

14 Tammuz 5781
June 24, 2021



Yoma Daf 74

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

MISHNAH: On Yom Kippur it is forbidden in eating, in drinking, in washing, in anointing oneself, in wearing shoes or in cohabitation. A king or bride may wash the face, and a woman after childbirth may wear shoes. This is the view of Rabbi Eliezer. The Sages, however, forbid it. If one eats the equivalent of a large date, i.e., the equivalent of it with its pit included, or if he drank a mouthful, he is culpable. Any foods complement one another in making up the equivalent of a date, and all the liquids complement one another in making up a mouthful, but what a man eats and drinks does not go together. (73b4)

GEMARA: [Merely] forbidden? But surely punished with kares? — Rabbi Ila, or as some say, Rabbi Yirmiyah, said: This refers only to “half a measure.” That will be right according to the view that even “half a measure” is forbidden by the law of the Torah, but what can be said according to the view that “half a measure” is permitted by the law of the Torah? For it was said: As for “half a measure,” Rabbi Yochanan holds it forbidden by the law of the Torah, but Rish Lakish considers it permitted by the law of the Torah. Now [the above answer] would be right according to Rabbi Yochanan, but what can be said according to Rish Lakish? — Rish Lakish would agree that [“half a measure”] is forbidden by [decree of] the Rabbis. If that be the case, one should not be liable on its account to offer a sacrifice for an oath, why then did we learn: If

one had sworn an oath not to eat, and then he ate neveilah, tereifah things, abominable or creeping things, he is culpable? Rabbi Shimon holds him not culpable. And we raised the point in connection with that: Why should he be culpable? Surely he stands committed to the oath from Mount Sinai on! [And] Rav, Shmuel and Rabbi Yochanan [in reply] said [it is a case] when he includes things permitted in the oath along with foods which are forbidden, whereas Rish Lakish said: This cannot be explained except where he either expressly refers to “half a measure,” and that in accord with the view of the Sages,¹ or that he made a general statement and in accord with Rabbi Akiva, who said that a man may prohibit to himself anything in any quantity, however small. And if you would say that since it is permitted by the Torah, [the law relating to the] sacrifice for an oath is operative, surely we learned: An ‘oath of testimony’ applies only to those qualified to bear witness; and we raised the point: what does that mean to exclude, whereupon Rav Pappa said: This excludes a king, and Rav Acha bar Yaakov said: This excludes a professional dice-gambler. Now a dice-player, as far as Biblical law is concerned, is qualified to bear witness and only the Rabbis declared him unfit, and yet an oath does not apply to him? There it is different, for Scripture said: If he do not utter it, and this man cannot make a [valid] utterance. Now would you say that wherever the punishment is kares the term ‘forbidden’ is not used? Surely it was taught: Although the term

¹ The Sages hold that an oath ‘I will not eat a certain thing’ implies ‘I will not eat as much as the legal minimum’, hence he could be guilty in the case of having eaten less than that only if he had expressly stated: I shall not eat anything at all of that

food, his special declaration investing his oath with validity in the case of an infinitesimal amount of the food now forbidden to himself.

‘forbidden’ was used in connection with all of them, the punishment of kares applies only to he who eats or drinks, or engages in labor? — This is what is said: When the term ‘forbidden’ is used, it is applied but to less than the legal minimum, but where the legal minimum has been transgressed the punishment involved is kares; and also kares is the penalty, that is the case only with him who eats or drinks or engages in labor. Or, if you like, say: When [the Mishnah] uses the term ‘forbidden’, it refers to the rest [of the transgressions], for Rabbah and Rav Yosef taught in the other books of the School of Rav: From where do we know that it is forbidden on Yom Kippur to anoint oneself, to wash, to put on shoes, and to cohabit? Therefore, the text reads: Shabbason, which implies that one must rest [from engaging in all these other pleasurable activities on that day]. (73b4 – 74a2)

