

Yoma 2

תָּנוּ רַבָּנָן שְׂבָעָה בָּנִים הָיוּ לָהּ

Kimchis had seven sons.

Kimchis had seven sons and all served as Kohen Gadol. When asked what she had done to merit this, she responded, “My whole life, the beams of my house never saw the braids of my hair.”

Is a woman required to cover her hair her whole life? At all times?

R Moshe Feinstein says – Even the strictest opinions only require hair to be covered when she is outside her house and in public, but while she is in her home, it may be uncovered.

There is no need to cover one’s hair

-before marriage.

-in her home.

What is the rule if she is in her home and has guests?

Kimchis’ answer tells us of the high degree of modesty in her behavior. Perhaps her answer is immodest. Rather than claim that her personal qualities resulted in merit, better to thank God’s goodness for the success of her sons.

6-Yoma 47a2 line 41 B34

Daf Digest

תָּנוּ רַבָּנָן שְׁבַע בָּנִים הָיוּ לָהּ לְקִמְחִית

Kimchis had seven sons.

There are some questions about this story.

How is it “fortunate” that all 7 sons served as Kohen Gadol? Did each die, so the next could ascend? There is a story of spittle from an idolater on the Kohen Gadol and his brother had to serve in his place. Thereby, Kimchis had 2 sons serve as Kohen Gadol on the same day!

Her sons are named- R Yishmael ben Kimchis

- R Yosef ben Kimchis

How is it that they are named by the mothers' name?

אִפְכִּיּוֹ לְמִנָּא וְדַבְּקִיּוֹ לְקוּמְץ בְּאַרְעִיתִיּוֹ דִּמְנָא מַהוּ

If he inverted the utensil and attached the kometz to the bottom, what is the law?

The kometz must be placed into a utensil. Is an upside down utensil being used in an abnormal or in an acceptable manner? Is it considered “new”, since it has this new manner of use or new manner of function?

This has application during the nine days or the three weeks. Does changing an old garment, i.e., a jacket into a shirt, or a sheet into a garment, create a new garment and permits one to wear it? We are uncertain.

We can solve this problem by wearing it for a few hours. Then all agree, even a brand new garment is considered used and is permitted to be worn during the nine days or the three weeks.

נְשִׁיף הַדָּם עַל הָרֶצֶפָה וְאַסְפוֹ

There are 4 steps in the procedure of offering an animal:

1. Shechitah- slaughtering
2. Kabbalah - receiving its blood in a kli shareis (its life blood).
3. Holachah - conveying it to the altar.
4. Zerikah - throwing it upon the altar wall (or daubing it).

If during Kabbalah the blood falls on the ground, may it be gathered up and used?

No, the blood has to be from the animal's neck vessels, which is considered the life blood of the animal and it must flow directly into a container.

If, during Holachah, the blood was received correctly, but then fell, he may gather up the blood and use it.

(Note #7)

Does the Kohen have to collect all of the blood of the animal? Yes (Lev 4:7 Note #14).

נִשְׁפָּךְ הַדָּם עַל הָרֶצֶפָה וְאַסְפּוּ

If the blood spilled on the floor?

Does the Kohen have to collect all of the blood of the animal in the vessel? The Gemara states that, yes, he must collect it all. If some falls later, he can still proceed with the Avodah.

We learn that he must collect all of the blood, from the phrase, ‘midam hapor’, “from the blood of the bull.” But that phrase could be interpreted as only part of the blood of the bull, not necessarily all the blood from the bull!

So the Gemara tells us a new rule to use in clarifying the Torah. We may subtract a letter from one word, add it to another within the same verse and then, expound on that verse. Here, if we change ‘midam hapor’ to ‘dam mehapor’, the translation changes to, ‘from the blood’ of the bull to ‘blood from the bull’.

The shift of that one letter, helps clarify that all the blood from the bull must be collected. That helps somewhat, in answering our question.

6-Yoma 48a2 line 20 A21
Daf Digest

גוֹרְעִין וּמוֹסִיפִין וְדוֹרְשִׁין

Subtract, add and analyze,

“This should be a person’s daily obligation,” says the Maggid of Mezeritch.

A person should strive to subtract from his sins and bad deeds, add to his mitzvahs and good deeds, and constantly analyze by self searching, so as to improve himself.

וּמֵאֵי שְׁנָא רַבִּי חֲנִינְיָ מְשׁוּם דְּבָקִי בְּרְפוּאוֹת הוּא

Why was the question addressed to Rebbe Chaninah? Because he was an expert in healing.

However, he was a Kohen, and one who derives benefit from a Kohen, who is consecrated to God, (“Kohanim, you are holy to God”) is guilty of ‘meilah’, ‘using a consecrated item’.

This is a severe sin.

That is correct.

However:

1. A Kohen may forego this honor. However, the Mishnah Berura states, that even if he forgoes this honor, it is still not permitted to derive benefit from him.
2. If he is paid for his services, it is not considered meilah.
3. One who knows how to heal, is mandated by the Torah to do so (Rambam).
4. By healing, the Kohen doctor, does not forgo an honor towards himself. The Kohen doctor enhances that honor . This is due to the fact that the patient entrusts himself to the doctor to be treated. (LK)

בְּזֹאת יָבֵא אַהֲרֹן אֶל-הַקֹּדֶשׁ בְּפֶרֶךְ בֶּן-בָּקָר׃

“And with this, Aaron came to the Holy with a young bull,”

“And with this’, i.e., with a consciousness of his exalted office, Aaron came to offer a young bull.

R Shimshon Rafael Hirsch says, “And so each of us should come each day, eternally fresh and young, full of devotion and enthusiasm.”

Start anew each day in the morning.

6-Yoma 50a1 line 12 B17

Daf Digest

דְּחֻטָּאת שְׁמִיתוּ בְּעָלֶיהָ הִיא

A Chatas (sin offering) whose owner dies.

A Chatas (sin offering), whose owner dies, is allowed to die. The Chatas loses its holiness. It can't be offered as a sacrifice or used for any purpose by anyone else.

Any sacrificial item, once it loses its sanctity, i.e., by no longer being used for its holy purpose, and there is no likelihood that it will once again be used for its holy purpose, then the sanctity has already left it.

A synagogue in a very dangerous, bad, or changed area, may be sold for other uses. It has lost its sanctity and can never be used for its holy purpose again.

תָּנוּ רַבָּנָן בֵּין הַמִּזְבֵּחַ לַמְנוֹרָה

The Rabbis taught between the inner Altar and the Menorah.

This is a discussion as to which route the Kohen Gadol took on Yom Kippur, to pass through the Heichal, and to reach the Holy of Holies.

R Yehuda taught that the Kohen Gadol passed between the inner Altar and the Menorah.

R Meir said the Kohen Gadol walked between the Table and the inner Altar.

Others say that he walked between the Table and the Wall on the Northern side of the Heichal.

This is to teach us that there are many ways to reach Kodesh Kodashim. Each person must find his own way, to utilize his/her various strengths to achieve this lofty goal.

- Some learn in depth.
- Some learn in breadth, covering a lot of ground.

The Brisker Rav cautioned that no single method is ideal for the talents and inclination of each and every person. Some routes may go against a person's natural tendencies and he/she will not master the "Brisker" method either.

חֲמִשׁ מִקְרָאוֹת בַּתּוֹרָה אֵין לָהֶן הַכְרֵעַ

There are five sentences in the Torah, whose grammatical structure cannot be determined.

Each sentence contains a phrase that can be linked to either, an earlier or a later clause.

1. Genesis 4:7
2. Exodus 25:34
3. Exodus 17:9
4. Genesis 49:7
5. Deuteronomy 31:16
(Genesis 34:7)

The Ritva teaches that the correct interpretation of these sentences can be determined from their cantillation marks.

However, Rav Yosel Dano points out that there are different traditions between west and east, and Sephardim and Ashkenazim, regarding the melody of the cantillation marks.

לֹא מָתוּ בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן אֶלֶּא

The sons of Aaron did not die, except.

This is a discussion regarding why Aaron's sons were punished (Lev 4:23).

-They burned deficient Ketores.

