

10 Tishrei 5774  
Sept. 14, 2013



Pesachim Daf 86

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

### ***Sanctity Of The Roof***

The Mishna said that the windows and the thickness of the walls have the status of the inside. Rav says that roofs and upper rooms do not have the consecration of the area they are on.

The Gemora challenges this from Rav’s statement in the name of Rabbi Chiya that there were such large groups bringing the Pesach that each person would only have a kazayis and it seemed that the roof was caving in from the loud recitation of hallel. The Gemora assumes that they not only said the hallel on the roofs, but also ate the Pesach there, indicating that the roof has the sanctity of the city, where the Pesach must be eaten.

The Gemora deflects this by saying that they said hallel on the roof, but ate the Pesach below.

The Gemora challenges this from Rav, who explains that the Mishna which says that one may not do afikoman after the Pesach means that one may not move to another location after eating the Pesach, implying that hallel must be said in the same place.

The Gemora deflects this by saying that Rav was only referring to eating in a different place, but not to hallel, which came after they finished eating.


The Gemora challenge Rav from a braisa in which Abba Shaul says that the upper level of the kodesh kadashim was more sanctified than the kodesh kadashim. While the kohen gadol entered the kodesh kadashim once a year, people only entered the upper level once or twice every 7 years, to see what maintenance was necessary.

Rav Yosef answers that the sanctity of the components of the kodesh kadashim itself is different, as every detail was explicitly mandated by Hashem, and therefore had inherent sanctity.

The Gemora challenges Rav from a braisa which says that when chambers in a sanctified area open to a non-sanctified area, the interior of the chamber isn’t sanctified, but its roof is.

Rav Chisda deflects this by saying that the braisa is a case where the roof is level with the ground of the courtyard.

The Gemora challenges this from the end of the braisa, which says that if they are in a non-sanctified area, but open to a sanctified one, their interior is sanctified, but their roof isn’t. If this is a case where their roof is level with the ground, they are tantamount to tunnels, which Rabbi Yochanan said aren’t sanctified.



The Gemora answers that Rabbi Yochanan is referring to tunnels which open to the Temple Mount, but the braisa is referring to those that open to the courtyard.

The Gemora challenges this from a braisa in which Rabbi Yehuda says that tunnels under the sanctuary aren't sanctified, but the Gemora deflects this by saying that he is referring to tunnels which open into a non-sanctified area.

The Gemora challenges Rav from the continuation of Rabbi Yehuda, in which he says that the roof of the sanctuary is sanctified.

The Gemora notes that another braisa says that one may not offer eat sacrifices on this roof, which contradicts Rabbi Yehuda, and supports Rav.

The Gemora resolves the contradiction by saying that Rabbi Yehuda was referring only to the spot on the roof where they stored the two amos measuring sticks, which were themselves consecrated utensils.

The Gemora cites the Mishna which explains that two amos sticks were in the Shushan Habira building, one on the northeast corner, and one on the southeast corner. The one on the northeast was  $\frac{1}{2}$  a finger larger than Moshe's and the one on the southeast was  $\frac{1}{2}$  a finger bigger than that one, making it one finger larger than Moshe's. They had these two larger sticks to ensure the craftsmen never took too much from the maintenance fund. They measured the work they were supposed to do using Moshe's stick, and then measured the work they did using the larger

stick, effectively reducing the work they were paid for. The Gemora explains that the smaller of these was used for measuring gold and silver work, which is more expensive, and the larger one was used for construction work.

The Gemora challenges Rav from the Mishna, which said that the windows and thickness of the walls were sanctified. The Gemora explains that it is possible that the windows are a case where the inside of the window was level with the courtyard, but the roof must be above, and yet the Mishna says it is sanctified.

The Gemora answers that the Mishna is referring to a lower inner wall, which was level with the courtyard.

The Gemora supports this with the verse which mourns *chail v'choma* – *the barrier and wall*, which Rabbi Acha (or Rabbi Chanina) explains refers to the outer wall and the lower inner wall. (85b – 86a)

### ***Groups Eating The Pesach***

The Mishna says that if two groups were eating a Pesach in the same house, each group simply faces away from the other and eats, even with a kettle in between them. When the waiter goes to serve the other group, he keeps his mouth closed and faces his group, until he returns to them. A new bride turns away and eats.

