

23 Tammuz 5781  
July 3, 2021



Yoma Daf 83

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

The Mishnah had stated: A sick person is fed at the word of experts. Rabbi Yannai said: If the patient says, I need [food], while the doctor says: He does not need it, we listen to the patient. What is the reason? The heart knows its own bitterness. But that is self-evident? You might have said: The doctor's knowledge is more established; therefore the information [that we prefer the patient's opinion]. If the doctor says: He needs it, while the patient says that he does not need it, we listen to the doctor. Why? Delirium seized him.

We learned: A sick person is fed at the word of experts. [That implies]: Only upon the order of experts, but not upon his own order? [Further it implies]: Only upon the order of 'experts,' but not upon the order of a single expert? — This refers to the case that he says: I do not need it. But one should feed him upon the order of one expert? — This refers to the case when someone else is present who agrees that he does not need it. [If so, wherefore state that he] is fed at the word of experts. Surely that is self-evident, for it is a possibility of danger to human life and 'in the case of the possibility of danger to human life we take a more lenient view'! — It refers to a case in which two more people are present who say that he does not need it. And although Rav Safra said that 'Two are as a hundred and a hundred are as two'<sup>1</sup> applies only to witnesses, but with regard to opinion we go according to the number of opinions, all that applies only to opinions concerning money matters, but here it is a case where

there is a possibility of danger to human life. But since in the second part [of the Mishnah] it states: And if no experts are there, one feeds him at his own wish, it is to be inferred that in the first part we deal with the case that he said he needed it? There is something missing [in the Mishnah] and this is how it reads: These things are said only for the case that he says: I do not need it; but if he says: I need it, then if two experts are not there, but one who says: He does not need it, then one feeds him at his own wish.

Mar son of Rav Ashi said: Whenever he says. 'I need [food]', even if there be a hundred who say, 'He does not need it', we accept his statement, as it is said: 'The heart knows its own bitterness'. - We learned in the Mishnah: If no experts are there one feeds him at his own wish. That means only if no experts are there, but not if such experts were there? — This is what is meant: These things are said only for the case that he says, 'I do not need it', but if he says, 'I need it', then there are no experts there at all, [and] one feeds him at his own wish, as it is said: 'The heart knows its own bitterness'. (83a1 – 83a3)

MISHNAH: If one is seized by bulmos,<sup>2</sup> he may be given to eat even non-kosher things until his vision is restored. if one was bit by a mad dog, we do not give him to eat the lobe of its liver, but Rabbi Masya ben Charash permits it.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore did Rabbi Masya ben Charash say: If one has pain in his throat, he may pour medicine into his mouth on

<sup>1</sup> And yet on the strength of the two experts who say 'he needs it', he is fed.

<sup>2</sup> A life-threatening disease induced by hunger.

<sup>3</sup> That was considered a cure. The Tanna who forbids it denies its curative value, hence its use is forbidden. Rabbi Masya ben Charash believed in this cure, hence permitted it.

the Shabbos, because it is a possibility of danger to human life and every danger to human life suspends the [laws of the] Shabbos. If debris fall on someone, and it is doubtful whether or not he is there, or whether he is alive or dead, or whether he is a Cuthite or a Jew, one should open [even on Shabbos] the heap of debris for his sake. If one finds him alive one should remove the debris, and if he be dead one should leave him there [until the Shabbos day is over]. (83a3)

GEMARA: Our Rabbis taught: How did they know that his vision has been restored again? When he distinguishes between good and bad [food]. — Abaye said: Through its taste.

Our Rabbis taught: If one was seized by bulmos, one feeds him with the less forbidden things first; as between tevel [untithed food] and neveilah,<sup>4</sup> one should feed him neveilah first; between tevel and Shemittah produce, one should give him Shemittah produce first.<sup>5</sup> As between terumah and tevel, Tannaim are of divided opinion. For it was taught: One should feed him tevel, but not terumah. Ben Teima holds: Terumah, but not tevel. Rabbah said: If it is possible [to feed him] with chullin, there is general agreement that one should prepare it for him<sup>6</sup> and feed him with it; the dispute concerns the case when it is not possible [to feed him] with chullin; one holds that [the prohibition of] tevel is more severe, the other assuming that the prohibition of terumah is the more severe. The

one holds that [the prohibition of] eating tevel is more severe because terumah is permissible to Kohanim. The other holding [the prohibition of] terumah more severe, whereas tevel may be rendered right [by tithing].

‘If it be possible with chullin [etc.]’. Surely it is self-evident? - This refers to the case [that it would have to be done] on the Shabbos.<sup>7</sup> But on the Shabbos, too, it is self-evident, because moving is forbidden only by Rabbinic decree?<sup>8</sup> — We deal here with an unperforated pot, the obligation on which, too’ is only Rabbinic.<sup>9</sup> - ‘One holds [the prohibition of] tevel is more severe, the other holding [the prohibition of] terumah more severe.

