

דרש רב גידל בר מנשה מבירי דנרש: אין הלכה כרבי. לשנה נפקי כולי עלמא. מוגו ושתו חלא. שמע רב גידל ואיקפד, אמר: אימר דאמרי אנא דיעבד, לכתחלה מי אמרי? אימר דאמרי אנא פורתא, טובא 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 LeMelech* 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 שנתיים, 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 Yohanan 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).

אֵלָּא לְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן קְשִׁיָּא! אָמַר לְךָ רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: מֵאֵי שָׁנָה אוֹ שְׁתַּיִם – סְמוּךְ לְפִירְקָן.

But according to Rabbi Yoḥanan, who holds that there is no rabbinic law to complete the fast, this is **difficult**. In his opinion, what is the difference between one year before and two years before? Rabbi Yoḥanan could have said to you: What is the meaning of one year or two years? One year is referring not to the year before the year preceding their maturity, i.e. the two years preceding it, but actually to the year preceding their maturity. The phrase: One or two years, indicates that there is a difference between those who are required for one year and those who required for two, which depends on their health: The healthy child is required to fast two years, but one year is sufficient for a feeble child.

תָּא שְׁמַע, דְּתַנִּי רַבָּה בַּר שְׁמוּאֵל: תִּינוּקוֹת אֵינָן מְעַנִּין אוֹתָן בְּיוֹם הַכַּפּוּרִים, אֲבָל מְחַנְבִּין אוֹתָן שָׁנָה אוֹ שְׁתַּיִם סְמוּךְ לְפִירְקָן. בְּשִׁלְמָא לְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן – נִחָא, אֵלָּא לְרַב הוּנָא וְלְרַב נַחְמָן – קְשִׁיָּא! אָמַר לְךָ רַבְנָן: מֵאֵי חִינּוּךְ נִמִּי דְקַתְנִי – הַשְּׁלֵמָה.

Come and hear that which Rabba bar Shmuel taught in a *baraita*: With regard to children, one does not afflict them by withholding food on Yom Kippur; however, one trains them one year for a feeble child or two years for a healthy child preceding their maturity. Granted, according to the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan, this works out well; but according to Rav Huna and Rav Nahman, who say that there is an additional year that one is required to complete the fast according to rabbinic law, this is **difficult**. The Rabbis could say to you: What is this training that is also taught there? It is referring to fasting a complete day, which is required by rabbinic law. By rabbinic law, the time of completing the fast for a healthy child is two years before he reaches maturity.

וּמִי קָרִי לְחִינּוּךְ הַשְּׁלֵמָה? וְהָאֵי תַנָּא: אֵי זֶה חִינּוּךְ? הֲיֵהָ רִגִּיל לְאָכּוֹל בְּשִׁתֵּי שָׁעוֹת – מֵאֲכִילִין אוֹתוֹ לְשִׁלְשׁ, בְּשִׁלְשׁ – מֵאֲכִילִין אוֹתוֹ בְּאַרְבַּע! אָמַר רַבָּא בַּר עוּלָא: תַּרְי חִנּוּכֵי הוּוּ.

The Gemara asks: And is training called completion? Doesn't training mean that the child performs only part of the mitzva? Wasn't it taught explicitly in a *baraita*: What is training? If the child was accustomed to eat every day at the second hour of the day, one feeds him at the third hour, so he will begin to understand the concept of affliction. If he was accustomed to eat at the third hour, one feeds him at the fourth hour. Rava bar Ulla said: This is not difficult; these are two different types of training. There is training of small children to wait slightly longer before eating, and training of older children, in which one habituates them to fasting a full day.

מֵתַנִּי עוֹבְרָה שְׁהִיחָה – מֵאֲכִילִין אוֹתָהּ עַד שֶׁתִּשָּׁבַע נֶפְשָׁהּ. חוּלָה מֵאֲכִילִין אוֹתוֹ עַל פִּי בְקִיָּאִין, וְאִם אֵין שָׁם בְקִיָּאִין – מֵאֲכִילִין אוֹתוֹ עַל פִּי עֲצָמוֹ, עַד שֶׁיֵּאמַר דִּי.

