

23 Elul 5777
Sept. 14, 2017



Sanhedrin Daf 60

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h
Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Other Noahide Laws

Rabbi Shimon had said that the Noahites are prohibited from engaging in sorcery. The *Gemora* cites the Scriptural source for this.

Rabbi Eliezer had said that they are warned against *kilayim* as well. The *Gemora* cites the Scriptural source for this. (59b – 60a)

Which Name?

The *Mishna* had stated: Rabbi Yehoshua ben Korchah said: Every day they examine the witnesses with a substitute name, by asking them (*did the defendant say*) “May Yosi strike Yosi”? [*“Yosi” is chosen as a substitute, because it contains four letters, like the Specific Name of God, which must have been used by the blasphemer for him to be punished. Moreover, the numerical value of “Yosi” is the same as of Elokim.*]

Rav Acha ben Yaakov said: He is not liable for “blessing” Hashem unless he used the Four-letter Name (*of Hashem*), but not if he used the Two-letter Name.

The *Gemora* asks: Is this not obvious, for the *Mishna* stated: “May Yosi strike Yosi” (*indicating that the Name consisting of four letters must be used*)?

The *Gemora* answers: I might have thought that this Name is used as a mere illustration; Rav Acha therefore teaches us otherwise.

The *Gemora* cites another version: Rav Acha ben Yaakov said: He is liable for “blessing” Hashem even if he used the Four-letter Name (*and he is not required to use the Forty-two-letter Name*).

The *Gemora* asks: Is this not obvious, for the *Mishna* stated: “May Yosi strike Yosi” (*indicating that the Name consisting of four letters can be used*)?

The *Gemora* answers: I might have thought that this Name is used as a mere illustration; Rav Acha therefore teaches us otherwise. (60a)

“Blessing” Hashem

The *Mishna* had stated: If the judgment is concluded, they do not execute him with a substitute name, but rather, they send out every person and ask the greatest witness among them, and they say to him, “Say explicitly what you heard the defendant say,” and he says it. The judges stand on their feet, and they rend their garments and they do not mend them.

The *Gemora* asks: How do we know that they must stand when they hear Hashem’s Name?



Rabbi Yitzchak bar Ami answers: It is written: *And Ehud came to him (Eglon the king of Moav) and he was sitting alone in a cool upper parlor which he had for himself. And Ehud said, "I have a message from God to you." And he arose out of his seat.* Now, is this not a *kal vachomer*: If Eglon the king of Moav, who was an idolater and knew but a subordinate Name of God (Elokim), nevertheless arose, how much more so must a Jew arise when he hears the Specific Name!

The *Gemora* cites the Scriptural source which teaches us that they must rend their garments when they hear Hashem's Name.

The *Gemora* cites the Biblical source which teaches us that the rent garments are never repaired.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: The one who hears the blasphemy himself and the one who hears about it from someone who heard it initially are required to rend their garments. The witnesses are not required to rend their garments when they testify regarding the blasphemy in *Beis Din* since they already rent them when they heard the blasphemy.

The *Gemora* cites the Scriptural source which teaches us that once they rent their garments when they heard the blasphemy, they are not required to rend their garments again in *Beis Din*.

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: If one hears the Divine Name blasphemed by an idolater, he is not required to rend his clothes. And if you will challenge this from the incident with Ravshakeh (*when Chizkiyah the King rent his garments when he heard Ravshakeh "bless" Hashem*), the answer is that was an apostate (*mummar*) Israelite.

And Rav Yehudah also said in the name of Shmuel: One does not rend his garments unless he hears the Specific Name of Hashem; this excludes all the subordinate Names.

Shmuel's teachings are both in disagreement with Rabbi Chiya. For Rabbi Chiya said: He who hears the Divine Name blasphemed nowadays does not need to rend his garments, for otherwise his garments would be filled with tears (*for it would be done constantly, for the blasphemers do not fear the courts*). Now, from whom does he hear it? It cannot be from a Jew, for they would not be so irreligious (*to blaspheme so frequently*). Obviously, he is referring to an idolater. Now, if the Specific Name is meant, are idolaters so well familiar with it? He must therefore be referring to a subordinate Name, and concerning that he says that only nowadays is one exempt from rending his garments, but originally, one would have been obligated to rend his clothes. This proof is conclusive.

The *Mishna* had stated: And the second witness says, "I also heard like him."

Rish Lakish said: This proves that when a witness (does not state explicitly his testimony, but rather) says "I am like him," that is valid testimony in monetary and capital cases, but the Rabbis imposed a stringency (*insisting that each witness should explicitly testify what he saw or heard*). Here, however, since it is an impossibility (*for the second witness to testify what he heard because it is our desire to avoid the unnecessary mentioning of Hashem's Name*), they reverted to the Biblical law. For should you maintain that such testimony is even Biblically invalid, how can we execute a person when the testimony cannot be validly given (*even though it's impossible for him to say it*)?



The *Mishna* concluded: And the third says, "I also did."