-The Ketores was lacking an ingredient called 'maaleh asham' (53a1 N6), which literally means, something that makes smoke rise. It is the name of a certain herb.

The maaleh asham causes the smoke to rise like a stick, in a shaft of smoke. We are strict with the ingredients of the incense, since it says in (Lev 16:13) "Hakatores," which specifies the Ketores. Therefore, it must be correct. (see 53a1 N 8 & 9)

לֹא מֵתוּ בְּנֵי אֶהֱרֹן אֱלֹא

The sons of Aaron did not die, except.

Various sources cite other sins that might have precipitated the death of Nadav and Avihu, the sons of Aaron.

- They entered the Holy of Holies.
- They brought an unauthorized offering.
- They took their fire from an inappropriate source.
- They did not consult with each other.
- They were intoxicated.
- They failed to wear a required vestment.
- They entered without first washing their hands and feet.
- They failed to marry and have children.
- They gazed on a sacred vision while eating and drinking.
- They craved power, saying, “When will these two old men die and we will lead?”

וְכֵן פָּהֲגִים בְּעִבּוּרָתָן

And the same applies to the Kohanim in their service.

A Kohen's face should turn toward the bimah, in the direction of his original approach.

The Kohen Gadol exits, going the way he entered. This is interpreted as, just as he was facing forward when he entered, so he faced forward when he exited.

This is learned from II Chronicles 1:13.

Solomon began in Jerusalem and traveled to Givon to offer his sacrifices on the bimah. The Temple was not yet built. He then, returned to Jerusalem, walking backwards few steps and then turned, to go back to Jerusalem. We learn this way, because of the novel phrase, "Solomon came to the bimah which was in Givon, Jerusalem."

We learn from this that:

1. A Kohen Gadol, after serving, should not turn his back on the Kodosh Kodashim.
2. A person should not turn his back on the Torah (unless it is 10 tefachim above his height).
3. A person should not turn his back on his Rabbi or teacher, when he leaves him from the bimah.

How can a person address the congregation from the bimah?

- a. The paroches is closed.
- b. The Torah is elevated into a different domain.
- c. The drasha is itself, an honor to the Torah, is Kavod Shamayim.
- d. The reason for not turning one's back, is to accord respect and honor. An act such as a drasha, is an honor to the Torah itself, so no disrespect is implied.

וּכְבַר עָלָה סַנְחֵרִיב מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר וּבִלְבָּל כָּל הָאֲרָצוֹת

And Sancheirev, King of Assyria, confused all the lands.

This sentence comes up in discussion regarding intermarriage (in Deut 7:3).

There is a ban, “Neither shall you enter into marriage with them...” The word “them” relates to the 7 nations living in Eretz Yisroel when the King of Assyria “confused” all the people by exiling them to different areas and mixing them, so they could not be identified. Ostensibly, all were suspect of being from the 7 nations and were therefore, proscribed by the Torah.

Therefore, Nehemiah forbade marriage with any gentile (Nech 10:31).

לְעוֹלָם בְּמִקְדָּשׁ שְׁנֵי וְכְרוּבִים דְּצוּרָתָא הוּוּ קַיִימִי

In fact, in the Second Temple the images of cherubim still existed.

During the time of the second Bais HaMikdash, there were images of Cherubim on the walls of the Holy of Holies. These were painted or engraved wooden panels that covered the stone walls.

There is a prohibition against making graven images.

Is a photograph a type of graven image?

Only if the image is engraved or raised, a flat image does not apply.

Agree

Rambam

Shulchan Aruch

ink on wall/permitted

Disagree

Raavid

Ritva

Rav David Halevi- not permitted (if the image is of a person)

Most Poskim would agree that if a picture is not raised or engraved, it is permitted. Perhaps all would permit photographs, since it is not the person who makes the image, rather it is the camera. Perhaps, it may be that as such, it does not violate this prohibition.

6-Yoma 54b1

line 2

A4

Weiss #591

בְּשָׁעָה שֶׁנִּכְנְסוּ נְכָרִים לְהִיכָל רָאוּ כְּרוּבִים
הַמְּעוֹרִין זֶה בְּזֶה

When the heathens entered the temple to destroy it, they saw the cherubim embracing one another.

At a moment of severe punishment and chastisement, there was manifestation of closeness and of love.

So should we be when we must criticize others. We should criticize with compassion and warm regards for the other person's feelings.

6-Yoma 55a4 line 44 B7

Daf Digest

שְׁלֵא יִטְעָה בַּהֲזָאוֹת

So he will not err in counting the sprinklings.

In the Kodesh Kodashim, the Kohen Gadol sprinkles the blood of the bull and then the goat. He does this yet again, in the Heichal toward the Paroches. One sprinkle up, seven downward and counted in this way, in order “not to become confused” in his counting. He could count to 8 to solve this problem, but these sprinklings, are not actually one extended service. They are distinct and we are to end with the number 7, not 8. - R Yehudah, R Eliezer and Rambam.

Rama explains- One sprinkle up, represents the Almighty and 7 below the Yetzer Hara. The Kohen Gadol is, by this action, symbolically showing the problem to God. How can we succeed in serving you, when the single force of purity, has to be withstood by 7 different forces of impurity. In that we succeed at all, against such odds, you should have mercy upon us.

נְתַעְרְבוּ לוֹ דָּמִים בְּדָמִים

The Gemara presents the problem where the containers of blood from the bull and the goat were confused with each other.

The Gemara presents the problem where the containers of blood from the bull and the goat were confused with each other.

The Kohen must sprinkle the blood of the bull first, before that of the goat. How can we be sure this is actually accomplished? The answer is to sprinkle 3 times for 3 sets. If you chose incorrectly, Goat-Bull-Goat- then the second and third sprinkle will satisfy the requirement. If you chose correctly, Bull-Goat-Bull-then the first and second sprinkle will satisfy the requirement.

Why is a 3rd sprinkling suggested? Is that not a violation of ‘adding to’ the mitzvah, ‘Baal Toseph’? No, because once the mitzvah is completed with the first and second sprinkle, it is complete and cannot be added to. Therefore, Baal Toseph does not apply!

נוֹתֵן אֶחָת לְמַעַלָּה וְשֶׁבַע לְמַטָּה לְשֵׁם הַפָּר

R Yirmiyah says the Kohen Gadol should place 1 up and 7 below for the bull.

Also, because of doubt , the Kohen Gadol should place 1 up and 7 below for the goat.

Why are we not violating the prohibition against adding to the Torah (Baal Toseph). when we add to a mitzvah here? Some say that it is because the prohibition is not violated when we add to a mitzvah, when it is due to doubt. Others disagree.

A case: A person is not certain if he should place a mezuzah on the right or left. Should he place one on each side? No.

A case: A person bought a home and placed mezuzahs on the doorways. He later learned that the previous owner had already affixed mezuzahs on some of the doorways. Did he violate Baal Toseph? No. What is the rule if he adds mezuzahs because he is not certain of the Kashrus of the previously affixed mezuzahs? Is this Baal Toseph? No.

Adding because of doubt, is not a violation of the rule to ‘not to add ‘to the Torah.

וְלָקַח מִדָּם הַפָּר וּמִדָּם הַשְּׂעִיר

“And he shall take from the blood of the bull and the blood of the goat”.

This means he mixes the two bloods. He pours the blood of the bull into the container of the blood of the goat.

He then takes the full container and places it into the empty one. Does this mean he pours the contents of the full one into the empty one to mix the bloods more completely? Or does it mean that he put the full container into the empty bowl and thereby has two bowls, one inside the other, and holds the double bowl as he places the combined blood on the golden altar?

Rambam says-Both. He pours the blood back and forth to blend it and then puts the full bowl into the empty one.

So should it be with Torah learning. A student should mix with a teacher who knows more and a teacher should seek a student with whom he can share.

דָּאָמַר רִישׁ לְקִישׁ אֵין מְעַבְרִין עַל הַמִּצְוֹת

Reish Lakish said, “We do not pass over mitzvahs.”

It is prohibited to pass over one mitzvah, in order to do another mitzvah. We should perform the first mitzvah that presents itself. We don't know the event of reward for any particular mitzvah. Does this principle apply if the first mitzvah is Rabbinic and the second is Biblical? Some say the principle still applies, and others disagree.

