted before Rosh HaShana; if they sprouted between Rosh HaShana and Yom Kippur he is liable (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 612:7*).

Vinegar on Yom Kippur – חוּמֵץ בְּיוֹם הַכִּפּוּרִים – One who drinks pure strong vinegar on Yom Kippur is exempt. The *Mishna Berura* explains that this is vinegar that bubbles when it falls to the ground. If it was mixed with water, one who drinks it is liable (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 612:9* and in the comment of the Rema).

אֶכֶל אוֹכְלִין שְׂאִין רְאוּיִן לְאֲכִילָהּ. אָמַר רַבָּא: כִּסּ פְּלִפְלִי בְּיוֹמָא דְכַפּוּרִי – פְּטוּר, כִּסּ זְנוּגְבִילָא בְּיוֹמָא דְכַפּוּרִי – פְּטוּר.

מִתִּיבִי: הִיא רַבִּי מֵאִיר אוֹמַר, מִמִּשְׁמַע שְׁנֵאמַר: 'וְעֵרְלָתֶם עֵרְלָתוֹ אֶת פְּרִי' אֵינִי יוֹדֵעַ שְׁעַץ מֵאֶכֶל הוּא? אֲלֵא מֵה תְּלַמֵּד לֹדֵר לֹדֵר – עֵץ מֵאֶכֶל – עֵץ שְׁטַעַם עֵצוֹ וּפְרִי שׁוֹה, הִיוּ אוֹמְרֵי – זֶה פְּלִפְלִין. לְלַמֵּד דְּכִּי שְׁהַפְּלִין חֵיבִין בְּעֵרְלָהּ. וְאֵין אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל חֲסָרָה כְּלוּם, שְׁנֵאמַר: 'לֹא תִחָסֵר כֹּל בָּהּ'.

לֹא קִשְׂיָא: הָא – בְּרִטְיבְתָא, וְהָא – בִּיבִישְׁתָא.

אָמַר לֵיהּ רַבִּינָא לְמַרְיָמָא, וְהָאמַר רַב נַחֲמָן: הָאֵי הֵימְלִתָּא דְאֵתִי מִבֵּי הַנְּדוּאֵי שְׂרִיא, וּמִבְּרִינֵן עֲלֵיהּ 'בּוֹרָא פְּרִי הָאֲדָמָה'! לֹא קִשְׂיָא: הָא – בְּרִטְיבְתָא, וְהָא בִּיבִישְׁתָא.

תְּנוּ רַבָּנֵן: אֶכֶל עֲלֵי קָנִים – פְּטוּר, לֹלָבִי גְפָנִים – חֵיב. אֵלּוּ הֵן לֹלָבִי גְפָנִים? אָמַר רַבִּי יִצְחָק מִגְדְּלָאָה: כָּל שְׁלֵבְלָבוּ מֵרֵאשִׁית הַשָּׁנָה וְעַד יוֹם הַכִּפּוּרִים. וְרַב כְּהֵנָּא אָמַר: כָּל שְׁלֵשִׁים יוֹם. תִּנְיָא בְּוִוְחִיָּה דְרַבִּי יִצְחָק מִגְדְּלָאָה: אֶכֶל עֲלֵי קָנִים – פְּטוּר, וְלוּלָבִי גְפָנִים – חֵיב. אֵלּוּ הֵן לֹלָבִי גְפָנִים – כָּל שְׁלֵבְלָבוּ מֵרֵאשִׁית הַשָּׁנָה וְעַד יוֹם הַכִּפּוּרִים.

'שְׂתָה צִיר אוּ מוֹרִיִּים פְּטוּר'. הָא חוּמֵץ – חֵיב. מִתְּנִינֵן מִנֵּי – רַבִּי הֵיא, דְּתִנְיָא, רַבִּי אוֹמַר: חוּמֵץ מִשִּׁיב אֶת הַפֶּשֶׁת.

It was taught in the mishna: If one ate food that is not fit for eating, he is exempt. Rava said: If one chews raw pepper^B on Yom Kippur, he is exempt, since this is not considered eating. Similarly, if one chews ginger [zangvila]^{B1} on Yom Kippur, he is exempt.^H

The Gemara raises an objection to this. Rabbi Meir would say about the verse: "And when you shall come into the land, and shall have planted all manner of trees for food, then you shall count the fruit of it as forbidden [orla]; three years it shall be forbidden to you, it shall not be eaten" (Leviticus 19:23). From the implication of what is stated: "Then you shall count the fruit of it as forbidden," do I not know that the verse is referring to "trees for food," since it uses the word "fruit"? Rather, what is the meaning when the verse states "trees for food"? It includes a tree whose wood and fruit taste the same, i.e., a tree that is itself eaten in addition to its fruit. One must say that this is referring to pepper^N that grows on a tree, to teach you that even pepper is subject to the halakha of orla. And this also teaches that Eretz Yisrael lacks nothing, as even pepper can grow there, as it is stated among the listed praises of Eretz Yisrael: "You will not lack anything in it" (Deuteronomy 8:9).