[To turn to] the main text: As for the matter of “half a measure,” Rabbi Yochanan said: It is forbidden by Biblical law, while Rish Lakish said: It is permitted by Biblical law. Rabbi Yochanan said, It is forbidden by Biblical law; since it could be joined [to form a minimum] it is forbidden food that he is eating. Rish Lakish said: It is permitted by Biblical law, for the Divine Law speaks of eating and this is not [eating]. — Rabbi Yochanan raised the following objection against Rish Lakish: I know only that whatever involves punishment is subject to a prohibition; but in the case of the koy,² and “half a measure,” since they do not involve punishment, I might say that they are not subject to a prohibition either, therefore the text reads: Any cheilev. — This is only Rabbinical and the text [adduced] is but a mere support. And that is also logical. For if one should assume that the prohibition is Biblical, surely [the status of] the koy is doubtful and no Scriptural text is necessary to cover a doubtful case! — Were it only for this there would be no argument, they would hold the koy is a creature by itself. For if you were not to say so, how could

² A kind of bearded deer or antelope. It is left undecided as to whether it belongs to the genus of cattle, the tallow of which is

Rav Idi bar Avin say: ‘Also all’ includes the koy, since the koy is a doubtful case and surely no Scriptural text is necessary to cover doubtful cases. Hence [what you must say is] a ‘creature by itself’ is a different case, thus also here [say] ‘a creature by itself’ is a different case. (74a2 – 74b1)

Our Rabbis taught: You shall afflict your souls. One might assume that one must sit in heat or cold in order to afflict oneself, therefore the text reads: And you shall do no manner of work; just as the [prohibition of] labor [means]: sit and do nothing, so does [the enjoyment of] affliction [signify]: sit and do nothing. But say perhaps: If one sits in the sun and is warm, one may not say to him: rise and sit in the shade; or, when he sits in the shade and is cool, one may not tell him: rise and sit in the sun? — It is as with labor: Just as you have made no distinction with regard to labor, so in connection with the [prescribed] affliction is no distinction to be made.

Another [Baraisa] taught: ‘You shall afflict your souls’. One might assume that one must sit in heat or cold to afflict oneself, therefore Scripture said: ‘And you shall do no manner of work’. Just as in connection with work [the reference is to] something for which one may become culpable also in another connection, so with affliction it is to something for which one might become culpable in another connection, and what is that? This is piggul or nossar. I shall then include only piggul or nossar, because the penalty there is kares but not include tevel, since the penalty involved therein is not kares, therefore the text reads: ‘You shall afflict’, ‘and you shall afflict your souls’, which is inclusive. I might then include tevel, the punishment in connection with which is death, but not include neveilah, the penalty for eating which is not death, therefore the text reads: ‘You shall afflict’, ‘and you shall afflict your souls’, which is inclusive. I might then include

forbidden, or to beasts of chase, the tallow of which is permitted.

the [eating of] neveilah, which involves a [transgression of a] prohibition, but not non-consecrated food, [the eating of] which is not prohibited at all, therefore Scripture said: 'You shall afflict', 'and you shall afflict your souls', which is inclusive. I might then include non-consecrated food, the eating of which is not commanded, but exclude terumah, the eating of which is commanded, therefore Scripture said: 'You shall afflict', 'and you shall afflict your souls', which is inclusive. I might then include terumah, which is not subject to the law concerning nossar, but exclude holy sacrifices, in connection with which the law concerning nossar applies, therefore the text reads: 'You shall afflict', 'and you shall afflict your souls', which is inclusive. And if you should have any remark [in objection to this], [I can reply], Behold Scripture said: And I will destroy that soul, i.e., an affliction which causes a destruction of life, and what is that but [the denial of] eating and drinking? What is [meant by]: And if you should have any remark [in objection to this]? — One might have said Scripture speaks here of cohabitation, therefore the text reads: 'And I will destroy that soul', i.e., an affliction which causes the destruction of life, and that is [the abstention from] eating and drinking. (74b1 – 74b3)