Shall we say that Tannaim have been disputing this matter already? For it was taught: If one was bitten by a snake, one may call for him a doctor from one place into another,<sup>10</sup> or tear open a hen for him, or cut leak from the ground for him, give it to him to eat, without having separated its tithe; this is the view of Rebbe. Rabbi Elozar son of Rabbi Shimon said: He must not eat until tithe has been separated. Shall we say that it is in accord with Rabbi Elozar son of Rabbi Shimon, and not with Rebbe?<sup>11</sup> — You may even say that it is in accord with Rebbe's view. Rebbe [one may say] makes his statement only here because the tithe of vegetables is in question and that is due but Rabbinically, but in the case of the tithe of grain, which is obligatory by Biblical law, even, Rebbe would agree that if you permit him to eat without [due tithing] in the case of

<sup>4</sup> Whenever the permitted and forbidden food alone are insufficient to restore the patient, one should proceed by eliminating as far as possible the more forbidden foods. Untithed food involves punishment of death by divine hand, whereas the eating of neveilah involves only the punishment of lashes.

<sup>5</sup> Similarly is the Shemittah produce less ‘forbidden’, its eating implies much less penalty than the eating of tevel, because there only the transgression of a positive commandment is involved.

<sup>6</sup> By setting aside the prescribed dues.

<sup>7</sup> On the Shabbos it is not usually permitted to separate the terumah.

<sup>8</sup> The prohibition to set aside on Shabbos any of the priestly dues is of Rabbinical origin, in the same category as moving about on the Shabbos articles that are unfit for use.

<sup>9</sup> I.e., the tevel under consideration grew in an unperforated pot, and consequently not subject biblically to priestly dues. Nevertheless, where it can be rendered right by setting aside the dues, we are told one should rather override the shevus involved than feed him with what is regarded as tevel only Rabbinically.

<sup>10</sup> On the Shabbos, as a rule, that would not be permitted, but in the case of a possible danger to human life, that restriction would be inoperative.

<sup>11</sup> I.e., Rabbah's principle is in agreement with Rabbi Elozar ben Rabbi Shimon, who likewise holds that the vegetables must be first tithed even on Shabbos, although they are subject to tithes only Rabbinically.

an unperforated pot, he would come to eat likewise even in the case of a perforated pot.<sup>12</sup> (83a4 – 83b1)

Our Rabbis taught: If one was seized with bulmos, he is given to eat honey and all kinds of sweet things, for honey and very sweet food restore the vision of man. And although there is no proof for the matter, there is an intimation in this respect: See now, how my eyes lit up because I tasted a little of this honey. What does ‘although there is no proof for the matter’ mean? Because there, no bulmos has seized him.

Abaye said: This applies only after a meal, but before the meal, it even increases one's appetite, as it is written: And they found an Egyptian in the field, and brought him to David, and gave him, bread, and he did eat, and they gave him water to drink, and they gave him a piece of cake of figs, and two clusters of raisins, and when he had eaten, his spirit came back to him, for he had eaten no bread, nor drunk any water, three days and three nights.

Rav Nachman said in the name of Shmuel: If one was seized by a bulmos, one should give him to eat a tail (of a sheep) with honey. Rav Huna, the son of Rav Yehoshua said: Also pure flour with honey. Rav Pappa said: Even barley-flour with honey [is effective].

Rabbi Yochanan said: Once I was seized by bulmos, whereupon I ran to the eastern side of a fig-tree, thus making true in my own case: Wisdom preserves the life of he who has it, for Rav Yosef learned: One who would taste the [full] taste of a fig, turns to its eastern side, as it is said: And for the precious things of the fruits of the sun.

Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Yosi were walking together when a bulmos seized Rabbi Yehudah. He seized a shepherd and devoured his bread. Rabbi Yosi said to him:

You have robbed the shepherd! As they entered the city, bulmos seized Rabbi Yosi. They brought him all sorts of foods and dishes. Whereupon Rabbi Yehudah said to him: I may have deprived the shepherd, but you have deprived a whole town.

