

# daf yomi summary

## parashat Miketz 5781

פסחים יט - כה

EDITION: 47

### THE SPIRITUALITY IN MIKETZ

#### THANKS

I saw an interesting observation of Rabbi Aharon of Karlin brought down in the sefer Parperaot L'Torah. R' Aharon notes that following Yaakov's dream with the angels in which Hashem assures him that his descendants will inherit Eretz Yisroel and of Yaakov's own well-being during his travels outside Eretz Yisroel, the Torah states, "V'yikatz Yaakov mishenato v'yomer achayn yesh Hashem bemakom hazeh - Yaakov awoke from his sleep and said "Surely there is Hshem in this place..." (28:16).

Contrast this with the first dream of Pharoah in which he saw seven thin cows eat the seven fat cows. Given that the Egyptians worshipped cows, you would think Pharoah's dream would have made a tremendous impression on him - his "g-d" was eaten! Yet, the Torah records, "V'yikatz Pharaoh...v'yishan v'yachalom shenit - Pharaoh woke up...then fell asleep and dreamed again... (41:4-5). Yes, after this momentous dream, Pharaoh fell asleep - a sleep so deep he had another dream!

The same word "Vayikatz" is used to describe both Yaakov's and Pharaoh's awakening from their dreams. What's is the Torah teaching us?

R' Aharon suggests that the difference between Yaakov's reaction upon awakening (acknowledging the presence of Hashem), and Pharaoh's reaction upon awakening from the first dream (falling back asleep) highlights the difference between the sensitivity of these two individuals to spirituality.

Yaakov possessed a heightened sense of spirituality and so immediately recognized the significance of his dream, and acknowledged Hashem's message. Whereas Pharaoh's spiritual sensitivity was so deadened that even a dream concerning the "death" of his deity was insufficient to elicit a reaction. Interestingly, it is only after Pharaoh's second dream involving the healthy and sick ears of grain, that Pharaoh feels troubled upon awakening.

Shedding light on Pharaoh's mindset is an observation regularly made in Strive for Truth by Rav Dessler who explains that when a person is preoccupied with material pursuits -- so that they are the dominant interest in his life -- his interest in spiritual matters is

correspondingly diminished.

This was the case with Pharaoh - he was exclusively focused on material acquisitions and personal power, and so was able to fall right back asleep even after a dream in which his deity was devoured. It was only when the second dream suggested a risk to his material standing that Pharaoh became troubled. As opposed to Yaakov, who responded with intensity immediately after encountering Hashem in his dream.

Based on the foregoing, we can also perhaps better understand Yosef's comment to Pharaoh at the beginning and at the end of his interpretation that the two dreams were one dream. Specifically, the individual preoccupied with material pursuits may not see Hashem's hand in the world, but, in fact, Hashem is behind all "material" successes and "natural" events. These are simply vehicles through which Hashem executes his plan.

A "spiritual" person can sense this, while a person preoccupied with the "material" only sees the "external" causes. So how does one cultivate a strong spiritual sensitivity so as to better appreciate Hashem - and by extension - prioritize the spiritual in daily life? Immersion in Torah and mitzvos will awaken a person to seeing Hashem's hand in the world!

### BACK TO THE MAKOR..... ANALYSIS OF PASUKIM IN THE DAF

#### THANKS TO SARAH ROBINSON

The gemara in Psachim 22b discusses the pasuk in Shmot 21:28. About a goring ox. The pasuk contains two clauses: first "ולא יאכל את בשרו" -- that we may not eat of it" and second, "ובעל השור נקי" -- that the ox's owner is clean [of liability]." The gemara wonders why the Torah needed to communicate both phrases in the pasuk. After all, if an ox is being stoned, it will be a נבלה and can't be consumed anyway.

Eventually, the gemara מתרץ that the first phrase "ולא יאכל את בשרו" was a prohibition against both eating from this ox and deriving הנאה while the second clause "ויקנ רושה לעבו" comes to teach us that deriving האנה from the skin is also forbidden.

