

22 Tammuz 5781
July 2, 2021



Yoma Daf 82

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: One should not afflict children at all on Yom Kippur. But one trains them a year or two before in order that they become used to fulfilling commandments. (82a1)

GEMARA: Since [the Mishnah has taught already that] two years before [their reaching adulthood] they must be trained, is it necessary to state that one must do so a year before that time? Rav Chisda said: This is no difficulty: the one refers to a healthy child, the other to a sickly one. (82a1)

Rav Huna said: At the age of eight and nine years one trains them by hours,¹ at the age of ten and eleven they must fast to the end of the day, by Rabbinic ordinance. At the age of twelve they must fast to the end of the day by Biblical law, [all this] referring to girls. Rav Nachman said: At the age of nine and ten one trains them by hours, at the age of eleven and twelve they must fast to the end of the day by Rabbinic ordinance, at the age of thirteen they must fast to the end of the day by Biblical law, [all this] referring to boys. Rabbi Yochanan said: There is no Rabbinic ordinance about the obligation of children to fast to the end of the day. But, at the age of ten and eleven one trains them by hours, at the age of twelve they must fast to the end of the day by Biblical law.

¹ Extending the hours of fasting from one hour to another.

² Whereas Rav Huna and Rav Nachman could explain ‘Before’ as meaning ‘before they are obliged by Rabbinic law’ to fast to the end of the day. Rabbi Yochanan holds there is no Rabbinic

We learned: One should not afflict the children at all on Yom Kippur, but one trains them a year or two before. That will be right according to Rav Huna and Rav Nachman: A year or two before [means] a year before, according to Rabbinic law, or two years before, according to Biblical law. But according to Rabbi Yochanan, there is a difficulty!² Rabbi Yochanan will tell you: ‘One or two years before means: before their reaching adulthood.’³

Come and hear: For Rabbah bar Shmuel taught: One does not afflict children on Yom Kippur, but one trains them a year, or two, before their reaching adulthood. That will be right according to Rabbi Yochanan, but according to Rav Huna and Rav Nachman this presents a difficulty. — [These] Rabbis will tell you: ‘Training’ here means ‘fasting to the end of the day’. But has ‘training’ the meaning of ‘fasting to the end of the day’? Was it not taught: What is training? If he was accustomed to eat at the second hour, one feeds him now at the third hour; if he was accustomed to eat at the third hour, one feeds him now at the fourth. Rava bar Ulla said: There are two kinds of training. (82a1 – 82a2)

MISHNAH: If a pregnant woman smelled [food on Yom Kippur, and she has a strong craving to eat], she must be given to eat until she feels restored. A sick person is fed at

ordinance compelling children to fast to the end of the day, and would be unable to account for this text.

³ His answer is simple; ‘before’ means ‘before adulthood’, when yet the obligation to fast to the end of the day does not apply.

the word of experts, and if no experts are there, one feeds him at his own wish until he says: Enough. (82a2 – 82a3)

GEMARA: Our Rabbis taught: If a pregnant woman smelled sacrificial meat, or of pork, we put for her a spindle into the juice and place it upon her mouth. If thereupon she feels that her craving has been satisfied, it is well. If not, one feeds her with the juice itself. If thereupon her craving is satisfied it is well; if not one feeds her with the very fat itself, for there is nothing that can stand before [the obligation of] saving a life, with the exception of idolatry, illicit relations, or murder [which are prohibited in all situations].

From where do we know that about idolatry? For it was taught: Rabbi Eliezer says: If it says *'with all your soul,'* why should it be necessary to also say, *'with all your resources,'* and if it says *'with all your resources,'* why should it be necessary to also say, *'with all your soul'?* The reason is because if a person values his body more than his money, then it must be written, *'with all your soul'* (teaching that in order to avoid idolatry, he must forfeit his life – something, which is the greatest sacrifice for that person). And if a person values his money more than his body, then it must be written, *'with all your resources'* (teaching that in order to avoid idolatry, he must give up his wealth – something, which is the greatest sacrifice for that person).

From where do we know it about illicit relations and murder? — For it was taught: Rebbe said: [It is said regarding a betrothed naarah (maiden) who is not punished for committing adultery against her will:] for like a man who rises up against his fellow and murders him, so is this thing (the raping of a betrothed naarah). Now, what connection has a murderer with a betrothed maiden? Thus this comes to throw light, and is itself illumined. The

⁴ Since one does not know whose life Hashem values more, he cannot murder someone else in order to save his own life.

Torah likens the laws regarding a murderer to the laws regarding the betrothed naarah, which teaches us that just like a betrothed naarah should be saved from the rape even at the expense of her attacker's life, so too if someone will fall prey to murderer, the victim should be saved even at the expense of the murderer's life. The law regarding the betrothed naarah is learned from the law of a murderer, as just like one must forfeit his life rather than to murder another Jew, also a betrothed naarah should forfeit her life rather than commit adultery.