Those who disagree say that applying the principle depends on:

1. Origin-The principle applies only if the two mitzvahs are of similar origin Biblical or Rabbinic.
2. Frequency- The importance and Kedushah is greater for the more frequently occurring mitzvah. So, perform the more frequently occurring mitzvah first and one should pass over the lesser mitzvah in those cases.

If one designates a Pesach offering and it becomes lost. **הַמְּפָרִישׁ פֶּסַחֹו וְאָבֵד**

If one designates a Pesach offering and it becomes lost, he designates a second offering in its stead. What is the rule if the first offering is found afterwards, which offering should he use?

Chachamim- Which ever he wishes.

R Yosi - The first offering, unless the second is nicer. Quality is a factor.

Case: A Baal Tokeah (a person who blows the shofar) became sick and another was chosen to blow the shofar but then the first recovered. Rambam teaches like the Chachamim (Hil. Korban Pesach 8:4).

One should stipulate clearly, either to #1 that a replacement is being chosen who will serve even if #1 improves, or to #2, that his service is contingent on the continued illness of #1.

(LK)

שְׁנֵי שְׁעִירֵי יוֹם הַכִּפּוּרִים מִצֻּרְתָּן שִׁיְהִיו שְׁנֵיהֶן שְׁוִין

The two goats of Yom Kippur: It is preferred that they are similar.

The Mishnah continues with the description of the Yom Kippur service involving two goats. The preferred mode of performance is that they be alike in appearance (i.e., either black or white or grey (Rashi), in height and in value.

The requirement that the two goats be essentially identical seems impossible to fulfill unless, of course, they are identical twins. However, no rabbinic interpretation requires the degree of similarity to be so exact and absolute, as long as they are basically the same.

The Gemara (in Sanhedrin 71a) augments this discussion stating that the two parents of a recalcitrant son (ben Sorer U'Morah) be similar in voice, appearance and height. The Gemara notes that these requirements will never be met since it is impossible that two parents will ever share all these similar features, and as such, the severe punishment will never be meted out.

שְׁנֵי שְׁעִירֵי יוֹם הַכִּפּוּרִים מִצֻּרְתָּן שִׁיְהִיו שְׁנִיְהֶן שְׁוִין

The two goats of Yom Kippur: It is preferred that they are similar

There is a special lesson to be learned from the fact that the goats are identical, yet one is sent for a high purpose – to the sanctuary, and the other is chosen for an undignified end -cast into the abyss.

On Yom Kippur we are told this story to dramatize the choices we can make as paths in life present themselves. Neither our physical qualities/appearance, “marek”, our social standing, i.e., height, ‘komah’, or our wealth, ‘damim’, nor any surrounding circumstances, ‘lekiche’, forces us in one direction or another.

Once someone asked Rabbi Nachman of Breslaw.

“Rebbe, “We are free to choose, but how does free will work?”

Rabbi Nachman answered, “If you want, you do, if you don’t, you don’t!”

However, you chose before this, now is a new opportunity to choose. You have the freedom.

If you want, you do – if you don’t, you don’t.

6-Yoma 62a2 line 26 A9
Daf Digest

מֵת אֶחָד מֵהֶם

If one of them (the goats) died.

If it is before the Kohen Gadol cast the lots – simply purchase another one. However, if the goat died after the Kohen Gadol cast the lots, he must bring another pair and cast lots upon them anew.

(See N5) Since at this point the surviving animal has already been designated, it cannot be subjected to a new lottery. A newly purchased animal, to replace the dead one, will not have been designated by lot, as the Torah requires. A new pair must be bought and lots drawn over them, as if new.

מִיָּוֶן שְׁלֵא יִקְדִישׁוּנוּ מִחוּסֵר זְמַן

What is the source from which we learn that we should not consecrate an animal that is premature?

One has transgressed the prohibition against the slaughter of a mother animal and her offspring on the same day, only if the animals were properly slaughtered. If one of the animals was not properly slaughtered, you may slaughter the remaining one.

If the slaughtering of one animal was improperly done, i.e., by a deaf mute, insane or minor person, whose shechitah is not halachically qualified, we may slaughter the other animal on the same day because, technically they have not both been “slaughtered” on the same day.

This is the method to use unless: The animal was slaughtered to perform a mitzvah, i.e., to treat an ill person. Since a mitzvah was involved, that shechitah is considered valid.

In the case of our Gemara (Yoma 63b1 – line 12), we learn that the Azazel cannot be a premature animal. That disqualifies it. However, if its mother was slaughtered for a mitzvah, the animal, though otherwise not qualified for an Azazel, could be used. If the animal would be used, it would be considered to have been slaughtered properly, and the prohibition against slaughtering mother and child on the same day, would have been violated.

הָא אָמְרִי בְּמַעְרְבָא דְחֵיטּוֹ לְצוּק זֶה הִיא שְׁחִיטָתוֹ

They say in the west (Eretz Yisroel) shoving the goat off the cliff is paramount to slaughtering it.

(If so, is its carcass tamei or tahor, similar to a ritually slaughtered (shected) animal?)

The lottery on Yom Kippur, between the two goats, represents a choice between good and evil, truth and falsehood. The death of the goat that is sent away over the precipice constitutes its shechitah, because casting away falsehood is a holy act. This holy act is equivalent to choosing truth in its function of serving HaShem.

It is often difficult to choose between good and evil because the source of all is the same. Everything emanates from HaShem. It takes a special person like a Kohen Gadol to clarify the proper path, as in this case, by making his choice. He can see more clearly.

Story - There was a boy from Europe studying in Yeshivas Chevron during the Arab riots in Israel in the 1930's. When he came home for a visit, his father insisted that to return to Eretz Yisroel was a pekuach nefesh and he must not go back. They decided to ask a great Rabbi, who told them, "There certainly is a great danger coming. Anyone who can save himself is obligated to do so. This is why the young man must return to Yeshivas Chevron." By doing so, he was saved from WWII.

תָּנִן הֵתָם בְּנֵי הָעִיר שֶׁשְּׁלָחוּ אֶת שְׁקֵלֵיהֶן וְנִגְנְבוּ אוֹ שֶׁאֲבָדוּ

We learn in a Mishnah there, that the residents of a city sent their Shekalim and they were stolen or lost.

If the agent was paid, he is a shomer sachor and he is responsible for the loss.

If the agent was not paid, he is not responsible for lost or stolen property. He must take 3 oaths that the property was not lost by negligence, it is not in his possession and he did not use the missing object.

What is the obligation of a person who maintains a tzedakah box in his home? If the money becomes lost or stolen, is the homeowner responsible to the tzedakah institution for the lost money?

A person who maintains a tzedakah box in his home bears no responsibility because he does not accept the responsibility of being a watchman. It is equivalent to telling a friend, “Use my house if you wish.” Furthermore, the accepted practice is to leave the tzedakah box out in the open. Some say once the money has reached the box, it is the possession of the tzedakah collector and the home owner has no further responsibility. This may be a good policy or people might not be inclined to permit these boxes to be in their homes.

אֵין מְקַדִּישִׁין וְאֵין מְעַרְיָכִין וְאֵין מַחְרִימִין בְּזִמְן הַזֶּה

We don't sanctify items, or make an erech vow, i.e., pledge the value of a particular person, or make Cherem vows, i.e., the value of an object that he consecrates, nowadays.

We do not make these vows/pledges because we don't have the Bais HaMikdash.

How then, do we make a binding pledge?

- Kinyon - is binding and all agree.
- Written - but what if it is not given to anyone?
- Verbal - binding is like a kinyon – says R' Alfasi, R Yosef Karo, R Moshe Isserles.
- However, verbal binds only sacred property, it is not binding for tzedakah.

Unuttered thoughts to give tzedakah:

- Binding, though not enforceable in Bais Din.
- Not binding, since thoughts in one's heart, bear no legal weight.

Unuttered thoughts to give tzedakah to a specific organization or to a specific person is binding. .
 You should give the tzedakah, even though it is not enforceable. It is best to give the tzedakah and best of all to give the tzedakah where you thought to give it initially.