The gemara then wonders, for the תנאים who "ובעל השור נקי" to teach a different halacha -- from where do they know that it is forbidden to derive הנאה from the skin? They derive it from the additional word "ולא יאכל את בשרו." in "את"

ברכות (63)	Jan 5 2020
שבת (156)	Mar 8 2020
שירובין (104)	Aug 11 2020
פסחים (120)	Nov 23 2020
שקלים (21)	Mar 23 2021
יומא (87)	Apr 13 2021
סוכה (65)	Jul 9 2021
ביצה (39)	Sep 2 2021
ראש השנה (34)	Oct 11 2021
תענית (30)	Nov 14 2021
מגילה (31)	Dec 14 2021
חזקת פסח (28)	Jan 14 2022
הגדה (26)	Feb 11 2022
יבמות (121)	Mar 9 2022
כתובות (111)	Jul 8 2022
נדרים (90)	Oct 27 2022
נזיר (65)	Jan 25 2023
סוטה (48)	Mar 31 2023
גיטין (89)	May 18 2023
קידושין (81)	Aug 15 2023
בבא קמא (118)	Nov 4 2023
בבא מציעא (118)	Mar 1 2024
בבא בתרא (175)	Jun 27 2024
סנהדרין (112)	Dec 19 2024
מכות (23)	Apr 10 2025
שבועות (48)	May 3 2025
עבודה זרה (75)	Jun 20 2025
הוריות (13)	Sep 3 2025
זבחים (119)	Sep 16 2025
מנחות (109)	Jan 13 2026
חזון (141)	May 2 2026
בבא בתרא (61)	Sep 20 2026
עירובין (33)	Nov 19 2026
תמורה (33)	Dec 26 2026
כריתות (27)	Jan 24 2027
תעילה (36)	Feb 20 2027
גיטין (72)	Mar 28
SIYUM HASHAS	Jun 7 2027

But for the first Tana who learned the **איסור הנאה** from "ובעל השור נקי", how does he explain that extraneous "את"? The gemara is **משיב** with a supporting **ברייתא** that one need not derive any **דרשות** from any extraneous "את" in a pasuk.

Specifically, Shimon HaAmsoni would interpret every 'את' in the Torah. But when he arrived at the pasuk in Devarim 6:13 "את ה' אלקיך תירא" he didn't know what to derive from that "את" since there shouldn't be anything additional beyond the fear of Hashem. Upon realizing this, Shimon HaAmsoni retracted all the **לימודים** he had previously made using the word "את."

The **ברייתא** digresses into a brief though touching moment. In realizing the loss of all the **לימודים** he had just rendered incorrect, his students inquire: "What will happen to all your other **דרשות** with the word 'את'?" Shimon HaAmsoni answers,

"כשם שקבלתי שכר על הדרישה כך אני מקבל שכר על הפרישה"

meaning, "just as I have received a reward for all the **דרשות** I have made, so too I will receive a reward for retracting these **לימודים**."

To me, I hear confidence and tragedy -- while the investment and toil of Torah learning was valuable, Shimon HaAmsoni was ready to retract his **לימוד** when he felt it could not be substantiated. And in the name of authenticity, there are times when a **לימוד** no matter how beloved, must be retracted.

But then Rabi Akiva comes to be **שרוד** the extraneous "תא" in the pasuk in Devarim to teach -- to include fear of teachers," meaning, that the fear of Hashem is equivalent to fear of torah scholars. Armed with this **השרד**, Rabi Akiva gave a beautiful and, more broadly, saved the entire category of **לימודים**.

Relatedly, Rabi Akiva's **דרשה** here nicely parallels Menachot 29b, a famous **אגדתא** where Rabi Akiva is **דורש** from the crowns adorning the letters of the Torah. In both cases, Rabi Akiva derives meaning from seemingly insignificant elements of the Torah.

More broadly, Rabi Akiva's **לימוד** reminds me of Rav Aharon Lichtenstein's gorgeous essay, "The Source of Faith is Faith Itself." There, Rav Aharon, in his usual poetic, nuanced, and refreshingly sincere style wonders where his faith comes from. He realized that it is not predicated on complex philosophical arguments but "key persons" who modeled a life of Torah and Mitzvot. Rav Aharon speaks lovingly about his parents, Rav Yosef Dov Soloveitchik, Rav Aharon Soloveitchik, and Rav Hutner in how they "limned the contours of my religious and intellectual universe and filled it with content" and how their Torah made him feel that he was "becoming a link in the unbroken chain of the tradition from Sinai." He acknowledged that this **מהלך** would be philosophically unsatisfying, though it felt true to his religious experience. In this way, Rav Aharon has shown us Rabi Akiva's **לימוד** -- that the fear of **תלמידי חכמים** directly leads to authentic **עבודת ה'**.