The Gemora says that this Mishna follows Rabbi Yehuda. The Gemora cites a braisa in which Rabbi Yehuda says that the verse which refers to the houses in which they will eat them [the Pesach] teaches that

one Pesach can be eaten in separate groups, while the verse which states that it must be eaten in one house teaches that any one individual may only eat it in one place. Therefore, if a waiter ate a kazayis of the Pesach next to the oven, he would be smart to fill himself up right there, and if the group was nice to him, they would join him there. Rabbi Shimon says that the verse which refers to the houses teaches that an individual may eat the Pesach in more than one place, while the verse which refers to one house teaches that it may not be eaten in more than one group.

The Gemora explains that their dispute depends on the way one explains a word which is can be read one way, based on the letters, but is read a different way, with its given vowels. Rabbi Yehuda says that we follow the letters, and therefore the word ye'achel – will be eaten in the verse about one house can be read as yochal – he will eat, mandating that each person only eat it in one location. Rabbi Shimon says that we follow the given vowels, and we therefore understand the verse to refer to the Pesach itself, mandating that *it* be eaten in one place, i.e., group. (86a – 86b)

### ***Adding Or Removing A Barrier***

The Gemora explains that if one group was eating the Pesach, and a barrier was place in the middle of them, Rabbi Yehuda would say they may continue eating, while Rabbi Shimon would say they cannot. If two groups were eating, separated by a barrier, and the barrier was removed, Rabbi Yehuda would say they may not continue eating, as they are now in a new place, while Rabbi Shimon would say they may, as the Pesach is in the same place.

Rav Kahana stated this without doubt, but Rav Ashi said that he should ask whether removing and making a barrier makes two groups or not. Rav Ashi leaves this an unresolved taiku. (86b)

### ***Table Etiquette***

Rav Chiya bar Abba quotes Rabbi Yochanan explaining that the new bride turns her face away when she eats, since she's embarrassed.

Rav Huna the son of Rav Nasan went to Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak's house. When they asked him his name, he said it was Rav Huna. They told him to sit on the bed, a place for notables, and he did so. They gave him a cup, and he took it right away, and drank it in two sips, without turning away. They asked him why he gave his name including his title, and he explained that his name has always been *Rav* Huna, even when he was a child. They asked him why he sat on the bed, and he said that one must listen to whatever the head of the house commands one to do. They asked him why he accepted the cup right away, and he explained that one refuses a simple person, but not someone important. They asked him why he took two sips for the cup, and he cited a braisa which discusses drinking behavior. It says that one sip is the way of a glutton, two sips the polite way, and three sips a haughty way. They asked him why he didn't turn away, and he said that the Mishna only says that a bride turns away, implying that there is no need for others to.

Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yossi went to Rabbi Shimon the son of Rabbi Yossi ben Lakunia's house. They gave him a cup of wine, and he accepted it right



way, and drank it in one sip. They asked him if he didn't accept the braisa which says that drinking in one sip is gluttonous, and he answered that this doesn't apply here, as the cup is small, the wine is sweet, and he is large.

Rav Huna says that a group can request a waiter one they are three, but then each individual can leave separately, even though the waiter now has less than three to wait on.

Rabbah says this is only if they enter and exit during the regular mealtime, and if they notified the waiter that they will eat this way.

Ravina says that they must pay the waiter appropriately, and the last one must pay most, but the Gemara says we don't rule like this. (86b)

**WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, KEITZAD TZOLIN**

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### *Do Everything Your Host Asks - Except for "Leave"*

This well-known saying finds its source in our Gemara, but what does it really mean? Should we interpret it at face value, that a guest should be so audacious as to refuse to leave? In our version of the Gemara the words "except for leave" are written in parentheses, implying that they are not accurate to the original text of the Gemara. The Meiri writes that they were inserted by a prankster who sought to mock the Gemara's words.

נ"ז : The version cited in Ein Yaakov includes the words "except for leave." The Zohar (Pinchas, p. 244)

also quotes this saying, including these puzzling words. Therefore, various explanations have been offered to make sense of them.