This, the *Gemora* notes, is following Rabbi Akiva's opinion, who compares three witnesses to two (*and that is why the third one is examined, for if he would become disqualified, the entire set of witnesses would be ruled invalid*). (60a)

Mishna

The following get punished by stoning: One who serves an idol – whether he serves, sacrifices, burns an offering, pours a libation, bows down, accepts it as a deity, or if he says to it, "You are my god." But if he embraces, kisses, sweeps, sprinkles, washes, anoints, dresses, or puts shoes on the idol, he transgresses a negative prohibition. If he makes a vow in its name or he swears in its name, he transgresses a negative prohibition. One who defecates to *Baal Pe'or*, this is its service. One who throws a stone to *Markulis*, this is its service. (60b)

Serving an Idol

The *Gemora* asks: What does the *Mishna* mean when it said, "one who serves"?

Rabbi Yirmiyah says: It means that he serves the idol in its usual manner (*including embracing and kissing, even if it is in a disgraceful way*), or he sacrifices, burns an offering, pours a libation, bows down (*any service that is performed in the Temple*) – even if it is done in a manner which is not usual for it.

The *Gemora* asks: Why doesn't the *Mishna* include a person who sprinkles blood (*since this was performed in the Temple*)?

Abaye answers: Sprinkling is included in the case of pouring a libation.

The *Gemora* cites the Scriptural source which teaches us that one is subject to stoning if he sacrifices, burns an offering, pours a libation, bows down to an idol – even if it is done in a manner which is not usual for it. The *Gemora* cites verses which teach us the punishment and the warning. The verses also teach us that one is not subject to stoning if he embraces, kisses, or puts shoes on the idol (*when it is not in the usual manner*). We derive from slaughtering that in order to be subject for stoning, it must be a service that was performed in the Temple. (60b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Erasing Elokim

The Teshuvos Avnei Tzedek wonders if it would be permitted for a scribe to erase the name "Elokim" in the verse, "Zovei'ach la'Elokim Yererem" – "One who slaughters to the gods shall be destroyed," for according to our *Gemora*, this name is referring to idolatry. Accordingly, it would be permitted to erase that word if the scribe would need to fix the Sefer Torah.

However, based upon Kabbalah, and similarly, it is written in the Zohar, that the Name has sanctity to it; it therefore would be forbidden to erase it.

The *halachah* is that if the scribe does not write the Name of Hashem with specific intent to sanctify it, the Sefer Torah is invalid. Accordingly, there would be a

practical difference in this dispute: should the scribe have intent to sanctify this name when initially writing it in the Sefer Torah? According to our *Gemora*, he should not, but based upon the Zohar, he should.

According to the above, if a Sefer Torah would come before a scribe and there would be a necessity for him to fix this word, there would arise a *halachic* doubt if he would be permitted to erase it or not - for possibly the original scribe wrote it with sanctity according to the Zohar's opinion, and if so, it would be like all of the other Names of Hashem, and it would be forbidden to erase it.

The Avnei Tzedek concludes that since it is a "sefeik sefeika," it would be permitted to erase it. Firstly, there is a doubt if the Name is holy at all, and secondly - even if it is holy, perhaps the scribe did not write it in sanctity, for he maintained that the *halachah* is according to the *Gemora* that it is not holy, and since it was written without the intent of sanctifying it, it would be permitted to erase it (based upon a Shach Y"D 276).

DAILY MASHAL

Blood and forbidden fat created with the *Sefer Yetzirah*

Our *sugya* relates that Rabbi Shimon ben Chalafta encountered two lions while he was going from place to place. Alarmed at the danger, he pronounced the verse "The young lions roar for prey" (Tehillim 104:21) and a miracle immediately occurred. Two pieces of meat fell from the sky and the lions satisfied their hunger with one of them. He took the other piece of meat to the *beis midrash* and asked if it was *tahor* – i.e., allowed to be eaten. The *chachamim* replied that it was surely *tahor* as "nothing impure descends from heaven."

The Gemara later recounts (67b) that Rav Chanina and Rav Oshaya would learn the halachos of creation every *erev Shabos*. They combined letters of Hashem's name by which He created the world and a fine calf was created for them, which they ate. The Gemara does not mention if the calf needed *shechitah* or, as it was not born naturally, did not require *shechitah*. The Acharonim discuss this question and HaRav Yeshayah Halevi Horovitz, the *Shelah Hakadosh (parashas Vayeishev, p. 70)*, asserts that an animal created with the *Sefer Yetzirah* needs no *shechitah*. The *Seder HaDoros* concludes that our *sugya* proves likewise (*Seder Tanaim VaAmoraim, os Shin, Ma'areches Rabbi Shim'on ben Chalafta, os B', 182*), as Rabbi Shimon ben Chalafta was satisfied when he heard that the meat derived from a kosher animal. If an unnaturally born animal needs *shechitah*, he could never have eaten the meat.

The author of *Tur Barekes (Hilchos Yom Tov, p. 143)* adds that there is no need for *nikur* (removing the forbidden fat and veins) in an animal come down from heaven, nor any need to remove the *gid hanasheh*. Still, the *Sedei Chemed (Ma'areches Chametz Umatzah, 2:3)* warns that a person should rather suspect that the wind brought such a piece of meat onto his premises: the halachos mentioned in the Gemara were intended for the Amoraim who could create animals with the *Sefer Yetzirah* and who knew very well if a certain piece fell from heaven.

We should mention the interesting remark of Rabbi Tzadok HaKohen of Lublin (§6), that though a created animal needs no *shechitah*, it may be sacrificed in the Temple.