I'll close with two beautiful **סיטשפ** to this **קוספ** -- from the Ramban and Netziv which teach us about how to live a life with **אמונה**.

What is the connection between the three clauses of this pasuk "את יקוק אלוקיך תירא" -- that you should fear HaShem" then "ובשמו תשבע" -- and Him you should serve" then finally "ואתו תעבד" and swear in His name"? Though each is important, why did Moshe choose to juxtapose them? The Ramban explains (רמב"ן על דברים ו:יא)

that we don't necessarily have to swear, but if we need to -- it is only meaningful if we already have a strong belief in Hashem.

Otherwise, it will be mere words. One might have thought that it would be better to swear in the name of other gods, so Moshe is saying that if you need to swear, best to do it in HaShem's name. The Ramban closes by saying that someone who authentically believes in HaShem and could even swear in HaShem's name is someone who lives their entire life for Hashem, like a slave whose entire self, even their sleep, is devoted to their master. In this way the Ramban sees Moshe Rabbenu encouraging us to aim high when creating a threshold for our **עבודת ה'**.

How does this pasuk connect with the other surrounding psukim? Contextually, Moshe tells Bnei Yisrael to declare HaShem as our God, to not be swayed by idolatry, and to perform the mitzvot. The shmah is just 6 psukim preceding. Moshe explains that it will be tempting to forget HaShem when we come into Israel and receive so much bounty in vineyards, groves, and cisterns that have been already planted. The Netziv has a beautiful **pshat** (העמק דבר על דברים ו:יא). He says that when Am Yisrael are going to war they'll enjoy the produce that is already in Israel, even though they didn't work for it. He says that the soldiers should enjoy all the food so they can fight more effectively. In this way, by caring for our bodies, we can eventually become stronger in doing the mitzvot for HaShem.

May we all be zocheh to fully serve HaShem in this way!

THURSDAY 10 DECEMBER

פסחים יט

THANKS TO HADRAN - YAFIT FISHBACH-ROSEN

Nearing the end of our tangent off Pesachim and into the difficult concept of tumah and taharah, daf 19 delves into the topic of **ספק טומאה**. After citing various Tannaic opinions regarding the tumah capacity of foods and beverages, the Gemara cites a Mishna concerning a needle being discovered in the flesh of a slaughtered offering. It determines that the meat of the animal is tamei, but the knife and the hands of the slaughterer are tahor.

Upon hearing this, Rabbi Akiva says, "We are fortunate that there is no rabbinically decreed tumah upon hands in the temple!"

Firstly, we can ask why he only said "hands" when the knife is also not considered tumah, but more interestingly, this phrase gets to the heart of the difficulties of tumah and taharah - the biblical definition versus the rabbinic decrees.

Biblically, hands cannot become tamei independent of the rest of the body, but the rabbis decreed that they can be considered "tamei sheni" given that they're used often and are apt to touching unclean parts of the body. They wanted to avoid tamei hands touching terumah and making it inedible, so they instituted this decree.

However, the rabbis had to strike a balance between protecting terumah from becoming inedible and protecting kodashim from constantly being spoiled. Therefore, they did not make this decree effective in the Temple at all, which we can learn from the fact that the Mishna says that the knife and hands are declared tahor in the case of the needle. If the decree was enacted in the Temple as well, the hands of Kohen would certainly be tamei. The rabbis often add to Biblical prohibitions, especially in the case of tumah, but they're still careful to be realistic in their expectations and try to make things

easier for people, such as avoiding spoiled kodashim in the Temple.

FRIDAY 11 DECEMBER

פסחים כ

THANKS STEVE WIND

The Gemara discusses the concept that passive causation of tumah is permitted, while active causation is prohibited. A possible exception is a broken barrel of trumah wine that is flowing down into many barrels of chullin wine, which would result in a significant loss as none of the wine could be used.

Can one save the chullin wine by capturing the trumah in a tamei vessel, thereby actively causing the trumah wine to become tamei? The Gemara contrasts this with a similar case involving a broken barrel of trumah oil that is flowing into many barrels of chullin oil. The difference with oil is that it can be used for lighting and therefore its value is not entirely lost.