In any event, it has been derived that pepper is called food, which contradicts Rava's statement. The Gemara answers: This is not difficult. This statement about edible pepper is referring to bell pepper, which is moist; and that halakha pertaining to Yom Kippur is referring to black pepper, which is dry and is not considered food.

Ravina said to Mareimar: But didn't Rav Nahman say that it is permitted to eat this cooked ginger [himalta]^{BH} that comes from India, and there is no concern that gentiles may have cooked it. And we recite the blessing: Who creates the fruit of the ground, over it. Apparently, ginger is edible. The Gemara answers: This is not difficult: This statement is referring to wet ginger, which is considered food; and that earlier statement pertaining to Yom Kippur, which maintained that ginger is not food, is referring to dry ginger.

The Sages taught in a baraita: If one ate leaves of reeds on Yom Kippur, he is exempt, but if one ate grapevine shoots^{NH} he is liable. The Gemara clarifies: What are these grapevine shoots? Rabbi Yitzhak from the city of Migdal said: All shoots that sprouted between Rosh HaShana and Yom Kippur and are still very soft are considered food. And Rav Kahana said: All shoots that sprouted up to thirty days before Yom Kippur are considered food. The Gemara comments: It was taught in a baraita in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yitzhak from Migdal: If one ate leaves of reeds he is exempt, but if one ate grapevine shoots he is liable. What are these grapevine shoots? They are all those that sprouted between Rosh HaShana and Yom Kippur.

It was taught in the mishna that if on Yom Kippur one drank fish brine or the briny liquid in which fish are pickled, he is exempt. The Gemara comments: From the language of the mishna it may be inferred that if one drank vinegar, he is liable.^H Who is the tanna of the mishna? It is Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, as it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: Vinegar revives the spirit and is therefore considered a beverage.

NOTES

One must say that this is pepper – הִיוּ אוֹמְרֵי זֶה פְּלִפְלִין: Since the pepper vine is a small plant that does not look like a tree, one might have thought it was a type of vegetable, to which the halakhot of orla do not apply (Rashi on tractate Sukka).

Grapevine shoots, etc. – לֹלָבִי גְפָנִים וכו': The Talmud does not

deal with items that people do not eat at all and are in no way considered human food. Rather, the discussion is about items that are not considered substantial and that people eat from time to time but not on a regular basis. The Gemara questions whether or not one who ingests these foods is considered to be eating food subject to the usual prohibitions, e.g., those of Yom Kippur.

דרש רב גידל בר מנשה מבירי דנרש: אין הלכה פרהי. לשנה נפקי כולי עלמא, מזוגו ושתו חלא, שמע רב גידל ואיקפד, אמר: אימר דאמרי אנא דיעבד, לכתחלה מי אמרי? אימר דאמרי אנא פורתא, טובא מי אמרי? אימר דאמרי אנא חי, מזוג מי אמרי?!

The Gemara relates: Rav Giddel bar Menashe from the town of Birei DeNeresh taught in a public lecture that the *halakha* is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda Ha-Nasi, and vinegar is not considered a beverage. The next year everyone went out and mixed vinegar with water and drank vinegar on Yom Kippur. Rav Giddel heard this and became angry with them for their actions. He said: Say that I said one is not liable for drinking vinegar only after the fact; however, did I say it is permitted to drink it *ab initio*? Furthermore: Say that I said my statement with regard to one who drinks a little, but did I say it is permitted to drink a lot? Furthermore: Say that I said my statement in reference to pure vinegar, which is very strong, but did I say anything about diluted vinegar? That is certainly prohibited.

