

29 Iyar 5781  
May 11, 2021



Yoma Daf 30

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

Rav Pappa said: If there is excrement in its place (the anus), he is forbidden to read the Shema.

The *Gemora* analyzes this halachah: How shall we consider this case? If it is visible, that is self-evident; if it is invisible, surely ‘The Torah was not given to the ministering angels!’ [What is there for him to do?]

The *Gemora* explains the case: It refers to a situation in which it is visible when he sits and invisible when he stands.

The *Gemora* asks: But what is the difference between this and one who has excrement on his body, for it has been stated: If there is some excrement on a man’s flesh, or if his hand is inside a latrine (*by inserting his hand through a window*), Rav Huna says that he is permitted to say the *Shema*, while Rav Chisda says that he is forbidden to say the *Shema*. [the *Gemora* in Brachos 25a explains: Rava said: What is Rav Huna’s reason? It is because it is written: *Let everything that breathes praise God (so it is only the mouth and the nose that need to be clean in order to praise God; the other organs do not need to be)*. And Rav Chisda says that it is forbidden to say the *Shema*. What is Rav Chisda’s reason? It is because it is written: *All my bones shall say, “God, who is like You?”*]

The *Gemora* answers: In its place, the vileness is most deplorable; away from it, it is less so. (30a1 – 30a2)

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: This is the halachah with regard to a meal: If a man goes out to urinate, he washes his one hand (used to wipe away the droplets) and re-enters. If (while outside) he conversed with his fellow and waited (for some time), he washes both his hands and re-enters. When

he washes his hands, he should not wash them outside and enter, because of the suspicion (that people will think he did not wash), but he should enter, sit at his place and wash his two hands there, then pass the pitcher around to the guests (for them to wash their hands – if they need to; but this way, he indicates to them that he indeed washed).

Rav Chisda said: What we said (that he should not wash outside) refers to drinking (i.e., he only intends to drink), but as to eating, he may wash his hands outside and re-enter, for people know that he is fastidious of taste (and he most certainly will not touch food without washing first).

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: I would do the same before drinking, as people know me to be fastidious. (30a2)

MISHNAH: No man, even if he were *tahor*, could enter the Temple Courtyard, without having immersed himself.

The *Kohen Gadol* on *Yom Kippur* must immerse five times in a *mikvah* and wash his hands and feet ten times, and all these immersions were in the holy, on the roof of the Parvah Chamber, with the exception of this one (the first one), which was in an unsanctified place, on top of the Gate of the Water, which was beside his own chamber. A linen sheet was spread between him and the people. (30a2)

GEMARA: Ben Zoma was asked: What is the purpose of this immersion (if he is *tahor* anyway)? He answered: If one (a *Kohen Gadol* on *Yom Kippur*) who moves from one holy place to another and from one place (the entering of) which (in *tumah*) involves *kares* to another place (the entering of) which (in *tumah*) involves *kares*, requires immersion, how much more so shall he require immersion when he moves

from his non-sacred home into the holy Temple, and from a place (the entering of) which (in tumah) does not involve kares, to a place (the entering of) which (in tumah) involves kares! Rabbi Yehudah, however, said: It is only a “reminder” immersion required, so that he may remember if there is any tumah on him and abstain from entering.

What principle are they arguing about? The issue is whether the service is desecrated (by performing a service without immersing first in the morning). According to Ben Zoma, the service is desecrated, and according to Rabbi Yehudah he does not.

The *Gemora* asks: But is the service, in accordance with Ben Zoma’s opinion, desecrated? Has it not been taught in a *Baraisa*: If a *Kohen Gadol* did not immerse himself or wash his hands and feet between changes of clothes and services (i.e. on *Yom Kippur*), his service is still considered valid. However, if a *Kohen Gadol* or an ordinary *Kohen* did not wash their hands and feet in the morning, their service is invalid.

Rather, the *Gemora* asserts, the dispute concerns the question as to whether he transgresses a positive command or not. Ben Zoma holds that he transgresses a positive command, and Rabbi Yehudah maintains that he does not.

The *Gemora* asks: But does Rabbi Yehudah indeed hold this view? Has it not been taught in a *Baraisa*: A metzora (on his last day of purification) immerses himself and stands in the Nikanor Gate. Rabbi Yehudah said: He does not need to immerse himself, for he has done so already on the evening before!

The *Gemora* answers: This has its own reason, as it was taught explicitly: It is because he had immersed himself on the evening before.

The *Gemora* asks: What was he who asked this thinking (when the resolution is quite obvious)?