6-Yoma 66a3 line 42 A14

Daf Digest

טוֹל וְצֵא טוֹל וְצֵא

“Take it and leave! Take it and leave!”

The red strand is tied to a stone to represent the men who were created from the earth.

The red strand is tied to the horns to represent the women who were created from Adam’s bone.

The first ‘Tal V’Yetze’ is related to the sins of the men and provides atonement. The second is for the womens’ sins. When the strand turns white, both are exonerated, because the Jewish people cannot survive if only ½ is purified and the other ½ is not.

שְׁבִטוֹ שֶׁל לֵוִי לֹא עָבַד עֲבוֹדַת פִּזְבָּיִם

The tribe of Levi did not commit the sin of idolatry, i.e. worship the Golden Calf.

This assertion is unsuccessfully challenged . Why does R Yehudah say this?

Because the Posuk (Ex 32:26) states, ‘Vyamod Moshe b’shaar hamachaneh’, ‘and Moses stood in the gate of the camp’ and said, “Whoever is for HaShem join me and all the Levites joined around him.”

“All the Levites!”, says Rashi, implies each and every member of this tribe was blameless.

6-Yoma 68b3 line21 A4
Daf Digest

בַּת לוֹ פִּהֵן גָּדוֹל לְקָרוֹת

The Kohen Gadol comes to read.

The Kohen Gadol, (after he has been informed that the goat has reached the wilderness, goes to the woman's courtyard of the temple) and reads.

“He may read in the vestments of the Kohen Gadol or in his own clothes” (Achrei Mos Lev Ch 16: 1-34 on Yom Kippur (see note #4).

Here we learn that he may receive personal benefit from these consecrated vestments (see Note #4).

הַרְוָאָה בְּהֵן גְּדוּל בְּשֶׁהוּא קוֹרֵא אֵינוֹ רוֹאֶה פֶּר וְשֹׁעִיר

One who saw the Kohen Gadol read the Torah, could not also see the burning of the bull or goat.

One who saw the Kohen Gadol read the Torah could not also see the burning of the bull or goat, because these activities took place simultaneously at a great distance apart.

Is it permissible to leave one mitzvah activity to attend another?

Is it permissible to leave a bris in order to attend Sheva Brachos? Or vice versa?

The scenario regarding the Kohen Gadol involves activities in which the person attending is not performing the mitzvah. The same is the case regarding a bris, you are merely a guest. However, when you are attending a Sheva Brachos, you are actually involved in the mitzvah of Simchas Choson V'Kallah. So, you could leave a bris to attend a Sheva Brachos, but you should not leave a Sheva Brachos to attend a bris.

תַּחַת רֵאשִׁיהֶן

(The priestly garments were) under their heads.

(BT Horayot 13) There are 5 things that cause a person to forget his learning, one of which is to have his garments beneath his head when he sleeps. Why was this action permitted here?

- The restriction only applies if a person sleeps on his clothing on a regular basis. Here, the Kohanim only did this during the few weeks per year they were serving in the Temple.
- Sacred garments do not cause this negative effect.
- There is no problem when a person puts his head on his sleeve and goes to sleep. The clothes cause no ill effect while they are being worn.

מֵאֵלֶּפְסֵי־רוֹם מוֹקְדוֹן

When Alexander the Macedonian.

The Kohen Gadol, may only wear the priestly vestments when going to or coming from the performance of an avodah.

Rashi - However, (in Deut 17:11) the Rabbis are given authority to administer the law and the people must obey the Rabbis

(In Avos 1:2) Shimon HaTzaddik served as Kohen Gadol in the Second Temple era and he donned the priestly garments to meet Alexander the Great. He had received word that Alexander had given the Cuthean Army (Samaritans) permission to destroy the Temple. They had built an imitation on Mount Gerizim.

Shimon HaTzaddik was permitted to leave the Temple dressed in the Holy consecrated vestments in order to make an impression on Alexander, for the good of the Jewish people. The Rabbis have the right to make an exception, a takanah, when they deem it necessary. As a result, Alexander changed his mind.

„וּבְעָשׂוֹר” שֶׁל חֻמֵּשׁ הַפְּקוּדִים קוֹרָא עַל פִּיהָ

And the section of Uv’Aser (on the tenth) in Chumash Pekudei (Sefer Bamidbar) was recited by heart (by the Kohen Gadol).

There is a prohibition against reciting the Torah by heart (BT Gittin 60b) Why is it permitted here?

One may recite by heart in order not to burden the tzibbur. The restriction does not apply to the reading of the day. The restriction applies only to obligatory readings, when one person reads on behalf of the congregation.

Therefore, a person giving a Dvar Torah, since it is not an obligatory reading and reading from the text would interrupt the flow of the speech, is permitted to quote from memory. Also, verses that people commonly know by heart are excluded from this prohibition.

מְשׁוּם בְּרָכָה שְׂאִינָה צְרִיכָה

Because of an unnecessary blessing.

There is a concern regarding an unexpected event occurring during Torah reading, which may result in an unnecessary blessing.

A Torah reader is unable to finish reading that aliyah what is to be done?

Reish Lachish is concerned about a ‘beracha livatalah’, an unnecessary blessing.

Tur-(Megillah 4:5 Yerushalmi)-If you suggest that a new reader can pick up where the first left off, the first verses have a blessing before them, but not after them and vice versa.

Ohr Ha-Chayim- The successor Baal Koreh should start reading that section again.

What if the person who is called to the Torah, is stricken while his portion is being read?

He could not have included another person in his blessing since his infirmity was not anticipated. Likely, the ruling would be that a new person should remake the blessings and read that Torah portion from its beginning.

6-Yoma 71b1 line 11 A17

Daf Digest

כִּהְיֵן גְּדוּל מְשִׁמֶשׁ בְּשִׁמוֹנָה כְּלִים וְהֵדְרִיּוֹט בְּאַרְבָּעָה

The Kohen Gadol serves in eight vestments and the common Kohen in four.

The clothes of the Kohen Gadol were pure, white linen and some contained gold. When he went into the Holy of Holies on Yom Kippur, he did not wear any garments containing gold, so as not to recall the memory of the Golden Calf. However, Aaron himself, was involved in that great sin. How could he enter the Holy of Holies? Would that not recall the great sin also?

We must conclude that this is further proof that Aaron did not sin and he bore no guilt. It was the garments with gold threads which were specifically disallowed from entering the Holy of Holies, while Aaron himself was allowed to enter. This was to the honor and glory of Aaron.

וְהַמְסִיר בְּיָדוֹ אֶת רוֹדֵי לִוְיָה

One who removes the poles of the Ark incurs lashes.

The rods of the ark must never be removed from it.

Anyone who does so is subject to lashes. The poles for carrying the Altar or the Table only need to be in place when those items are actually being moved.

Mesach Chochma explains-The poles of the Ark represent the people who support and uphold Torah scholars. They need to be constantly in place to be immediately available to play their part on an ongoing basis.

כָּל הַרוֹצֶה לִיקַח יָבֵא וְיִקַּח

Anyone who wants, can come and take it.

Based on this Gemara, Rambam writes (in Hil: Talmud Torah), “There are three crowns. The crown of Torah, the crown of Kahunah and the crown of Malchus.” The crown of Torah, anyone who wants it, is able to come and take it.

This is used to discuss the inheritance of a Rabbinic position. A rabbinic position should not pass by inheritance, but should go to the person who is the greatest scholar. Often however, the greatest scholar is the Rabbi's son. The Rabbi's son has learned Torah intensively from his father and he is, indeed, the greatest scholar in the community.

6-Yoma 72b2 line 25

B6

Weiss #783

כָּל תַּלְמִיד חָכֵם שֶׁאֵין תּוֹכוֹ כְּבָרוֹ אֵינוֹ תַלְמִיד חָכֵם

Any Torah scholar whose inside is not like his outside, is no Torah scholar.

Just as the ark was covered in gold both inside and outside.

No disciple, whose character does not correspond to his exterior, may enter the Bais Hamidrash (Berachos28a).

Therefore, a student should attend to his appearance, so that his outside reflects well upon his inner qualities.

