



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

### Yuma Daf Pey Gimmel

#### CHOLEH MACHILIN OSO AHL PI BEKI'IN

- **R' Yanai** said, if the doctor says that the sick person does not need to eat (he is not in grave danger), and the sick person says that he must eat, the halacha is that we give him to eat. If the doctor says he must eat and the patient says that he does need to, the halacha is that we give him to eat.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna says that we give the patient to eat if the doctor says we should. It seems that if the doctor says that the patient does not need to eat and the patient says that he does we would still listen to the doctor!? The Mishna also seems to say that we only give the patient to eat based on the opinion of "beki'in", which means there is more than one doctor!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing where the patient says he does not need to eat. It is in that case that we follow the opinion of the doctors, and not of the patient.
    - **Q:** Why does the Mishna say that 2 doctors are required to permit him to eat?  
**A:** The Mishna is discussing where the patient and one doctor said that the patient does not need to eat. In that case, it would take 2 doctors to permit him to eat. However, when only contradicting the patient himself, one doctor would be enough.
    - **Q:** If it is 2 against 2 it is obvious that we will permit him to eat, because we always rule leniently when a life is questionably in danger!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing where there are 2 doctors who agree with the patient that he need not eat, but 2 other doctors say that he must. Even though the permitting doctors are in the minority, we give him to eat because a life is questionably in danger.
    - **Q:** Since the last part of the Mishna says that if there are no doctors we permit him to eat based on his own opinion, that would suggest that the previous part of the Mishna discusses where he also says that he needs to eat, but we only allow him to eat if the doctors agree with him!? **A:** The Mishna is missing words and should say, that we only need doctors to permit him to eat when he himself says that he does not need to eat. However, if he says that he needs to eat, even if there is a doctor who says that he does not need to eat, we still allow him to eat.
  - **Mar bar R' Ashi** said, if the patient says he needs to eat, even if 100 doctors say that he does not need to eat, we allow him to eat.
    - **Q:** Our Mishna says, if there are no doctors, we allow the patient to eat based on his own opinion. This suggests that if there are doctors, we do not follow the patient's own opinion!? **A:** The Mishna means to say that doctors are needed to permit him to eat when he alone feels that he does not need to eat. However, when he feels that he needs to eat, we don't listen to any doctors who say differently.

#### MISHNA

- One who is seized with "bulmus" (a life threatening condition caused by hunger), is given to eat even non-kosher food until his vision is restored (a sign that the danger has passed).

- If one was bitten by a wild dog, we do not allow him to eat from the dog's liver (this was thought of as a cure, but was not a true cure and therefore does not allow for the eating of non-kosher).

**R' Masya ben Charash** allows it.

- **R' Masya ben Charash** also allows one who has a condition in his throat which is considered to be possibly life threatening, to have medicine made and applied on Shabbos (he considers this to be a true cure).
- If a building collapses on someone on Shabbos and it is unknown whether the person is in the rubble or not, or whether he is even alive if he is beneath the rubble, or whether the person thought trapped is even a Yid, we clear away the rubble to try and save him. If we find him alive, we continue to remove the rubble from around him. If he is found dead, we stop and leave him there.

## GEMARA

- A Braisa says, we consider his vision to be restored when he can tell the difference between good food and bad food. **Abaye** said, this means when he can taste the difference between good food and bad food.
- A Braisa says, if one is seized with bulmus we give him to eat the food with the lightest level of issur available. If we have the choice between neveilah and tevel ,we give him neveilah. Between tevel and shmitta produce, we give him shmitta produce. If we have a choice between tevel and terumah, the **T"K** of a Braisa says that we give him tevel (it is able to be fixed by removing the ma'aser and is thus a lighter issur) and **Ben Teimah** says we give him terumah (which is mutar to a Kohen, whereas tevel is assur to all).
  - **Rabbah** explains this machlokes, that if there is enough tevel that the ma'aser can be removed and there will be enough chullin left over to remove the bulmus, all would agree that we should remove the ma'aser and give him to eat the rest. The machlokes is only where there would not be enough produce remaining for the bulmus.
    - The chiddush of **Rabbah** is that even on Shabbos (when the **Rabanan** say that ma'aser may not be separated), and even in a case where the ma'aser obligation is only D'Rabanan (like produce grown in a pot without a hole), still we should remove the ma'aser on Shabbos rather than eat tevel, even though it is only Rabbinic tevel.
      - **Q:** This seems to be a machlokes among Tanna'im. A Braisa says that **Rebbi** says, if one is bitten by a snake on Shabbos we may cut leeks from the ground to give them to him to eat, and we need not give ma'aser from them. **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** says, we must first take off ma'aser. It seems that **Rabbah** would only follow **R' Elazar** (that we take ma'aser on Shabbos)? **A:** It could be that **Rebbi** would agree in the case of **Rabbah** (which was discussing produce, which is sometimes chayuv in ma'aser even D'Oraisa) that we must take ma'aser first, so as not to lead one to eat without giving ma'aser in a D'Oraisa situation. This Braisa is dealing with vegetables, which are always only chayuv in ma'aser D'Rabanan.
- A Braisa says, one who is seized with bulmus should eat some honey or other sweet things.
  - **Abaye** said, this is only beneficial when eaten after first eating other foods. However, if eaten before other foods, it actually makes the bulmus worse.
  - **R' Nachman in the name of Shmuel** said, a person with bulmus should eat the fatty meat of a sheep's tail with honey.
  - **R' Hunah the son of R' Yehoshua** said, he should eat fine flour with honey.
  - **R' Pappa** said, he can even eat barley flour with honey.
  - **R' Yochanan** said, he once had bulmus and ran to eat figs from the east side of the tree, which are very sweet.
  - **R' Yehuda and R' Yose** were traveling and **R' Yehuda** was seized with bulmus. He took bread from a shepherd without permission and ate it (to save his life). **R' Yose** said, "you

have made the shepherd lose”! When they reached the city, **R' Yose** was seized with bulmus. The entire city came and brought him sweet foods and cooked foods. **R' Yehuda** then told him, “you have made the whole city lose”!

- It once happened that they were travelling with **R' Meir**. **R' Meir** would examine the names of people, but they would not. When they needed a place to stay for Shabbos, they went to someone whose name was Kidor. **R' Meir** thought, based on how this word is used in a pasuk, this man must be a rasha. They, who didn’t examine names, gave their wallets to the host for safekeeping. **R' Meir** took his wallet and hid it in the cemetery, at the headstone of the father of this man. On Shabbos morning, the host relayed that his father came to him in a dream and told him to come get a wallet that is by his head. **R' Meir** told him to disregard the dream, and then went and stayed with his wallet until after Shabbos. When they were ready to leave their host and asked for their wallets, the host said he was never given wallets to watch. They convinced the host to go with them for a drink, and noticed that he had some lentils on his mustache. They went to his house without him and asked his wife for the money, telling her that her husband instructed her to release the wallets to them. They told her, the proof that they were telling the truth was that he said that he ate lentils. She gave them the wallets. When the host came home, he was so upset, that he killed his wife.
- It is regarding this story that a Braisa says, not being careful with washing before eating caused a Yid to eat pig (the restaurant owner thought the Yid was a goy because he did not wash before eating, and therefore gave him pig to eat), and not being careful with mayim achronim caused someone to be killed (had the host washed mayim achronim, he would have wiped his mustache, and would not have ended up killing his wife).