One explanation is that "leave" in Hebrew is נצ. Here, an apostrophe should be added between the letters, implying that it is an acronym for נצ איסור, which means "element of the forbidden." That is to say, good manners requires us to fulfill all our host's requests, unless he asks us to violate halacha (see Gan Yosef p. 104; Ben Yehoyada here).

**Leave on an errand:** Other commentaries explain the word נצ according to its simple meaning, and offer various interpretations.

The Bach (O.C. 170) explains that a guest is expected to help his host by performing various chores around the house. However, he need not leave the house to run an errand for his host. Since he is a stranger in the area, it is not fair to expect him to find his way among unfamiliar streets.

The Maharsham (Daas Torah on Shulchan Aruch ibid) cites his father's explanation based on a subsequent sugya (99b), where we find that when a group has joined together to share a Korban Pesach, they cannot always tell one member to take his portion of the korban and eat it elsewhere. A guest who had already agreed to take part in his host's Korban Pesach should not leave the group after the Pesach has been shechted.

The Sefas Emes (here) explains based on the incident of Kamtza and Bar Kamtza, wherein a host embarrassed his guest by forcing him to leave. The

offended guest then slandered the Jews to the Roman authorities, and this eventually led to the destruction of the Beis HaMikdash. As a response to this terrible event, the Sages instituted a ruling that once a guest has entered someone's home, one may not force him to leave.

**Fights with the landlord:** Perhaps most surprisingly, some interpret this Gemara according to face value that one should not leave at his host's command. Elsewhere, (Erchin 16b) the Gemara tells us that a tenant should not leave until his landlord hits him or throws out his belongings. Tenants and landlords can enter into heated disputes, and a landlord may get so upset that he threatens to evict his tenant. However, a tenant should not be so quick to take the landlord's threats seriously. When a person is forced to leave his apartment, both the tenant and his landlord could get a bad reputation. People will think that they do not know how to interact peacefully. Until the landlord gets physically violent, a tenant should choose to stay. The Drisha (O.C. 170:3) and Mateh Moshe (290) apply this explanation to our sugya, and their opinion is cited as halacha by the Magen Avraham (O.C. 170 s.k. 10) and Aruch HaShulchan (ibid, 8).

**Teshuva is always accepted:** We conclude with the explanation of the Reishis Chochma (Shaar HaKedusha ch. 16), cited by the Shlah and others. A person may feel so depressed over his many sins that he is doubtful whether Hashem will ever accept his teshuva. After the Sage Elisha ben Avuya left the path of Torah observance, a Bas Kol emanated from the Heavens proclaiming, "Return, wayward children – except for Acher [Elisha]" (Chagiga 15a). Elisha was

told that his teshuva would not be accepted. However, this was only a test from Heaven. Elisha was meant to ignore the Bas Kol, and return nonetheless. We are all guests in Hashem's world. Even if our Host tells us to leave His service, we must not listen. Teshuva is always effective, even for the most terrible sins.

### ***Guzzling a Drink***

The braisa states that if a person guzzles down a drink he is considered a "drinker," if he finishes in two sips it is considered good manners, while three sips is considered haughty.

The Rema (Orach Chaim 170:8) qualifies the braisa and puts it into perspective. He explains that if the cup is a small cup which contains less than a revi'is (i.e. a shot glass), there is no problem drinking it in one sip. Additionally, if one has a very big cup, there is no problem to drink it in three or four sips.

The Mishnah Berura (170:20) quotes the Magen Avraham as saying that there is a fourth stage. If someone drinks a cup in one gulp but leaves even a small amount of drink in it, he is not considered a "drinker." However, this is also not considered positively good manners (rather it is a neutral act). The Mishna Berura continues (170:22) to say that the Rema's law regarding a small cup less than a revi'is is only regarding a regular person and wine. However, if a person is a big person or the wine is sweet, even more is permitted.

The Mishna Berura concludes that certainly our beer that is not very strong can be drunk in one gulp even if it is more than a revi'is. However, he does not say how much more one could drink at one time.