זָכָה נַעֲשִׂית לּוֹ סֵם חַיִּים לֹא זָכָה נַעֲשִׂית לּוֹ סֵם מִיתָה

If he is meritorious, it becomes an elixir of life for him, if not, it becomes a deadly poison.

If one uses the Torah properly, it will enhance his life. If he makes improper use of it, it will destroy him. Everything depends on the recipient.

The Torah is compared to rain (Deut 32:2), “My discourse will drop as rain.” Rain waters the earth. If it falls on a field that is cultivated, i.e., ready to receive it, the field flourishes. If it falls on an area not cultivated, it can do no good. In fact, it can harm that field by washing away the topsoil or cultivate weeds. It all depends on the recipient.

6-Yoma 74b3 line 40 B27
Daf Digest

הַמְאַכְלֶךָ מִן בַּמִּדְבָּר . . . לְמַעַן עֲנִתְךָ”

Who feeds you manna in the desert in order to afflict you?

The Torah refers to the eating of the manna in the desert as an affliction. Should the Jews in the desert be permitted to eat manna on Yom Kippur, since it was an “affliction” for them?

The way in which the manna was an affliction for the people was not in the eating of the manna, but in the anxiety as to whether it would actually fall and be available to them each day. The uncertainty was the affliction, not the manna itself.

6-Yoma 75a4 line 35 A11
Daf Digest

וַיֵּצֵא הָעָם וּלְקָטוֹי״

And the people shall go out and collect.

The verse in Exodus 16:4, states that individual people (singular) went out and they (plural) collected.

Apparently, there were three categories. The righteous found their portion of manna on their doorstep. The average person had to go out and gather it. The evil person had to wander all day to finally collect his quota.

They went out as individuals with unique qualities (singular), but then they had to collect their portion according to those qualities.

צְדִיקִים יָרַד עַל פֶּתַח בְּתֵיהֶם בִּינוֹנִים יֵצְאוּ וְלָקְטוּ רְשָׁעִים שָׁטוּ וְלָקְטוּ

For the righteous the manna fell in front of their home, the average people went out and gathered it, while the wicked people had to wander far to gather it.

Why did not God do a complete miracle and actually deliver the manna into their homes and onto their tables?

Why was human effort needed to complete the miracle by every segment of society?

It was to teach us that our daily bread, which requires our effort, is no less a miracle than was the heavenly bread. Both are provided for us by God and both require our effort to complete the miracle.

6-Yoma 75b4

line 38

B10

Daf Digest

דָּבָר שֶׁנִּבְלַע בְּמַאֲתָיִם וְאַרְבָּעִים וּשְׁמוֹנָה אֵיבָרִים

A food item that is absorbed in the 248 limbs of the body.

Manna was unique in that it had no extraneous matter within it and therefore, produced no waste. It was referred to as Gid Lavan. Gid like in Aggadata. Some think of Aggadata in the Talmud as extraneous material. It can be understood on a simple level, but always has a higher allegorical message, an esoteric meaning which is not obvious to all. It is our task as students, to try our best to understand the higher message. There is no extraneous matter in the Torah or in the Talmud. Aggadata is also Torah.

6-Yoma 76a1 line 6 A22
Daf Digest

מִפְּנֵי מָה לֹא יָרַד לֶחֶם לְיִשְׂרָאֵל מִן פַּעַם אַחַת

Why did the manna not fall only one time per year?

A King gave his son a yearly allowance and therefore, he saw his son only once per year.

He changed and doled out the allowance on a weekly basis and thereafter, he saw his son every week.

This daily portioning of the manna caused the people to direct their hearts to Heaven daily.

6-Yoma 76a1 line15 B3
Daf Digest

נִמְצְאוּ פוֹלְן מְכוּוֹנִים אֶת לִבָּם לְאֲבִיהֶן שֶׁבַשְׁמַיִם

It turns out that they all direct their hearts to their Father in Heaven.

Manna could have been provided only once a year. By relying on its availability daily, the people constantly turned their attention to God. They had to prove their trust in God.

Is it proper to purchase life insurance? Should we not simply trust that God will provide for our families? Yes and He did.. He provided life insurance. And He will provide the funds by which we can pay for the life insurance. The purchase of the policy does not demonstrate a lack of faith in God.

6-Yoma 76b2 line 14 A9
Weiss #204

זָכָה נִעְשָׂה רֹאשׁ לֹא זָכָה נִעְשָׂה רֵשׁ

If he is meritorious, he becomes a head (leader) through its use, if not, he becomes poor through its use.

This is said regarding drinking of wine. If one drinks in moderation it is beneficial, otherwise he becomes impoverished through it.

6-Yoma 77b2 line 16 A19
Daf Digest

עוֹבֵר עַד צְנֵאֲרוֹ בַּמַּיִם וְאִינוֹ חוֹשֵׁשׁ

A person is permitted to cross a river on Yom Kippur in order to greet his father or his Rebbe, even if he will be submerged in water up to his neck.

This is not a violation of bathing or washing one's clothes. This, may be the result of his activity, but was not his intention. It is not a Malachah Machshoves, a calculated work activity, and is therefore, permitted on Shabbos or on Yom Tov.

6-Yoma 77b2

line 22

B21

Bleich 4:139

וְהָכִי קָא מִיבְעִינָא לִיה

But he did not permit them to go back.

R Joseph permitted people to traverse a stream on Yom Kippur to hear a lecture but denied them permission to do so on their return. Abaye permitted them to return through the stream on their way home, “Lest they abstain from attending discourses in the future,” because of the inconvenience of being required to wait until the end of Yom Kippur in order to return home.

This is used to support the idea that people who respond to a life threatening event, should be permitted to have the rules of Shabbos still be superseded on their way home, to assure their participation in future emergencies.

One does not require a loud voice

Nor should he merely think his prayer in his heart, but use the voice used by Channah in her prayer.

How loud was Channah's prayer?

Rav Yosef Karo -The person himself should hear his prayer but others should not hear it.

The Zohar says even he should not be able to hear it.

Sefer B'bechor Shor-Others may hear, as long as it is not loud enough for many surrounding people to hear it.

The loudness of prayer is compared to Channah addressing the Urim V'Tumim that entails having the Kohen Gadol actually hear. So the words should be loud enough to be heard not only by yourself, but even by people in the immediate vicinity.

6-Yoma 79b2 line 33 B34
Daf Digest

אֵלֶּא מִהֶבֶּא

Rather the proof is from here. How much bread must one eat in order to join a zimun?

Minchas Chinuch inquires whether the benefit from food on Yom Kippur is prohibited when the food enters the stomach or when it enters the mouth.

A person might chew a small amount of food and spit it out or swallow a small amount and regurgitate it, his mouth may have been satisfied, but not his stomach.

The Minchas Chinuch posits that the prohibition relates to filling one's stomach, because that is where soothing one's mind or satisfying one's appetite occurs. Satisfaction is not just when food is introduced into the mouth.

6-Yoma 80b1 line 6 A20
Daf Digest

בְּשֵׁתֶּיהָ בְּדִידֶיהָ מִתְּבָא דְעֵתֶיהָ

Regarding drinking (Chazal determined that) a person's mind is put at ease with the quantity of his own cheek-full.

It is a measure calculated subjectively, since its an amount that puts a persons mind at ease. It is estimated as a quarter of a log, i.e., approximately a revii's, or about 30-40 cc.

כָּל הָאוֹכֵל וְשׂוֹתֵהּ בַּתְּשִׁיעִי מַעֲלָה עָלָיו
הַכָּתוּב כְּאִילוּ הִתְעַנָּה תְּשִׁיעִי וְעָשִׂירִי

One who eats and drinks on the 9th of Tishrei is credited by the Torah as if he had fasted on the 9th and 10th.

If the mitzvah to eat is only to aid in the fast, is a person who knows he will not fast required to keep that mitzvah?

Rashi - No. Rashi suggests that such a person is exempt from the mitzvah of eating on the 9th. However, another Rashi (in Rosh Hashanah 9a), implies that this mitzvah is an independent obligation, not associated with the upcoming Yom Kippur.

R Akiva Eiger was asked by a woman if she was required to eat on the 9th of Tishrei since eating caused her pain and suffering. He answered, “No!” In fact, she was forbidden to eat more than she ate on a normal day.