The School of Rabbi Yishmael taught: Here the phrase 'affliction' is used, and there the term 'affliction' is used; just as there an affliction through hunger is meant, so is here an affliction through hunger meant. But let us infer from: 'If you shall afflict my daughters'? — One should infer concerning the affliction of a community from another affliction of a community, but not for the affliction of a community from the affliction of an individual. But let us infer it from the 'affliction' in Egypt, as it is said: And [Hashem] saw our affliction, and in connection with which we said: This is the enforced abstinence from cohabitation? — Rather [answer thus]: One infers for a heavenly affliction from another heavenly affliction, but one should not infer concerning a heavenly affliction from an affliction through human beings. (74b3)

Who fed you in the wilderness with manna . . . that He might afflict you. Rabbi Ammi and Rabbi Assi [are disputing], one said, You cannot compare one who has bread in his basket with one who has none, the other said: You cannot compare one who sees what he eats with one who does not see what he is eating. Rav Yosef said: This is an allusion to [the reason] why blind people eat on without becoming satisfied. Abaye said: Therefore, let he who has a meal eat only in daylight. Rabbi Zeira said: What Scriptural verse intimates that? Better is the seeing of the eyes than the wandering of the desire. Rish Lakish said: Better is the pleasure of looking at a woman than the act itself as it is said: 'Better is the seeing of the eyes than the wandering of the desire'. (74b3 – 74b4)

One who sets his eye on the wine goblet perceives that he goes in upright paths. Rabbi Ammi and Rabbi Assi [dispute concerning it], one said: Whosoever fixes his eye on the cup, all illicit relations appears to him like a plain; the other said: One who indulges in his cup, the entire world appears to him like a plain. (74b4 – 75a1)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Face Washing

Tosfos Yeshonim states that it is forbidden *min haTorah* to wash or smear one's entire body on Yom Kippur. This is why it is permitted for a king or bride to wash their faces, for that would be only an *issur midrobonon* and the decree was never instituted by them.

The Gaon from Minsk asks that even though it's true that the Torah only forbade washing the entire body and not just their faces, but it should be forbidden *min haTorah* according to the opinions that *chatzi shiur* (less than the required amount) is forbidden *min haTorah*?

The Emek Brocha answers that *chatzi shiur* is *ossur* only when the Torah is particular on a certain amount. Here the



Torah forbade washing the entire body for the benefit one receives from that washing is considered that he is not afflicting himself. Washing one's face is not a benefit that contradicts affliction and therefore the Torah did not forbid this and it will not be included in *chatzi shiur* as well.

Half a Date

In order to be *chayav* on Yom Kippur for eating, one must eat at least the size of a large date, which will provide him satisfaction. Less than that amount, he will not be satiated and therefore not liable. The Gemora brings an argument between Reb Yochanan and Rish Lakish regarding one who eats less than this amount, if it will be forbidden *min haTorah* or not.

The Yerushalmi in Terumos disagrees and holds that even though Rish Lakish normally holds that *chatzi shiur* is permitted, by Yom Kippur he agrees that he will be *chayav*. The Gaon explains the reasoning. The Torah does not state by Yom Kippur that one should not eat, rather it says that a person should be afflicted, which we learn from there that one shouldn't eat and be satiated. Eating an amount equivalent to a date will satisfy a person fully and eating less than that will satiate him somewhat. This is why Rish Lakish agrees.

DAILY MASHAL

The Gemara teaches that although a person could make the Manna taste like anything he desired, it nevertheless retained its original appearance. Even though the complainers were able to make the Manna taste like fish, they lacked the pleasure and satiety which comes from seeing the food that they wanted to taste. The Gemara adds that a blind person won't enjoy or become as full from a meal as a person with normal vision who consumes the same food.

In light of this complaint, the Midrash questioned how a person will be able to avoid the same dilemma on Shabbos since he won't be able to appreciate the Shabbos delicacies if he is forced to eat them in darkness. The Midrash concluded that from their protest, we may derive that a person is obligated to light candles so that he can see and enjoy his food on Shabbos!