Perek VIII

Daf 82 Amud a

NOTES

Training children – חינוך התינוקות: There are many versions of this text, as there are many halakhic opinions on this matter. The author of the *Mishne LeMelekh* cites four approaches. First, according to the Rambam, who claims that the Rif agrees with him, training begins at ages nine and ten. By rabbinic law, the fast must be completed at age eleven, with no distinction between girls and boys. By Torah law, thirteen-year-old boys and twelve-year-old girls fast the entire day. Second, according to *Ba'al Halakhot Gedolot*, the Ran, and others, there is no rabbinic requirement for children to complete the fast. Rather, children are trained to fast for several hours until they reach maturity. A third approach states that there is a rabbinic law that girls must complete the fast when they are eleven years old, but there is no rabbinic law that boys must complete the fast. The fourth view is that of the Ra'avad. He maintains that there is a rabbinic law that requires boys of twelve years old and girls of eleven years old to complete the fast. The Rosh basically agrees with the Ra'avad's opinion but argues for different lengths of partial fasts at different ages.

HALAKHA

Training children to fast – חינוך קטנים לצום: Healthy nine-year-olds and feeble ten-year-olds, whether male or female, are trained to fast for several hours. If they are accustomed to eat at a certain hour, they are fed a bit later, according to their strength and need. Eleven-year-olds, both boys and girls, complete the fast by rabbinic law. Some authorities say that there is no rabbinic law that children must complete the fast at all (*Ba'al Halakhot Gedolot*; Ran; *Or Zarua*), and such an opinion may be relied upon in the case of a weak child who cannot fast (Rema). A girl from her twelfth birthday and a boy from his thirteenth birthday who have physical signs of puberty are considered adults and complete the fast by Torah law. If they lack the physical signs of puberty, they complete the fast by rabbinic law. Children younger than nine years old may not fast, even if the child himself wishes to be stringent (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 61:2* and in the comment of the Rema).

מתני' התינוקות אין מענין אותן ביום הכפורים, אבל מחנכין אותן לפני שנה ולפני שנתים, בשביל שיהיו רגילין במצות.

MISHNA With regard to the children, one does not afflict them by withholding food on Yom Kippur; however, one trains them one year before or two years before they reach majority, by means of a partial fast lasting several hours, so that they will be accustomed to fulfill mitzvot.^{NH}

גמ' השתא בפני שתים מחנכין להו, בפני שנה מפעיא?! אמר רב חסדא: לא קשיא; הא – בחולה, הא – בבריא.

GEMARA The Gemara asks about the wording of the mishna: Since it is stated that one trains children two years before their maturity, is it necessary to say that one trains them one year before? This expression in the mishna is superfluous. Rav Hisda said: This is not difficult. This statement that one trains children one year before their maturity is referring to a feeble child; that statement that one trains children two years before their maturity is referring to a healthy child.

אמר רב הונא: בן שמונה ובן תשע מחנכין אותו לשעות, בן עשר ובן אחת עשרה משלימין מדרבנן. בן שתים עשרה משלימין מדאורייתא בתינוקות. ורב נחמן אמר: בן תשע בן עשר מחנכין אותן לשעות, בן אחת עשרה בן שתים עשרה – משלימין מדרבנן. בן שלש עשרה משלימין מדאורייתא בתינוק. ורבי יוחנן אמר: השלמה דרבנן ליבא, בן עשר בן אחת עשרה – מחנכין אותו לשעות, בן שתים עשרה – משלימין מדאורייתא.

Rav Huna said: One trains a healthy child of eight years and nine years to fast for several hours; at ten years and eleven years, they complete the fast by rabbinic law; at twelve years they complete the fast by Torah law. This applies to girls who reach maturity and become obligated in mitzvot at age twelve. And Rav Nahman said: At nine years and ten years one trains them to fast for several hours; at eleven and twelve years they complete the fast by rabbinic law; at thirteen years they complete the fast by Torah law. This applies to boys. And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: There is no obligation with regard to children completing the fast by rabbinic law. Rather, at ten and eleven years, one trains them to fast for several hours; and at twelve years girls are obligated to complete their fast by Torah law.

תנן: התינוקות אין מענין אותן ביום הכפורים, אבל מחנכין אותן לפני שנה ולפני שתים, בשלמא לרב הונא ורב נחמן – לפני שנה ולפני שתים, לפני שנה לדבריהן ולפני שתים לדבריהן.

S We learned in the mishna: With regard to the children, one does not afflict them by withholding food on Yom Kippur; however, one trains them for one year before or two years before they reach maturity. Granted, this makes sense according to the opinion of Rav Huna and Rav Nahman, who hold that for one or two years before reaching maturity there is a rabbinic law requiring children to complete the fast. The mishna that states one year before or two years before should be understood as follows: A feeble child is obligated to complete the fast on Yom Kippur in the year before reaching maturity by rabbinic law, and a healthy child is obligated to complete the fast on Yom Kippur in the two years before reaching maturity by rabbinic law (Vilna Gaon).