He also wondered if women are obligated in this mitzvah at all, since it is a positive commandment that is time oriented.

כָּל הָאוֹכֵל וְשׂוֹתֵהּ בַּתְּשִׁיעִי מֵעֵלָה עָלָיו
הַכָּתוּב כָּאִילוּ הִתְעַנָּה תְּשִׁיעִי וְעֲשִׂירִי

One who eats and drinks on the 9th (of Tishrei) is credited by the Torah as if he had fasted on the 9th and the 10th.

Four reasons are given for the mitzvah to eat on Erev Yom Kippur:

1. Great joy that the time for atonement has arrived.
2. The meal for this Yom Tov is on the day before the Yom Tov.
3. To strengthen our bodies to make the fast easier.
4. Or, perhaps, the contrast is to make the fast harder to bear.

If the reason is #3, there is no reason to feast on Erev Yom Kippur if you are ill or old and do not plan to fast.

If the reason is # 1, then we should eat meat to celebrate. However, if eating is only related to its effect on the fast, there is no compelling reason to include meat in that meal.

כָּל הַאוֹכֵל וְשׁוֹתֵה בַּתְּשִׁיעִי מֵעֵלָה עָלָיו
הַכָּתוּב כְּאִילוּ הִתְעַנָּה תְּשִׁיעִי וְעָשִׂירִי

Everyone who eats and drinks on the ninth, the scripture treats him as though he fasted on the ninth and the tenth.

Everyone who eats and drinks on the ninth

One of the requirements for the Sabbath or the festivals is oneg (delight). Oneg involves eating and drinking. Since that cannot be done on Yom Kippur, the oneg of Yom Kippur is observed a day earlier. Feasting on the 9th is dictated by the rules of fasting on the 10th and credit is given for observing both requirements.

6-Yoma 82a2 line 24 A23

Daf Digest

עוֹבְרָה שֶׁהִרִיחָהּ

If a pregnant woman smelled food or drink (on Yom Kippur) (line 22).

If a pregnant woman smelled food or drink on Yom Kippur, we feed it to her until she feels relieved (line 23). In the case of a sick person, we feed him on the advice of experts (line 24). If no experts are present, we feed him according to his own assessment, until he says, “Enough.” Why? Because the preservation of life overrides the prohibition of eating on Yom Kippur.

Note 22- Or the fetus smells food and craves it and if the mother does not eat both will be in danger (Rashi).

Note 23- “Feels relieved,” “Teshev Naphsha,” her soul returns to her i.e., her life is saved

Note 24 - Experts- doctors – plural suggests at least 2 doctors (see 82b line 6 B14).

6-Yoma 82a2 line 24 A23
Bleich 4:24
See note 22

עוֹבְרָה שֶׁהִרִיחָה

If a pregnant woman smelled.

If a pregnant woman smelled food (the fetus smells food and craves it and if she does not eat, both are in danger).

Sabbath observances – Kosher observances - Yom Kippur observances-All are suspended for the purpose of preserving the life of a fetus. There is an obligation to preserve fetal life therefore, it may not be destroyed with impunity. This is true even if it is a product of invitro fertilization and its development takes place outside the mother's womb.

6-Yoma 82a3 line 29 A14

Daf Digest

שֵׁאִין לְךָ דְבַר שְׁעוּמַד בְּפָנַי פְּקוּחַ נַפְשׁ

There is nothing that overrides the saving of a life.

However, there is an exception.

We learn (in Deut 22:26) that the preservation of life does not override the prohibition of illicit relations and murder. The rape of a ‘naarah’, ‘a young girl’, is “like a man who rises up against his fellow to murder him, (a rodef), so is this thing.”

(A betrothed naarah may be saved from rape at the cost of her pursuer’s life.)

6-Yoma 82a3 line 29 A14

Note 30

שֵׂאִין לְךָ דְבָר שְׂעוּמַד בְּפָנַי פְּקוּחַ נַפְשׁ

There is nothing that overrides the saving of a life.

“Observe my commandments which if a man do, he shall live by them.” (Lev 18:5)

“I have set before you life and death, blessing and curse. Choose life, so that you and your off spring may live.” (Deut 30:19)

The Rabbis concluded that there is no higher priority than saving a human life, your own or your fellow man.

.

שְׂאִין לָךְ דְּבַר שְׁעוּמַד בְּפָנֵי פְקוּחַ נַפְשׁ

There is nothing that overrides the saving of a life.

This dictum is used to permit the post mortem donation of organs to save another's' life or vital functions.

There are objections to this practice called, 'kavod hamais', 'honor of the dead'.

- Disgracing the dead, as by disfigurement.
- Deriving benefit from the dead.
- Delaying the burial.

While these matters deserve concern, they are overridden by the main purpose, which is to preserve life. Rabbi Oshry presented a case during the Holocaust, where a pregnant woman was murdered. He authorized a Cesarean section on the dead woman, in the unlikely possibility of saving the child.

חוץ מֵעֲבוּדָה זָרָה וְגִילּוּי עֲרִיּוֹת וּשְׂפִיכוֹת דָּמִים

Except for the three cardinal sins: idol worship, illicit relations, or murder.

We learn from this posuk that preservation of life does not override idol worship (Lev 18:5).

(Deut 6:5) “And you shall love HaShem your God”, (obviously, if you love HaShem you won’t exchange Him for an idol (Rashi), with all your heart, with all your soul and with all your resources.”

(Note 33)Obviously, if you love HaShem with all your soul, why does it also have to say with all your resources? It is for those whose money is more valuable to them than their lives.

יְהַרְג וְאֵל יַעֲבוֹר

Let him die and not transgress.

This is related to only three situations: murder, illicit sexual relations and idolatry. However, in every other case all laws are disregarded if they conflict with life or health.

This quote from our Talmud is used by Rav Unterman to dispense with the concerns of Kovod Hamais, i.e., disgracing the dead body, when it comes to permitting the surgical removal of organs to save the life of another human being.

Pekuach Nefesh supersedes all other laws.

מֵאֵי חֲזִית דְּדָמָא דִּי דָּרְךָ סוּמָק טְפִי

What makes you think your blood is more red than his?

We do not know the relative value of a person's life and therefore, it is beyond our capacity to make a judgment concerning whose life is more valuable. As a result, we must look upon all life as of equal, and infinite value.

However, this debate only is pertinent in regards to a person given a choice to murder or to be murdered. It does not pertain if you merely play a passive role, i.e., you will be dropped on another person and he will die, in this case, you are not making a decision.

Regarding Siamese twins: R Moshe Feinstein ruled it was appropriate to make a decision based on which twin had the normal heart and which twin had an abnormal heart. One may decide to sacrifice one baby, to save the other.

זָרוּ רְשָׁעִים מִרֶחֱם נֶפֶק מִינָה שֶׁבֶתְאֵי אֶצֶר פִּירֵי

The wicked are estranged from the womb and indeed, Shabsai, the hoarder of produce, issued from her.

This comes up in the discussion regarding establishing a co-op for Kosher meat in a town that has an established kosher butcher who will be adversely affected by the competition and unfair business practices.

Talmud Yoma 83a frowns on merchants who corner a market and raise prices (i.e., as Shabsai did, above).

In large cities there are many choices and the competition will set prices. One additional place to buy will not have a severe effect.

In small towns however, a competing co-op would adversely affect the local butcher.

Unfair competition is a serious infraction of Jewish law.

R Moshe Feinstein withheld permission from a breakaway synagogue (where there is not room enough for both, it is forbidden to infringe on the livelihood of another).

6-Yoma 83a1 line 6

A28

Daf Digest

רופא אומר צריך וחולה אומר אינו צריך שומעין לרופא.

The doctor says you need it.

The patient says, “I do not need it.”

We should listen to the doctor.

Even if the sick person is a doctor himself and understands the disease, we should listen to the objective doctor.

One of the main principles of Judaism is to nullify one’s own understanding and yield to the opinion of the Torah and the Sages. They advise us not to self-treat, but to listen to your doctor.

מי שאתחזו בולמוס

One who is seized with bulmos (a life threatening) disease caused by hunger.