MISHNA With regard to a pregnant woman who smelled food^{NH} and was overcome by a craving to eat it, one feeds her until she recovers, as failure to do so could lead to a life-threatening situation. If a person is ill and requires food due to potential danger, one feeds him according to the advice of medical experts who determine that he indeed requires food. And if there are no experts there, one feeds him according to his own instructions, until he says that he has eaten enough and needs no more.

גַּמְ' תַּנּוּ רַבְנָן: עוֹבְרָה שְׁהִיחָה בְּשַׂר קוֹדֵשׁ אוֹ בְּשַׂר חֲזוּר – תּוֹחֲבִין לָהּ כּוּשׁ בְּרוֹטְבָּ, וּמִנְחִין לָהּ עַל פִּיהָ. אִם נִתְּנִי שְׂבִיבָה דְעֵתָהּ – מוּטָב, וְאִם לֹא – מֵאֲכִילִין אוֹתָהּ רוֹטְבָּ עֲצָמָה, וְאִם נִתְּנִי שְׂבִיבָה דְעֵתָהּ – מוּטָב, וְאִם לֹא – מֵאֲכִילִין אוֹתָהּ שׁוּמָן עֲצָמוֹ, שְׂאִין לְךָ דְבַר שְׁעוּמָד בְּכַפְנֵי פְקוּחַ נֶפֶשׁ חוּץ מֵעֲבֻדָּה זָרָה וְגִילּוֹי עֲרִיוֹת וּשְׂפִיכוֹת דְּמִים.

GEMARA The Sages taught in a *baraita*: With regard to a pregnant woman who smelled consecrated meat^N or pig meat and craved those specific foods, one inserts a thin reed⁸ into the juice of that item and places it on her mouth. If her mind become settled with that, it is well. And if not, one feeds her the gravy itself of that forbidden food. If her mind becomes settled with that, it is well. And if not, one feeds her the fat of the forbidden food itself, as there is no *halakha* that stands in the way of saving a life^{NH} except for the prohibitions against idol worship, and forbidden sexual relationships, and bloodshed.

עֲבֻדָּה זָרָה מְנַלֵּן? דְּתַנָּא, רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר אוֹמֵר: אִם נֶאֱמַר "בְּכָל נֶפְשְׁךָ" לְמָה נֶאֱמַר "בְּכָל מַאֲדָךְ"? וְאִם נֶאֱמַר "בְּכָל מַאֲדָךְ" לְמָה נֶאֱמַר "בְּכָל נֶפְשְׁךָ"?

The Gemara clarifies: With regard to the *halakha* that the prohibition against idol worship takes precedence over saving one's life, from where do we derive this? As it was taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Eliezer says: If it is stated: "And you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul" (Deuteronomy 6:5), why is it stated in the continuation of the verse: "And with all your might" (Deuteronomy 6:5)? And if it is stated: "With all your might," why is it stated: "With all your soul"? One of these statements appears to be superfluous.

NOTES

עוֹבְרָה שְׁהִיחָה – עוֹבְרָה שְׁהִיחָה בְּשַׂר קוֹדֵשׁ: This *halakha* is not limited to pregnant women, but it is more typical for pregnant women to have specific cravings. In these situations, the woman may be in danger if her desires are not satisfied. According to the *Ba'al Halakhot Gedolot*, the concern is mainly with regard to the health of the fetus, whereas according to the Ramban, the chief concern is the well-being of the mother (see Rosh and Ran; Rav Shmuel Strashun).

A pregnant woman who smelled consecrated meat – עוֹבְרָה שְׁהִיחָה בְּשַׂר קוֹדֵשׁ: Here the ruling is not that one should whisper to her that the desired food is forbidden, as mentioned in the Halakha note. Permission is not granted to transgress this prohibition, and therefore there is no reason to whisper (*Mikhtam*; see *Pithei She'arim*, who cites *Eshel Avraham* and *Levush*).