Although wine can be used for sprinkling around for the aroma, which was considered very valuable, this only applies to aged wine, and if the barrels are of new wine there is a risk in waiting for the wine to age, as it creates a stumbling block that one might forget that it is tamei and drink it.

There is no stumbling block in the case of oil as it can be avoided by putting the case of oil for lighting in a repulsive vessel. Therefore, to prevent significant loss, one can save the wine, but he must not actively cause tumah to save the oil. (It is auspicious that the Daf Yomi learns about pure and impure oil on Chanukah!)

SHABBAT 12 DECEMBER

פסחים כא

THANKS TO MIKE GORDON

The first Mishna of Perek II brings a machloket between Rabbi Yehuda and the Chachamim regarding the manner of removal of chametz on 14th of Nissan.

Rabbi Yehuda says it is accomplished only by burning the chametz, whilst the Chachamim say burning is not necessarily required and the chametz may be crumbled and then thrown into the wind or cast into the sea. The commentators say that the common practice today is to burn one's chametz, out of concern for those authorities who hold by the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda.

Some nine months ago, and the start of the Covid 19 pandemic, poskim needed to address the acute issue of burning chametz in the midst of the pandemic. What follows is Rav Hershel Shachter's psak: "It has been our custom that chametz should be destroyed on Erev Pesach by burning it. Many communities have made controlled public chametz burnings for the sake of fire safety.

However, during these times it is not safe to gather. On the other hand, there is a real danger of people making their own fires on their property. In addition, when people make small fires the heat is not intense enough to burn the chametz all the way to the center and sometimes people are left with edible chametz that they did not realize was still there.

Finally, we must also be careful of the public perception that Jews are going about their business as usual and conducting their affairs in public while the rest of the world is confining themselves to their homes. It could appear as if the Jewish people are not sharing the

burden and pain with the rest of humanity because of our religion. Perhaps the best advice would be to limit the amount of left-over chametz we have in our possession on the morning of Erev Pesach.

And the small amount of chametz (no more than a k'zayis is needed) should be crushed into tiny particles, so as to not clog the plumbing, and flushed in the toilet. This would also fulfill the directive of Chazal." Once again we see that our Mishna and Gemara are clearly not only ancient texts, but provide answers and guidance to the quandaries we find ourselves in today.

SUNDAY 13 DECEMBER

פסחים כב

THANKS DAVID GROSS

Daf 22 continues the underlying question of whether all prohibitions are equal in scope. Is the prohibition limited to consumption, or are we forbidden from benefiting in any way from the item that is prohibited?

The majority of the daf is consumed with whether one needs to use an extra source to bolster the all-encompassing nature of the prohibition of chametz, and if so, which one.

When examining the prohibition of chametz, one can apply the following distinctions in its regard which is expressed as follows: Does the nature of the prohibition devolve on to the chametz itself (תפוצא), or is it incumbent upon the individual (גברא)?

Those who argue the former do so on the basis that all prohibitions that are dependent on time. Those who argue the latter base themselves on the Tannaitic dispute between Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon regarding the status of chametz which exists in someone's domain from the 5th/6th hour until nightfall on the 14th of Nissan.

Rabbi Yehuda holds it is forbidden on a Torah level, while Rabbi Shimon holds it is only prohibited rabbinically. What is the נפקא מינא between the two positions?

Chametz which remained within the domain of a Jew over Pesach would be מותר בהנאה after Pesach according to Rabbi Shimon, though the prohibition on eating it would remain.

MONDAY 14 DECEMBER

פסחים כג

THANKS COHENRAV JONNY SOLOMON -  
[HTTPS://RABBIJOHNNYSOLOMON.COM/](https://rabbijohnnysolomon.com/)

This weekend\* I will be speaking alongside a number of other disciples about Rabbi Sacks zt'l, and while preparing my talk last night, I was reflecting on the concept of discipleship and what this means in terms of the responsibilities of a disciple to continue sharing the wisdom they have received from their teacher.