Also, Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Yosi were on a journey together. Rabbi Meir always paid close attention to people's names, whereas Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Yosi paid no such attention to them. Once as they came to a certain place. they looked for a lodging, and as they were given it, they said to him [the innkeeper]: What is your name? — He replied: Kidor. Then he [Rabbi Meir] said: From there it is evident that he is a wicked man, for it is said: For they are a generation [ki-dor] of reversals. Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Yosi entrusted their purses to him; Rabbi Meir did not entrust his purse to him, but went and placed it on the grave of that man's father. Thereupon the man had a vision in his dream [saying]: Go, take the purse lying at the head of this man! In the morning he [the innkeeper] told them [the Rabbis] about it, saying: This is what appeared to me in my dream. They replied to him: There is no substance in the dream of the Shabbos night. Rabbi Meir went, waited there all day, and then took the purse with him. In the morning they [the Rabbis] said to him: ‘Give us our purses’. He said: There never was such a thing! Rabbi Meir then said to them: Why don't you pay attention to people's names? They said: Why have you not told this [before]. Sir? He answered: consider this but a suspicion. I would not consider that a definite presumption! Thereupon they took him [the host] into a shop [and gave him wine to drink]. Then they saw lentils on his moustache. They went to his wife and gave her that as a sign, and thus obtained their purses and took them back. Whereupon he went and killed his wife. It is with regard to this that it was taught: [Failure to observe the custom of] the first water<sup>13</sup> caused one to eat the meat of

<sup>12</sup> In which case the obligation is Biblical, which involves the penalty of death by divine decree.

<sup>13</sup> The washing of hands before meals implies ‘the first water’, as against the latter water-washing of the hands after meals, to remove



pig, [failure to use] the second water killed a person. At the end they, too, paid close attention to people's names. And when they called to a house whose [owner's] name was Balah, they would not enter, saying: He seems to be a wicked man, as it is written: Then I said of her that was [balah] worn out by adulteries. (83b1 – 83b4)

The Mishnah had stated: If someone was bitten by a mad dog. Our Rabbis taught: Five things were mentioned in connection with a mad dog. Its mouth is open, its saliva dripping, its ears flap, its tail is hanging between its thighs, it walks on the edge of the road. Some say: Also it barks without its voice being heard. Where does it come from? — Rav said: Witches are having their fun with it. Shmuel said: An evil spirit rests upon it. What is the practical difference between these two views? — This is the difference as to killing it by throwing something at it. It was taught in accordance with Shmuel: When one kills it, one does so only with something thrown against it. One against whom it rubs itself is endangered; one whom it bites, dies. 'One against whom it rubs itself is endangered'. What is the remedy? — Let him cast off his clothing, and run. As happened with Rav Huna, the son of Rav Yehoshua, against whom one mad dog rubbed itself in the market-place: he stripped off his garments and ran, saying: I fulfilled in myself. 'Wisdom preserves the life of he who has it'. (83b4 – 84a1)

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### *Lashon Hara*

The *D'aas Kedoshim* writes that the Chachamim compared one who speaks Lashon hara to a mad dog. This statement is sufficient to humiliate one who speaks Lashon hara, as

---

any fat, grease, crumbs, from the meal. The one precedes the blessing before the meal, the other the grace after meals. Failure to wash his hands before meals caused one to eat pork. A certain innkeeper, who served both Jews and heathens, guided himself by the attitude of the guests as to 'first waters'. Once a non-conforming Jew entered,

man was created in the image of G-d and through his despicable actions he can be denigrated to the level of a mad dog.

The analogy of one who speaks Lashon hara to a mad dog is appropriate, as both the one who speaks Lashon hara and a mad dog have similar characteristics.

The Gemara states that five things were said regarding a mad dog. Its mouth is open, its saliva drips, its ears droop, its tail rest on its legs, and it walks on the side of the road. Some say it also barks but its voice is not heard. One who speaks Lashon hara always has his mouth open, and he is constantly dripping saliva, i.e. words of slander and degradation. One who speaks Lashon hara also has drooping ears, because the Gemara in Kesubos 5a states that one should pace his earlobe inside his ear so he should not hear improper words, whereas one who speaks Lashon hara not only does not refrain from hearing Lashon hara, but he widens his ears to hear more Lashon hara. For this reason he is likened to a mad dog whose ears are enlarged and doubled over. Furthermore, the mad dog walks on the side of the road, and a person who walks on the side of the road is deemed to be arrogant. It is well-known that arrogance leads one to denigrate the righteous. Lastly, the one who speaks Lashon hara is likened to a mad dog that barks but its voice is not heard. The one who speaks Lashon hara is concerned that the person he denigrates should not be informed of the slander, and if the victim is informed, the one who slandered him will deny his wrongdoing. Since he "barks" but his voice is not heard, the righteous person who is a victim of the slander is not aware of the words that were spoken against him and it is difficult to spare himself from

asked for a meal, without washing his hands; the innkeeper taking him for a heathen, placed pork before him (Rashi). In our case, had Kidor washed his hands after meals, and as is usual in such a case, wiped his upper lip, the traces of his repast would not have been visible, the Rabbis would have had no clue as to how to restore their purses to themselves, and the enraged thief would not have killed his wife.



the suffering which is caused by the one who barks and bites with his speech.