There is no *halakha* that stands in the way of saving a life – אֵין לְךָ דְבַר שְׁעוּמָד בְּכַפְנֵי פְקוּחַ נֶפֶשׁ: There is a long debate in the Talmud on the source of this important principle (see *daf* 85a).

HALAKHA

עוֹבְרָה שְׁהִיחָה – עוֹבְרָה שְׁהִיחָה: If a pregnant woman smells food and her face shows her craving for it, even if she does not explicitly state that she wants the food, one whispers to her that it is Yom Kippur. If she is placated by this reminder, nothing further need be done; if not, she is fed until she is content. In terms of quantity of food, a pregnant woman is fed bit by bit until she is satisfied. An ill person is fed whatever amount is necessary, according to doctor's orders (*Mishna Berura*). Similarly, if any other person smells food and his face shows a craving for it, he is fed a bit until he is relieved (*Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim* 617:2–3).

פְקוּחַ נֶפֶשׁ – Saving a life: If a gentile tells one that he must transgress a *halakha* in private or be killed, he must transgress the *halakha*. This is the case for all prohibitions in the Torah except idol worship, forbidden sexual relations, and bloodshed. For these three transgressions, one is obligated to forfeit his life even if he is in private and even if the threat does not come during a time of religious persecution. This is the ruling even if he would be performing the acts only for the pleasure of the gentile, whose motive is not the transgression of mitzvot (*Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 157:1).

BACKGROUND

Thin reed – כּוּשׁ: This is referring to a long, thin stick that was also used as a spindle in ancient times. By dipping it in food, one could provide the woman with some flavor without her actually consuming much food.



Ancient spindle

NOTES

Whose property is more beloved to him than his body – שְׂמֹמֹנוּ חֲבִיב עָלָיו מְגוּפוֹ: One approach to this Gemara highlights the difference between people in varying stages of their lives. A young person is able to work, so his body is dearer to him than his money. On the other hand, a weak, elderly weak man will be left hungry and wanting if his money is taken from him, so his money is dearer to him than his body (*Tosefet Yom HaKippurim*).

Forfeiting one's life rather than engaging in forbidden sexual relations – מִקְסוּרוֹת נֶפֶשׁ בְּגִילוי עֲרִוּוֹת: See Rashi and *Tosafot*, who deal with this issue extensively. Many medieval commentaries suggest that a situation may arise in which a deathly ill person can be cured only by having forbidden relations. Such an individual must choose to die (*ge'onim; Tosefet Rid*).

HALAKHA

May be saved at the cost of his life – נִתֵּן לְהַצִּילוֹ בְּנֶפֶשׁוֹ: If someone is chasing another person in order to kill him, all efforts must be made to save the victim, even at the cost of killing the attacker. Similarly, if someone is chasing a betrothed woman to rape her, she must be saved, even at the cost of the attacker's life (Rambam *Sefer Nezikim, Hilkhot Rotze'ah UShmirat HaNefesh* 1:6–10).

אִם יֵשׁ לְךָ אָדָם שְׂגוּפוֹ חֲבִיב עָלָיו מִמְמוֹנוֹ – לְכֶךָ נֹאמַר "בְּכָל נֶפֶשׁוֹ", וְאִם יֵשׁ לְךָ אָדָם שְׂמֹמֹנוּ חֲבִיב עָלָיו מְגוּפוֹ: לְכֶךָ נֹאמַר "וּבְכָל מְאֹדְךָ".

גִּילוי עֲרִוּוֹת וְשִׁפְכַת דַּמִּים מִנָּא לֵךְ? דִּתְנֵינָא, רַבִּי אֹמְרִי: "כִּי כַּאֲשֶׁר יִקּוּם אִישׁ עַל רֵעֵהוּ וּרְצָחוֹ נֶפֶשׁ בֶּן הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה" וְכִי מָה עֲנִין לְמַדְנוּ מִרוֹצֵחַ לְנַעֲרָה הַמְּאוֹרְסָה?