I mention this in light of the end of today's daf (Pesachim 23b) where, embedded in the intense ongoing discussions on the question of whether it is prohibited to derive benefit from something that is prohibited from consumption, we read a conversation between - or more accurately, an intense examination of - a nameless student of Rabbi Yehoshua Ben Levi by Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachmani. To give some context, Rabbi Yehoshua Ben Levi was a first century Amora (NB some even consider him a final generation Tana - see Rashi on Pesachim 23b) who lived in Eretz Yisrael and who was active circa 220-250 CE.

He was a bold, original and spiritual scholar who emphasised the role of ethics and the timeless messages of Torah. But in addition to this, Rabbi Yehoshua Ben Levi believed that the way to secure the future of the Jewish people was to actively raise many students. Significantly, Rabbi Yehoshua Ben Levi was the first to ordain his students, and in so doing, he placed his faith in his students - which led them to have faith in themselves.

Living two generations later (circa 290-320 CE) was Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachmani who, in his youth (he lived over 100 years), had learnt from Rabbi Yehoshua Ben Levi (amongst others), but whose generation in Eretz Yisrael was one of relative spiritual decline - which meant that he personally felt a great responsibility to clarify Torah laws and, in particular, core Jewish beliefs, for the future of the Jewish people.

Having explained all this we can return to our daf, where we are told that "a certain scholar sat before Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachmani, and while seated [and seemingly while sharing a variety of other teachings], he said in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi: 'From where is it derived with regard to all the prohibitions in the Torah that just as it is prohibited to eat them, so too, it is prohibited to benefit from them?'"

Immediately, Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachmani interrupts and challenges this student, asking, "Why did Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi interpret as he did (and not in accordance with Chizkiya or Rabbi Avahu)?" to which the student offers a robust reply. This occurs again - to which the student responds, and once again, to which, the student again offers a compelling answer.

On first glance, it seems that Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachmani simply doesn't agree with the approach of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi. However, the very speed with which he challenges and interrupts him suggests that something else is happening.

As mentioned, the question of whether it is prohibited to derive benefit from something that is prohibited from consumption was an ongoing discussion amongst the Amoraim, and then, amidst a conversation with one of Rabbi Yehoshua Ben Levi's closer disciples, Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachmani is told that Rabbi Yehoshua Ben Levi had held an alternative view which he had, until then, not encountered. Having heard this, Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachmani wished to know more.

He interrupted the student at every moment - not as a sign of disrespect - but because he was hungry to learn more about a position offered by one of his teachers which he was not yet acquainted with.

What is remarkable is that every challenge presented to this student is answered with clarity and with ease. And why? Because this disciple had so carefully absorbed the words of his teacher that even when asked questions which his teacher himself may not have explicitly addressed, he was able to confidently answer them. Suffice to say, whoever this nameless student was (and this itself is curious as to why we are not told his name), not only was he a great scholar, but he was also a great disciple too.

In one of his stunning tributes capturing both how I and so many others feel, Rabbi Alex Israel observed that "it is impossible to know where the ideas of Rabbi Sacks' end, and where ours begin", and this itself is a profound insight of discipleship - namely 'attachment' to the

ideas and personality of a teacher. Like Rabbi Yehoshua Ben Levi, Rabbi Sacks zt'l was a bold, original and spiritual scholar who emphasized the role of ethics and the timeless messages of Torah, and who placed his faith in his students - which led them to have faith in themselves.

And just like this student of Rabbi Yehoshua Ben Levi, I hope that the many disciples of Rabbi Sacks continue to share the great wisdom they have received from their teacher - because it is wisdom that is more precious than rubies, diamonds or pearls. \* To attend this programme, visit <https://www.lsj.ac.uk/the-life-changing-ideas-of-rabbi-lord-sacks-ztl-1287.php>

TUESDAY 15 DECEMBER

THANKS TO SHULIE MISHKIN -  
[WWW.SHULIEMISHKINTOURS.COM](http://WWW.SHULIEMISHKINTOURS.COM)

פסחים כד

Just in time for Chanukah, this daf addresses many Temple related issues. The overarching question is what is considered meilah, making improper use of objects that are consecrated to the Temple. None of these are clear cut cases like taking money from the Temple treasury or gaining benefit from sacrificial animals. Instead, these cases are about much more abstract types of benefit. Through exploring these cases we get to hear about various aspects of the Temple, a perfect subject for the week of Chanukah.