#### ***Providing the Sick with the most Lenient Prohibition***

The Gemara states that when there is no permitted food available to improve one's health, he is permitted to consume prohibited food. Nonetheless, we must first feed him from forbidden foods whose consumption is of less severity in punishment. An example of this would be a food that is only forbidden on account of a positive commandment, such as food that was planted during the *Shemittah* year. The prohibition of consuming such a food is more lenient than the prohibition of consuming *tevel*, which is food that *Terumah* and *Maaser* was not yet designated, and one who consumes *tevel* is punishable by death from heaven.

The *Ohr Samaeyach* in *Hilchos Maachalos Asuros* 14:14 suggests that this guideline only applies to the one who is feeding the sick person. The sick person himself, however, is not required to be particular and he can eat whatever he desires.

The *Ohr Samaeyach* writes that this idea that the sick person does not have to be particular regarding what he eats would be analogous to the rule regarding a *rodeif*, one who is chasing after someone with the intent to kill him. A bystander can attempt to intervene by wounding the assailant but he must ensure that he does not kill the assailant. The victim, however, is not required to make such a calculation and he can actually kill the attacker.

The *Ohr Samaeyach* writes that this is implied in the words of the Gemara that states that one who was seized with *bulmus*, we "feed" him the least severe of the forbidden foods available, implying that only the one performing the feeding must make a calculation, but the one consuming the food is not required to make such a calculation.

#### ***Listening to the Sick Person on Yom Kippur***

Rabbi Yannai maintains that if a sick person declares that he must eat on Yom Kippur and the doctor disagrees, we listen to the sick person and give him to eat. The rationale for this ruling is that *the heart knows the bitterness of its soul* and we assume that he does not want to be wicked and violate the prohibition of eating on Yom Kippur.

The *Shulchan Aruch* in *Orach Chaim* 618:1 rules that even if there are one hundred doctors that concur that the sick person does not need to eat, we still listen to the sick person.

*Mishna Berurah* writes that we must verify that the sick person knows that it is Yom Kippur, because it is possible that he forgot what day it was.

The Gemara states further that if the doctor maintains that the sick person must eat and the sick person disagrees, we listen to the doctor and give him to eat. The sick person's feelings are disregarded because it is possible that he was delirious due to his sickness.

*Shulchan Aruch* in *Orach Chaim* 618:2 rules that if one doctor claims that the sick person should eat and another doctor disagrees, we give the sick person to eat. The rationale for this ruling is that when there is a doubt regarding saving someone's life, we rule leniently.

*Shulchan Aruch* in *Orach Chaim* 328:10 rules that if anyone claims that there is a sickness for which we need to desecrate the Shabbos, we listen to that person even if he is not an expert in the medical field, as we rule leniently when one's life is in danger. Regarding Yom Kippur, however, *Shulchan Aruch* does not make mention of the need to consult a medical expert.

The Rema in *Darchei Moshe* to *Orach Chaim* 618:3, however, maintains that a medical expert is not necessary as long as one claims that he recognizes the sickness.



## DAILY MASHAL

### ***Bad Names; Bad Deeds***

The Gemara relates a story where Rabbi Meir determined that an innkeeper was a wicked person by examining his name.

*Tosefes Yom HaKippurim* questions this from a Medrash in Parshas Shelach regarding the names of the spies that Moshe sent to inquire about Eretz Yisroel. The Medrash states that some of their names were pleasant yet their deeds were despicable whereas others had despicable names yet their deeds were virtuous. Thus, we see that a name is not always indicative of one's actions.

The *Tosefes Yom HaKippurim* answers that this Medrash would be deemed an anomaly, as people whose names have negative connotations usually act in a despicable manner.

The *Shearim Mitzuyanim B'Halacha*, however, posits that Rabbi Meir is of the opinion that we must always be concerned for the minority and it was for this reason that Rabbi Meir suspected the innkeeper of evil intentions. The language that Rabbi Meir used is proof to this, as Rabbi Meir said, "when I said that one should be particular about names, I meant only that someone with a name that has negative connotations warrants suspicion." Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Yose, who were traveling with Rabbi Meir, maintained that one always follows the majority opinion, and in this instance they felt that the majority of names are not indicative of one's character.

### ***Story Regarding the Riva***

The Radvaz (3:444) relates an incident regarding the Riva, one of the Baalei HaTosafos, who was ill with an illness that he eventually succumbed to. The doctor informed the Riva that if he were to fast on Yom Kippur he definitely would not be able to continue living and were he to eat, it would be possible that he could continue to live. The Riva

was adamant in his refusal to eat on Yom Kippur and he subsequently died. The Radvaz writes that the Riva certainly did not maintain that one is permitted to be stringent with regard to his own health, as one is prohibited from disobeying the directives of the doctor. If one was coerced to violate a mitzvah in the Torah, if through his death HaShem's Name will be sanctified, he is permitted to forgo his life. Rather, the Riva was aware that even if he were to eat he was not going to live and this is an illustration of the proverbial dictum that *the heart knows the bitterness of its soul*.