1. He may eat even non-kosher food.
 2. One who was bitten by a mad dog, we do not feed him from it's unkosher liver.
 3. But R Masya ben Charash permits it.
-
1. Because the disease is caused by hunger and any food will definitely cure him.
 2. Because eating the liver of the dog that bit you is not based on logic or experience. A quack remedy is not sanctioned.
 3. Because he believes that it is a good cure.

6-Yoma 83a3

line 27

A13

Bleich 4:214-16

שׁוֹטֵה אֵין מֵאֲבִילִין אוֹתוֹ מִחֲצֵר כָּבֵד שְׁלוֹ

One who has been bitten by a mad dog should not be fed the lobe of its liver.

It is not a valid cure.

The commandment, “He shall cause him to be thoroughly healed”, (Ex 21:20) imposes an obligation to utilize only what is known to have therapeutic value, not to engage in random activity or even to initiate research, in the hope that a cure will be found. And certainly not, if Halachic prohibitions would need to be violated, in these less than clearly therapeutic measures (Rashi).

שׁוֹטָה אֵין מֵאֲבִילִין אוֹתוֹ מִחֲצֵר כָּבֵד שְׁלוֹ

One who has been bitten by a mad dog should not be fed the lobe of its liver.

But Mattia ben Henesh permits this practice.

This was a medically widespread therapy among physicians in the past. Halachic prohibitions are suspended in treating a patient with a life threatening illness, even if there is no certainty that it will eliminate the danger. No therapy is accompanied by a guarantee. There must, however, be a degree of potential benefit and not merely fervent hope. The Rabbis felt this treatment was “not a cure” and Mattia ben Henesh “thought it to be therapeutic,” at least having the possibility of therapeutic benefit.

A “quack” treatment cannot be sanctioned if it entails a violation of Halachah, but a therapy of doubtful value could be tried if no violation of Jewish law was involved.

Reason and experience as well as folk custom would determine.

6-Yoma 83a3 line 28 A13
Daf Digest

שׁוֹטֵה אֵין מֵאֲכִילִין אוֹתוֹ מִחֶצֶר כְּבֵד שְׁלוֹ

A person bitten by a mad dog may not be fed the mad dogs liver (as a treatment).

Non-Kosher ingredients used for medical treatment that have not been shown to be scientifically beneficial, may not be utilized. However, if proven effective, they may be utilized, if no alternative is available. What is the rule concerning homeopathic medications? Has that medication been demonstrated as an effective cure? That is the criteria to be used.

חַמְשָׁה דְּבָרִים נֶאֱמָרוּ בְּכֶלֶב שׁוֹטֵה

Five details are said about a mad dog.

The Sages compare those traits to a person who spreads Lashon Hara.

The dog

- It's (mad dog) mouth is always open,
- It's stench lingers,
- It's tail hangs down between his hips,
- His ears hang low,
- He stalks along the edge of the street,

- The secret to protecting yourself,

The person

- ready to share venomous slander
- slander leaves a foul and evil spirit.
- hidden, until he strikes.
- eager to hear slander about others.
- hiding, before he strikes.

- steer clear of it, before it comes close to you.

6-Yoma 84b1 line 16 B14

Daf Digest

לֹא סֵפֶק שַׁבַּת זֶה בְּלִבְדֵּי אָמְרוּ אֵלָא אֶפִּילוּ סֵפֶק שַׁבַּת אַחֲרָתָא

A person is not at risk of dying this Shabbos, but the treatment must be done to avoid his death soon.

We are allowed to violate this Shabbos to save him. Even though the danger is not for today itself. This teaches us that if we will need to violate Shabbos, do it now, rather than later, that same Shabbos. It is not better to observe Shabbos as long as possible. Also, if we must prepare medicine, for example, twice, and at least once must be on Shabbos, we can prepare both at the same time, on Shabbos.

וְאִין עוֹשִׂין דְּבָרִים הֵלְלוּ לֹא עַל יְדֵי נְכָרִים וְלֹא עַל יְדֵי כּוֹתֵיִם
אֶלָּא עַל יְדֵי גְדוּלֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

And we do not do these things by gentile, or by Cutheans only by Jewish adults.

Rambam rules that a non-Jew should not be asked to perform life-saving measures on the Sabbath. They should be performed by Jewish adults themselves. Why?

If people saw only non-Jews helping others on Shabbos, they might mistakenly believe that Jewish people may not violate the Shabbos to save a life and people would die as a result.

Some debate is raised as to whether the driver of an emergency vehicle going to the hospital should be a non-Jew, since he does not actually provide care and he drives as swiftly and safely, as others. However, R Moshe Feinstein wrote, that only Jews should be Hatzalah drivers.

6-Yoma 85a1 line 3 A15
Daf Digest

וְלִעֲנֵינָּן פְּקוּדַת נַפְשׁ אִינוּ כֵּן

In regards to saving a life it is not so.

We don't differentiate between peoples.

Saving a life takes precedence over Sabbath observance.

It does not matter if the majority of the inhabitants are Jews or non-Jews or Cutheans.

6-Yoma 85a3

line 27

A2

Responsa 1991-2000

עַד הַיְכֵן הוּא בּוֹדֵק עַד חוֹטְמוֹ

Up to where do we examine to see if he is alive? Up to his nose.

This phrase is the primary source that cessation of spontaneous respiration is the determinant of death in Jewish law.

Brain death is a criterion for confirming death in a patient who already has irreversible loss of spontaneous respiration.

בַּל אֲשֶׁר דָּכְתִּיב נְשִׁמַת רֵיחַ חַיִּים בְּאַפֵּי'וֹ

All, in whom the breath of life was in their nostrils, of all that were on dry land died (in the flood).

By linking the spirit of life to the nostrils, the Torah indicates that breathing is the most critical life function.

Rambam (commentary in Sotah 9:4)- Only when a person is determined to be no longer breathing can we determine that he is dead.

However, today we have respirators and a person is always breathing, albeit artificially. Brain death was determined to be an accepted determination of death in 1968. Judaism accepts brain death as a criteria of death only in a patient who already has irreversible absence of spontaneous respirations. R Moshe Tendler and the chief Rabbinate of Israel agree.

The determination of brain death can be made even if the patient appears to be breathing and has a pulse due to artificial machines and medications.

פִּיּוֹן דְּבִדְק לִיָּה עַד חוֹטְמוֹ שׁוֹב אֵינוֹ צָרִיךְ

Once he has checked the nose, he is not required to check further.

Death is total absence of motion in any organs of the body as manifested by cessation of both respiratory and cardiac activity, which is most important?

Our Gemara cites a case of a person buried under debris of a fallen building. As long as there is any chance of his survival, we may violate Shabbos to clear away the rubble. If we clear away his nose and we see no evidence of breathing, he is dead and we may stop. If we clear away the rubble from “the bottom up,” and find no heart activity he is considered dead also, but some controversy remains. Even if respirations and cardiac activity is not detected, but he moves his limbs, he is not considered dead. Any evidence of vital force is evidence that death has not occurred.

6-Yoma 85b1 line 5

B13

Bleich 2:208

וְשָׁמְרוּ בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת-הַשְּׂבֻתָּה׃

We shall live by them, but not die on their account.

All commandments, with the exception of the big three cardinal sins, homicide, idolatry and sexual offenses, are suspended for the purpose of saving a life. How then, can the Torah command us to wage war? As soon as there is a risk, this phrase can be used to justify you leaving the battle field in order to save your life!

Minchat Hinnuch explains that war is unique. The nature of the mitzvah to go to war or to eradicate Amalek, demands that the soldier's life be placed in danger. Since that is the essence of the obligation, that mitzvah cannot be suspended in face of possible danger.

6-Yoma 85b1 line 11 B6
Daf Digest

כְּדֵי שִׁישְׁמוֹר שַׁבָּתוֹת הַרְבֵּה

Rav Shimon's reason for saving a life on Shabbos is so that the person will observe many future Shabbosim.

What is the decision if we know a person will never observe future Shabbosim, i.e., he is mentally incompetent? Are we allowed to desecrate Shabbos to save him? The Rabbis say, yes, we must.

Schmuel says, "The laws are given to us so we may live by them and not use them, to die by them" (Vayikra 18:5).