אֵלָּא, הֲרֵי זֶה בָּא לְלַמֵּד וְנִמְצָא לְמַד: מִה נֶעֱרָה הַמְּאוֹרְסָה נִתֵּן לְהַצִּילָהּ בְּנֶפֶשׁוֹ – אֶף רוֹצֵחַ (כּוֹ). מָה רוֹצֵחַ יִהְרַג וְאֵל יַעֲבוֹר – אֶף נַעֲרָה הַמְּאוֹרְסָה – יִהְרַג וְאֵל יַעֲבוֹר.

Rather, it is to teach that if there is a person whose body is more beloved to him than his property, therefore it is stated: "With all your soul." The verse teaches that one must be willing to sacrifice his life to sanctify God's name. And if there is a person whose property is more beloved to him than his body,^N therefore it is stated: "With all your might." Rabbi Eliezer understands the phrase "with all your might" to mean: With all your possessions. Therefore, one must be prepared to forfeit his life rather than be saved through idol worship.

With regard to the concept that one must surrender his life rather than have forbidden sexual relations or shed blood through murder, from where do we derive this? As it was taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: It is stated about the rape of a betrothed woman: "For as when a man rises against his fellow and slays him, even so is this matter" (Deuteronomy 22:26). One might ask: What idea did we learn about a betrothed woman from a murderer? The *halakha* of a betrothed woman is clear; what new point is learned by comparing it to the *halakha* of a murderer?

Rather, this *halakha* about the murderer, which appears to come to teach about the betrothed woman, is found to actually be the subject of teaching. The inference is as follows: Just as with regard to the betrothed woman, permission is given to save her at the cost of the life of her attacker, so too, the murderer may be saved from committing the crime at the cost of his life,^H i.e., one may save the victim by killing the attacker. Another teaching is derived in the opposite direction, from the case of murder to the case of rape. Just as the murderer is subject to the *halakha* of let him be killed, and let him not transgress, i.e., one must even allow himself to be killed rather than take the life of another, so too, a man must surrender his life rather than engage in forbidden sexual relations with a betrothed young woman. By inference, the *halakha* of let him be killed, and let him not transgress, applies to all forbidden sexual relations.^N

Perek VIII
Daf 82 Amud b

NOTES

What did you see to make you think your blood is redder – מַאי חֲזִית דְּדָמָא דִּידְךָ סוּמְקָ טַפִּי: There are two explanations for this *halakha*. First, one life does not supersede another. Second, the only reason to transgress a mitzva is to save a life, and since here no life is saved, no permission is granted to perform a prohibited act and kill. The reasoning of: What did you see, applies even to a group. If, for example, gentiles say to a group of Jews: Surrender one person to be killed, and if not we will kill you all, the group must all submit to death rather than surrender a single individual. In that case, they cannot know if that person's worth is equal to the whole group, and so they cannot make a calculation based solely on numbers (*Tosefet Yom HaKippurim*).

וְרוֹצֵחַ גּוֹפִיָּה מִנָּא לֵךְ? סְבָרָא הִיא. דִּהֲהוּא דֹּאֲתָא לְקַמֵּיהּ (דְּרַבָּא), אָמַר לֵיה: אָמַר לִי מְרִי דּוֹרָא: קְטִלֵיהּ לְפָלְגֵינָא, וְאִי לֹא קְטִילְנָא לְךָ. אָמַר לֵיה: נְקַטְלְךָ וְלֹא תִקְטוּל. מַאי חֲזִית דְּדָמָא דִּידְךָ סוּמְקָ טַפִּי? דִּילְמָא דְּמָא דִּהֲהוּא גְּבָרָא סוּמְקָ טַפִּי.