Before we dive in, one word about meilah in general. The Temple was the site of enormous wealth, both physically (lots of money and precious objects) and in potential (the lucrative contracts for oil, wood, etc.). This is why we hear about Gentiles who come to plunder the Temple treasures, among them a Greek official of King Seleucus IV, the immediate predecessor to Antiochus IV of Chanukah fame. This official, named Heliodorus, does not succeed but others did. In addition, we have a huge problem in late Second Temple times of corruption in the Temple, with kohanim taking advantage of their access to the treasures. On this background, the laws of meilah seem not extreme but rather basic necessities, albeit necessities that did not stem the tide of corruption.

The Gemara's first situation is an intriguing one:

"They said about Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai that he would sit in the street adjacent to the Temple Mount in the shade of the Sanctuary and expound to a large number of people all day long."

Imagine a rock star lecturer, one who attracts an enormous crowd to hear him. That was Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai, teacher of Rabbi Joshua and Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrcanus and the most important rabbi of his generation. He was the one who saved Torah by insisting on moving scholars to Yavneh and setting up a bet midrash there after the Temple was destroyed. Now imagine Jerusalem on a hot July day. Where are all those people going to sit and hear Rabban Yohanan's teachings without fainting from heat? They needed a shady place and the building of the Temple (the heichal or sanctuary in English) was large enough that at the right hour its shadow would create a large shady space. (Don't worry about how all those people could hear the teaching, the world was a much quieter place then.)

I love this image. It gives us a real life picture of the Temple Mount, which was not only a place of sacrifices and ritual but of students and teachers. It also shows us the democracy of learning. Rabban Yohanan sat outside and taught to all comers. The rulings of the

Sanhedrin were not hidden away in some elite chamber but were out in the open, for all to hear. It also implies that the sanctuary was tall and broad, The Mishnah in Masechet Middot tells us the dimensions of the heichal:

“The heichal was a hundred cubits by a hundred with a height of a hundred.” (Middot 4:6)

A hundred cubits (amot) high is approximately fifty meters, or one hundred and fifty feet, high. Just for comparison, the Dome of the Rock on the same site is only thirty five meters high. So Rabban Yohanan had a nice amount of shade (there are ways to calculate this but the math is beyond my pay grade).

After determining that Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai was not improperly benefitting from the Sanctuary building, since its primary use is the inside and not the outside, we move on to workmen doing repairs in the Holy of Holies. The Holy of Holies was the innermost part of the Sanctuary and was off limits to everyone except the high priest and even he could only enter on Yom Kippur. But what if the curtain between the Holy and the Holy of Holies had to be cleaned (it was sprinkled with blood every Yom Kippur)? Or something else needed to be repaired? The rabbis solved the problem by lowering workmen from the roof in special cages. This way they did not technically set foot in the Holy of Holies, and their sight of it was limited as well. Maimonides notes however that if repairs are necessary and kohanim and leviim cannot do them, an Israelite can enter and if no cage is available, he can enter in the regular manner.

A fascinating question is can one derive benefit from non-physical objects: smell, sound. The halacha regarding these ethereal benefits is not clear so the kohanim were extra careful. Regarding smell, we have the illuminating story of the kohanim of the House of Avtinas, who were tasked with preparing the incense (ktoret). They refused to teach anyone else the secret technique. The Gemara in Masechet Yoma first seems to say that their secrecy was so that they could make more money, by monopolizing the incense industry. However, it goes on to say that they were extremely careful not to personally benefit from the incense itself (even though they made money making it):

“Never did a perfumed bride emerge from their homes. And when they marry a woman from a different place, they stipulate with her that she will not perfume herself, so that cynics would not say that it is with the work of the incense that they perfume themselves” (Yoma 38a)

The Gemara continues and relates that they kept the technique of incense making to themselves so that the ktoret would never be used in a place of idolatry, especially after the Temple was destroyed. The Gemara concludes that what we earlier thought was greed we now know was an attempt to keep the techniques exclusive to the Temple.

Finally, we have a discussion about the used garments of the high priest. On Yom Kippur, unlike other days of the year, the high priest switches between two sets of clothing, his regular “gold” vestments, and the simple white ones. After Yom Kippur, he is not allowed to use the white ones again. The Gemara questions whether these garments need to be buried in genizah or merely passed on to regular priests. Regarding the old clothes of the regular priests, we have a timely piece of information, mentioned elsewhere in our sources. These clothes were not put in genizah but rather unraveled

to be made into wicks for the menorah. Even the wicks had to come from consecrated items, and certainly the oil, which had to be made in purity and kept in purity. And on that note, happy Chanukah!