From where do we know this regarding murder itself? We know that one must forfeit his life rather than murder someone else based on logic, because a person came to Rava and told him, "The governor of my town has ordered me, 'Go and kill So-and-so, if not, I will kill you'." He answered him: 'Let him kill you rather than that you should commit murder; what [reason] do you see [for thinking] that your blood is redder? Perhaps his blood is redder.'⁴ (82a3 – 82b1)

There was a certain pregnant woman who had smelled [a dish]. People came before Rebbe [questioning him what should be done]. He said to them: Go and whisper to her that it is Yom Kippur. They whispered to her and she accepted the whispered suggestion, whereupon he [Rebbe] cited about her the verse: Before I formed you in the womb I knew you. From her came forth Rabbi Yochanan. [Again] there was a pregnant woman who smelled [a dish]. The people came to Rabbi Chanina, who said to them: Whisper to her [that it is Yom Kippur]. She did not accept the whispered suggestion. He cited with regard to her: The wicked are estranged from the womb. From her came forth Shabsai, the hoarder of produce.⁵ (82b – 83a1)

⁵ These incidents relate that a pregnant woman who smells a dish and develops a craving for it - it is the embryo, and not the mother, who has the desire. If the mother accepted the



INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Blessing by a Bas Mitzvah

The Rema (O" C 225:2) writes that one whose son is becoming bar mitzvah should recite the following blessing: Blessed are You, Hashem, our God, King of the universe, that You freed me from the punishment due this boy. He concludes that it is preferable to recite this blessing without mentioning Hashem's name.

The question is asked: Why is this blessing not recited when one's daughter becomes bas mitzvah?

The Peri Megadim states that it would depend on what the reason is for this blessing. The Magen Avraham (ibid; 5) explains this blessing as follows: Up until this juncture, the father was punished when his son sinned because he obviously did not train him well enough. Once the child becomes an adult, he is responsible for his own actions.

The Levush, however, interprets this blessing in the exact opposite manner. Up until now, the child gets punished for the sins of his father, as the Gemora Shabbos (32b) states: For the sin of unfulfilled vows, a person's children die when they are young. The meaning of the blessing is that his son will now not incur any punishments on account of the parents.

According to the Levush, there is no reason to make any distinction between a son and a daughter. However, according to the Magen Avraham, we can say that the blessing is only applicable to a son, where there is an obligation of chinuch. However, a father does not have a mitzvah of chinuch for a daughter and therefore there is

whispered suggestion, it was due to the noble piety of the unborn child, hence, Rabbi Yochanan was the child of the first woman. None is more contemptible than the speculator in foodstuffs who corners the markets for his sordid gain and who

no reason to recite the blessing when she becomes bas mitzvah.

The Kaf Hachayim writes that we can apply a different logic according to the Magen Avraham. It is customary for a father to sustain his daughter until she is married and therefore, she is naturally under his jurisdiction until then. He is capable of rebuking her until she marries and will be under the jurisdiction of her husband. He therefore does not recite the blessing when she becomes bas mitzvah since he is still rebuking her.

He explains according to the Levush as well. The Levush said that the reason for the blessing is because up until then, the son gets punished for the sins of his parents. It is possible to say that a daughter, who is already under the mazal of her husband, as it is said: It is announced in heaven, "The daughter of So-and-So will be married to So-and-So," his mazal will benefit her that she will not be punished on account of her father's sins.

Chinuch on the Mother

Tosfos Yeshonim states that the mitzva of chinuch is only on the father and not on Beis Din. He extends this to mean that it is only on the father and not on the mother. He asks on himself from a Gemora in Sukkah by Hilni HaMalka that it is evident from that Gemora that there is a mitzva of chinuch on the mother? He answers that there it was only "lmitzva b'alma."

Reb Akiva Eiger in Sukkah asks on this that the Gemora there is clear that it's more than just mitzva b'alma - it is the real mitzva of chinuch for the Gemora is proving the halachos of sukkah from there?

causes great affliction among the poor. Such a person, even in the embryonic stage, would not be influenced by the information that it is Yom Kippur. He would crave his food, unresponsive to any law or sentiment.



DAILY MASHAL

The limits of self-sacrifice

Our *sugya* explains that saving a life takes precedence over any mitzvah in the Torah with the exception of idolatry (*avodah zarah*), immorality and murder. Idolatry is an exception because the Torah says “Love Hashem...with all your soul” (Devarim 6:5). Murder is a logical exception as one should not cause another’s death to save one’s own. Immorality is an exception as it is scripturally compared to murder.

According to Maharam of Rottenburg (Responsa, 938), a Jew must sacrifice his soul to refrain from worshipping an idol but he is not commanded to suffer **endless torture**, as the Gemara in Kesubos 33b attests that if Nevuchadnetzar had tortured Chananyah, Mishael and Azaryah, they would have bowed to the idol (see the *Mordechai* on Gittin, §395).

Rabbi Manoach Hendel, author of *Chochmas Manoach*, is familiar to us by his comments at the end of the tractate. He passed away about 400 years ago and was one of the leading Torah authorities in the generation of the Maharsha, the Maharam and the Levush. An unfortunate event was referred to him when Jews were captured by gentiles and cruelly tortured so that they would admit to the “crimes” of other Jews entailing the death penalty. Their captors informed them that they would stop torturing them if they converted to their religion and Rabbi Hendel ruled that they may do so, relying amongst other sources on the proof from Chananyah, Mishael and Azaryah.

The coded letter of the *Chochmas Manoach*: It is interesting that Rabbi Hendel did not want to publicize his ruling at large and at the beginning of his reply he wrote: “We do not learn one *lamed* (teaching) from another

lamed in the middle, and a *lamed* (learned person) should only reveal it to the prudent.” He thereafter encoded his decision by adding a *lamed* in the middle of each word... (*Sefer HaZikaron* by HaGaon Rav Y.B. Zholti, Mechon Yerushalayim, p. 332 and onwards). We learn from his reply that this permission is given only for idolatry and immorality but not for murder.

That is the decision of the Maharam of Rottenburg but Rabeinu Tam disagrees (Kesubos 33b, s.v. *Ilmalei*) and asserts that even a cruelly tortured Jew must not worship an idol. The statue facing Chananyah, Mishael and Azaryah, he contends, was not an idol but merely a monument to the king (see at length in *Meoros HaDaf HaYomi*, III, p. 35).