The Gemara asks: And with regard to the murderer himself, from where do we derive this *halakha* that he should be killed rather than transgress the prohibition against murder? The Gemara answers: It is derived through reason, as it was told: A certain person came before Rava. He said to Rava: The master of the village where I live said to me: Kill so-and-so, and if you do not do so, I will kill you. What should I do? Rava said to him: Let yourself be killed, and you should not kill. Rava reasoned: What did you see to make you think that your blood is redder^N and more important than his? Perhaps the blood of that man is redder, and he is more important than you. If so, it is logical that one must not kill another person to save himself.^H

HALAKHA

Let him be killed and let him not transgress – יִהְרַג וְאֵל יַעֲבוֹר: From where is it derived that it is prohibited to violate the three prohibitions of idol worship, murder, and forbidden sexual relations, even to save one's life? It is written: "And you shall love the Lord your God...with all your life" (Deuteronomy 6:5). This means: Even if He takes your life. With regard to murder, this is based on logical reasoning: One may not destroy one life for the sake of another life. The *halakha* pertaining to forbidden sexual relations is derived through the connection in the Torah between forbidden sexual relations and murder (Rambam *Sefer HaMadda, Hilkhot Yesodei HaTorah* 5:7).

Whisper to her – לְחַשּׁוּ לָהּ: Some commentaries explain that this whispering is to the fetus (see Rashi). However, the main idea here seems to be that sometimes, by whispering to the woman that it is Yom Kippur and that she will be able to eat afterward, she will be able to endure until after the fast. The author of the *Meiri* writes that one should even promise her that if she does not eat, her child will have reverence of God as described in stories in the Gemara.

Before I formed you – בְּטַרְם אֶצְרְךָ: *Tosefet Yom HaKippurim* writes that the main point of the verse is the last clause: "And before you came forth out of the womb I sanctified you," indicating that in his mother's womb he was already sacred, since he fasted on Yom Kippur. A similar story is related in the Jerusalem Talmud, in which the following verse is cited: "From my mother's womb, You are my God" (Psalms 22:11; see *Sifah Yitzhak*).

הָיְתָא עוֹבְרָה דְאַרְחָא, אֲתוּ לְקַמְיָה דְרַבִּי אֲמַר לָהּ: זִילוּ לְחַשּׁוּ לָהּ דְיוֹמָא דְכִיפּוּרֵי הוּא. לְחַשּׁוּ לָהּ וְאִלְחִישָׂא. קָרִי עֲלֵיהּ "בְּטַרְם אֶצְרְךָ בְּבֶטֶן יְדַעְתִּיךָ" וְגו'. נִפְקַ מִינָה רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן.

§ With respect to a pregnant woman who smells food, it is told: **A certain pregnant woman smelled a food and craved it.** Those involved **came before Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi** to ask how to proceed. **He said to those who were inquiring: Go and whisper to herⁿ that today is Yom Kippur. They whispered to her, and this whispering helped;** she stopped craving the food. **Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi read this verse about the baby she was carrying: "Before I formed youⁿ in the belly I knew you, and before you came forth out of the womb I sanctified you" (Jeremiah 1:5), and indeed, the baby who came out of that woman was Rabbi Yoḥanan.**

הָיְתָא עוֹבְרָה דְאַרְחָא, אֲתוּ לְקַמְיָה דְרַבִּי חֲנִינָא. אֲמַר לָהּ: לְחַשּׁוּ לָהּ, וְלֹא אִלְחִישָׂא. קָרִי עֲלֵיהּ:

The Gemara relates another story: **A certain pregnant woman smelled food and had a craving to eat it on Yom Kippur.** Those involved **came before Rabbi Ḥanina** to ask how to proceed. **He said to them: Whisper to her that today is Yom Kippur.** They whispered to her, but **she did not accept the whisper** and continued to crave the food. **Rabbi Ḥanina read this verse about the baby:**

Perek VIII

Daf 83 Amud a

זִזְרוּ רְשָׁעִים מִרְחֹם, נִפְקַ מִינָה שְׁבֵטַי אֶצֶר פִּירֵי.

"**The wicked are estranged from the womb**" (Psalms 58:4), i.e., it is clear they are estranged already in their mother's womb. Indeed, **Shabbetai the hoarder of fruits came out of her.** He hoarded fruit during years of famine in order to inflate its price and profit at the expense of poor people.