WEDNESDAY 16 DECEMBER

פסחים כה

THANKS TO DR YARDAENA OSBAND - TALKING TALMUD  
PODCAST

The daf discusses under what circumstances a person is obligated to sacrifice his life for G-d, al Kiddush Hashem, and specifically not to commit an act of Avodah Zara. To discuss the source for this the Gemara quotes the following baraita:

תניא, רבי אליעזר אומר: אם נאמר “בכל נפשך”, למה נאמר “בכל מאדך”? ואם נאמר “בכל מאדך”, למה נאמר “בכל נפשך”? אלא אם יש לך אדם שגופו חביב עליו מממונו — לך נאמר “בכל נפשך”. ואם יש לך אדם שממונו חביב עליו מגופו — לך נאמר “בכל מאדך”.

Rabbi Eliezer says: If it is stated: “And you shall love the Lord your G-d with all your heart, and with all your soul,” why is it stated: “And with all your might” (Deuteronomy 6:5)? And if it is stated: “With all your might,” why is it stated: “With all your soul”? One of these statements appears to be superfluous. Rather, it is to tell you that if there is a person whose body is more beloved to him than his property, therefore it is stated: “With all your soul.” The verse teaches that one must be willing to sacrifice his life to sanctify God’s name. And there is a person whose property is more beloved to him than his body, therefore it is stated: “With all your might.” Rabbi Eliezer understands the phrase: “With all your might,” to mean: With all your possessions.

This baraita is quoted three other times in the Talmud Bavli: Berachot 61b, Yoma 82a, and Sanhedrin 74a.

In Berachot it appears when the Gemara discusses the pasuk from Devarim 6:5 as quoted in the Mishna (54a) and Rabbi Eliezer’s explanation of the pasuk is provided as an alternate interpretation to this pasuk than the one in the Mishna.

In Yoma, the Gemara discusses that one may feed a pregnant woman forbidden food because feeding a pregnant woman a food she craves falls under the category of Pikuach Nefesh, and the Gemara (quoting a baraita) explains that

שאיין לך דבר שעומד בפני פקוח נפש חוץ מעד וגילוי עריות ושפיכות דמים:

there is no halakha that stands in the way of saving a life except for the prohibitions against idol worship, forbidden sexual relationships, and bloodshed. Rabbi Eliezer’s teaching is quoted as the proof that one must sacrifice his life rather than commit an act of Avodah Zara.

However, in Sanhedrin 74 an important context is given to Rabbi Eliezer’s statement. The Gemara discusses an interesting tension around the concept of dying for a Kiddush Hashem. Before Rabbi Eliezer’s opinion is brought, the Gemara asks if one really needs to sacrifice their life in order to not commit Avodah Zara. To answer this question, a baraita is brought in which a teaching of Rabbi Yishamel is quoted:

תניא א”ר ישמעאל מנין שאם אמרו לו לאדם עבוד עבודת כוכבים ולא תהרג מנין שיעבוד ולא יהרג ת”ל (ויקרא יח, ה) וחי בהם ולא

## שימות בהם

Using the pasuk in Leviticus 18:5, "You should live by them", Rabbi Yishmael understands that a person should not sacrifice his own life because the Torah is meant to be lived. But the baraita quickly clarifies that this does not apply when one would be doing an act of Avodah Zara in public:

יכול אפילו בפרהסיא תלמוד לומר (ויקרא כב, לב) ולא תחללו את

שם קדשי ונקדשתי

The verse in Vayikara 22:32 teaches that in public one must sacrifice himself rather than commit a Hillul Hashem. Ultimately, the Gemara quotes again the baraita of Rabbi Eliezer and concludes that a person must sacrifice himself if he were forced to choose between that and doing an act of Avodah Zara. Rabbi Eliezer makes no distinction between a private or public act. His teaching applies in all cases.

This famous teaching of Rabbi Eleizer appears many times in the Talmud Bavli, likely because it provides an interpretation of the one of the foundational pesukim of the Shema.