וְשָׁמְרוּ בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת-הַשַּׁבָּת׃

The word Ve'Shamru (Ex 31:16) i.e., the children of Israel shall preserve the Sabbath.

This phrase permits the dictum, “Better to violate one Sabbath in order to observe many Sabbaths.”

This is used in the discussion to permit doctors who have responded to a life threatening emergency to return home after the emergency is over. In order for him:

1. To be in position to respond to another emergency.
2. Not to be so inconvenienced, i.e., spending Shabbos away from home, that he will be hesitant to respond to emergencies in the future. This will allow those whose lives one saved, to “observe many Sabbaths”.

6-Yoma 85b1 line 15

B13

Weiss #198

וְנָחִי בָּהֶם וְלֹא שִׁמּוֹת בָּהֶם

He shall live by them, but he shall not die because of them.

The main message is that we are not permitted to die in order not to violate any of God's mitzvahs, other than the important three cardinal sins. Another interpretation is to use this phrase to explain why we have a rule, that if you are involved in one mitzvah, you are exempt from any other (BT Succah 25a). Since you have put your entire being in the observance of one mitzvah, it is virtually impossible to bring a similar devotion to another mitzvah at the same time.

לְהַרְגֵךְ הַשָּׂמִים לְהַרְגֹוּ

If someone comes to kill, you kill him first.

This phrase is used even in relation to an abusive parent or spouse. If they will inflict bodily harm, death or rape, they can be considered a pursuer and may be stopped even to the extent of killing them, by either the victim or a third party. This is based on the dictum of saving a life, “Pekuach Nefesh.” In Jewish law, we are obligated to assist a person in danger, i.e., one being pursued or drowning. In American law, there is no mandate to get involved.

סֵפֶק מִנָּא לָן

How do we know in a case of mere possibility.

How do we know in a case of mere possibility, that a risk to life sets aside even the laws of Shabbos?

This phrase is used in the argument against suicide or assisted suicide. Preservation of life supersedes any Jewish law. It is a fundamental dictum. Shortening a life is not viewed as compassionate, but a sin. Even if the patient is in pain, there are strong medications. Even if he has a stroke or is in coma, comfort can be provided. Hospice care is a reasonable option in many cases. Assisted suicide is a slippery slope perhaps suggested to save society money. If it becomes acceptable, there would be great pressure on patients to save money for their families and for society and for the insurance companies, by requesting assisted suicide.

סֵפֶק מִנָּא לָן

6-Yoma 85b4

line 27

A7

Weiss #905

עֲבִירוֹת שְׁבִין אָדָם לְמָקוֹם יוֹם הַכַּפּוּרִים מְכַפֵּר עֲבִירוֹת
שְׁבִין אָדָם לְחֻבֵירוֹ עַד שִׁירְצָה אֶת חֻבֵירוֹ

Sins between man and God: Yom Kippur provides atonement.

However, R JB Soloveitchik says that until man appeases his fellowman and atones for all his sins, Yom Kippur does not cleanse us of individual transgressions. A person is cleansed only as a result of their total effort at purification. Just as it is impossible to immerse oneself partially in a mikvah to purify himself limb by limb, but he must immerse himself entirely in the mikvah, so too, on Yom Kippur, there can be no atonement for some of his transgressions, but only for all his transgressions.

הַעֲוֹן הַזֶּה לָכֶם עֵד-תְּמִתּוּן

This sin will not be atoned for until you die.

This suggests that death purges sin, i.e., it is the greatest form of repentance.

This concept is used in the discussion regarding suicide and assisted suicide and Judaism. Suicide is legal, in the sense that people who attempt suicide are not criminalized in any of the 50 states. Instead, they are given treatment.

In fact, according to the laws of Judaism, suicide is a greater sin than murder.

Judaism considers suicide a great sin, because:

1. The body belongs to God, even your own body. A person has no right to shorten his own life or harm his body.
2. There is no opportunity for repentance after suicide.
3. Death, the greatest form of repentance has been used to perform the greatest sin, murder.
4. He has repudiated God's ownership of his life, body and soul.

God will absolve penitents, but He will not absolve those who murder someone else.

גְּדוּלַת תְּשׁוּבָה שְׂמַנְעַת עַד בֵּסֵט הַכְּבוֹד

Repentance is great it rises to the throne of glory.

Rambam (Hilchos Teshuva 2:2) explains that teshuvah requires that we stop the sin, remove it from our hearts and resolve that we will not do that sin again.

What is the rule, if later we do repeat the sin? Does it mean that our teshuvah was insincere and it is cancelled retroactively?

No, HaShem knows how sincere we were when we made our resolution. If one does repeat that sin, it is as a new person, with a new sin, for which the person must do teshuvah, once again.

6-Yoma 86b4

line 37

B24

Weiss #207

כִּיִּן שְׁעָבַר אָדָם עֲבִירָה וְשָׁנָה בָּהּ הוֹתֵרָה לוֹ

Once a person sins, the second time it is permitted to him.

Or so it appears to him.

The urge for self justification is overpowering. A sin done frequently, becomes normal behavior and acceptable to the person as though it was permitted.

6-Yoma 86b4

B24

Daf Digest

כִּיּוֹן שְׁעֵבֶר אָדָם עֲבִירָה וְשָׁנָה בָּהּ הוֹתָרָה לוֹ

Great is repentance. It can transform premeditated sins into errors, and change those errors into merits.

R J B Soloveitchik-Repentance, generated by self examination and love of God, can motivate a person to study Torah in a different manner. Repentance from fear erases sin, but has no creative power.

R Nachman of Breslaw- If you are worthy, even your worst sins can be turned into something good. Nothing is beyond His power.

כִּיּוֹן שֶׁעָבַר אָדָם עֲבִירָה וְשָׁנָה בָּהּ הוֹתָרָה לוֹ

Once a person sins, the second time it is permitted to him.

Once a person sins, the second time it is permitted to him., or so it appears to him.

The urge for self justification is overpowering. A sin done frequently, becomes normal behavior and acceptable to the person, as though it was permitted.

6-Yoma 87b1 line 15 B19
Daf Digest

מִצְוַת וִידוּי עֶרֶב יוֹם הַכִּפּוּרִים עִם חֹשֶׁקָה

The obligation of confession (vidui) occurs on the eve of Yom Kippur, with the dark.

The vidui, as well as other prayers, and most famously Ashrei, are written following an acrostic of the Aleph Bais. The arrangement in that form is, itself, meaningful (see Berachos 4b) not merely as a device to help us memorize and recall the lines of the prayer, but it has a deeper significance.

We know that all the praises say about HaShem can be expressed only by using the 22 letters of the Aleph Bais. We cannot completely and adequately praise him. However, if we invoke the 22 letters, they can be reformatted so that they praise HaShem completely. The same with vidui. We cannot articulate all our sins, we mention the letters of the alphabet that can recombine to more completely list all our sins that need confession.

הָרִי שְׁהִיָּה שֵׁם כְּתוּב עַל בְּשָׂרוֹ
הָרִי זֶה לֹא יִרְחַץ וְלֹא יִסוּךְ

If a person had God's name written on his skin may he bathe or anoint that area?

No-The water will erase God's name, therefore, forbidden (Rashi).

No-Bathing requires standing naked before God's name, which is prohibited.

Yes-It will be erased passively not actively, but indirectly, as a result of bathing.

Yes-It is permitted, because it is not certain that an erasure will occur.

Yes-Indirect erasure is permitted when necessary to perform a mitzvah.

Yes-The reason it is permitted for a person with God's name written on his skin to bathe is, that eventually it will become erased anyway, it is not permanent. Therefore, it may be erased by bathing.

6-Yoma 88a3 line 27

B12

Daf Digest

יְדַאֵג כָּל הַשָּׁנָה כּוֹלָהּ

He should worry all year long.

A person complained to his Rabbi that every Yom Kippur he confesses his sins but then once the year starts, he goes back to them. He feels he is making no progress.

His Rabbi explained that this process is much like digging earth out of a pit and the earth falls back in and requires being dug out again. The first digging is the hardest, but thereafter, the earth is loose, it becomes more and more easy to dig it out. Things are improving and eventually the dirt will not fall back into the pit.