חֹלְהָ מְאֻכְלִין אוֹתוֹ עַל פִּי בְקִיאִין. אֲמַר רַבִּי יַנָּאי: חֹלְהָ אוֹמֵר "צָרִיךְ", וְרֹפֵא אוֹמֵר "אֵינוֹ צָרִיךְ" – שׁוֹמְעִין לְחֹלְהָ, מֵאֵי טַעְמָא – לֵב יוֹדֵעַ מֵרַת נִפְשׁוֹ. פְּשִׁיטָא! מַהוּ דְתִימָא: רֹפֵא קִים לִיה טַפְּי, קָא מְשַׁמַּע לָן.

§ It was taught in the mishna: If a person is ill and requires food due to potential danger, **one feeds him according to the advice of medical experts.** **Rabbi Yannai said: If an ill person says he needs to eat,^h and a doctor says he does not need to eat, one listens to the ill person.** What is the reason for this *halakha*? It is because the verse states: "**The heart knows the bitterness of its soul**" (Proverbs 14:10), meaning an ill person knows the intensity of his pain and weakness, and doctors cannot say otherwise. The Gemara asks: It is **obvious** that a person knows himself better than anyone else does. Why does this need to be stated explicitly? The Gemara answers: It is **lest you say that the doctor is more certain** because he has had more experience with this condition. Therefore, the verse **teaches us** that even so, it is the ill person who knows his own suffering better than anyone else.

רֹפֵא אוֹמֵר "צָרִיךְ" וְחֹלְהָ אוֹמֵר "אֵינוֹ צָרִיךְ" – שׁוֹמְעִין לְרֹפֵא. מֵאֵי טַעְמָא – תוֹנְבָא הוּא דְנִקְיֵי לִיה.

However, in the opposite case, if a **doctor says that the ill person needs food, but the ill person himself says he does not^h need to eat, one listens to the doctor.** What is the reason for this *halakha*? It is because **confusion [tunba]^l has taken hold** of the ill person on account of his illness, and his judgment is impaired. Consequently, he himself does not know how much he needs food.

תַּנְן: חֹלְהָ מְאֻכְלִין אוֹתוֹ עַל פִּי בְקִיאִין. עַל פִּי בְקִיאִין – אֵין, עַל פִּי עֲצָמוֹ – לֹא. עַל פִּי בְקִיאִין – אֵין, עַל פִּי בְקִי אַחַד – לֹא!

§ We learned in the mishna: If a person is ill, **one feeds him according to the advice of medical experts.** This implies that if there are experts present, then **according to the advice of experts, yes, one feeds the ill person;** but **at his own instructions, no, one does not feed him,** contrary to Rabbi Yannai's opinion. It further implies that **according to the advice of several experts, yes, one feeds an ill person;** however, **according to the advice of only one expert, no, one does not feed him.** There appears to be a requirement for at least two doctors, which also contradicts Rabbi Yannai's opinion that the opinion of one expert is sufficient to override the opinion of the ill person.

HALAKHA

An ill person says he needs to eat – חֹלְהָ אוֹמֵר צָרִיךְ: If an ill person says he needs to eat, he may be fed, even if doctors say it is not necessary (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim* 618:1).

A doctor says the ill person needs food but the ill person himself says he does not – רֹפֵא אוֹמֵר צָרִיךְ וְחֹלְהָ אוֹמֵר אֵינוֹ צָרִיךְ: If an ill person needs food on Yom Kippur, and an expert doctor, whether Jewish or gentile, says that if he is not fed his sickness will worsen and endanger him, he is fed, even if he denies needing food (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim* 618:1).

LANGUAGE

Confusion [*tunba*] – תוֹנְבָא: The origin of this word is Syriac, and it means a confusion of one's senses. This confusion is likely to come as a result of illness, whereupon the ill person is likely to lose sensitivity to many things, among them his sense of hunger.