The *Gemora* answers: It is because he wanted to raise another objection (from a different *Baraisa*, which states): Why was it called the Chamber of the Metzora'im? It is because the metzoraim immerse themselves there. Rabbi Yehudah says: Not only of the metzoraim did they say this, but of every man (who enters the Courtyard)? [R' Yehudah contradicts himself regarding the requirement of immersion for a metzora on his eighth day before inserting his thumb and toe into the Courtyard!]

The *Gemora* answers: That is not difficult, as one *Baraisa* refers to the case that he immersed himself (the evening before), whereas the other *Baraisa* refers to the case that he did not.

The *Gemora* asks: But, if he did not immerse himself, he must await nightfall (before entering)?

The *Gemora* answers: Rather, in both cases he is presumed to have immersed himself (beforehand), but one *Baraisa* is referring to a case where he diverted his attention (on the necessity of preventing *tumah*; and that is why he is required to immerse again), whereas the other *Baraisa* is referring to a case where he did not divert his attention at all.

The *Gemora* asks: But if he diverted his attention from it, he would need to be sprinkled on the third and the seventh day, for Rabbi Dostai ben Masun said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: Wherever attention is diverted, sprinkling on the third and the seventh day is required?

The *Gemora* answers: Rather, in both cases he is presumed not to have diverted the attention, yet there is no contradiction, for in one case he is presumed to have immersed himself for the purpose of entering the Temple, whereas in the other he is assumed to have done so without that purpose in mind (and therefore a new immersion is required).

Alternatively, you can answer by reading the *Baraisa* as follows: Rabbi Yehudah says: It was not said regarding

metzoraim, but rather, of every man (who enters the Courtyard).

Ravina said: Rabbi Yehudah makes his statement only as a response to the words of the Rabbis: As far as my view is concerned, a metzora does not need another immersion, but according to your opinion, admit at least that not only of the metzoraim did they say this, but of every man (who enters the Courtyard). And the Rabbis responded by saying that a metzora is accustomed to *tumah* (and therefore requires a new immersion); all others, however, are unaccustomed to it. (30a3 – 30b2)

Abaye said to Rav Yosef: Shall we say that the Rabbis who dispute with Rabbi Yehudah are of the opinion of Ben Zoma (that it is a Biblical requirement, even for a *tahor* person, to immerse before entering the Temple), and the reason they make reference to the metzora is to inform you of the far-reaching consequences of Rabbi Yehudah's opinion (that he does not need to immerse); or perhaps the difference in the case of the metzora lies in the fact that he is accustomed to the *tumah*? He answered: It is different with the metzora, because he is accustomed to his *tumah*. (30b2 – 30b3)

#### DAILY MASHAL

##### *Knowing the Torah Like the Angels*

One must always be exceedingly vigilant to avoid embarrassing any human being. Chazal compare doing so to murder, and they prescribed that one cast himself into a fiery furnace rather than fall into this prohibition. Although some Rishomin write that this is merely a *middas chassidus*, Rav Shlomo Zalman Aurebach, zt"l, rules like most Rishonim who take this at face value.

This is one reason why Rav Fischer, zt"l, refused to test children while their teachers were present. Not only that, but he would test each student separately, lest one who was less prepared be shamed in front of his friends. When the melamed would naturally ask after their performance, Dayan

Fischer would invariably reply, "They knew the material." He would immediately add, "Some knew more and some less, but they all knew..."

A certain father was very proud of his unmarried son who was studying for the first chelek of Yoreh Deiah in the hopes of becoming a Rav. When the young man finished the first one hundred and eleven simanim—the customary test for a Rav in those days—his father took him to the famous Rav Aizel of Slonim, zt"l, to be tested for semichah. However, although the young man had covered all of the material, his method had hardly been thorough. Sadly, his "good answers" proved that he was not nearly ready for the rigorous test which was the only way to obtain semichah from Rav Aizel.

The test had not been given in a public place, but there were several scholars waiting to speak with Rav Aizel there who witnessed the young man's performance. They wondered how Rav Aizel would manage to reject him without shaming him or his father. But they could never have guessed what the Rav's response would actually be. He turned to the father and said, "Although I cannot give your son semichah now, you should know that he is a malach, an angel." The father was thrilled with this approbation, and floated from the room.

Afterward, one puzzled scholar asked Rav Aizel, "Whatever did you mean? The boy is clearly an am ha'aretz!" Rav Aizel replied with a twinkle in his eye, "Does it not say in Yoma 30a that the Torah was not given to the ministering angels?"