

24 Kislev 5781
Dec. 10, 2020



Pesachim Daf 19

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 Ashi said to Rav Kahana: It is understandable that Rabbi Yosi does not hold in accordance with Rabbi Akiva, for it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Yosi said: How do we know that a *revi'i* (fourth degree of tumah) by *kodesh* is *pasul*? (The term “*tamei*” describes something that it itself is contaminated and it can transmit tumah to another item; “*pasul*” means that it itself is *cer item*.) He answers that this is derived through *hontaminated*, but it cannot transmit tumah to another *kal vachomer*: We find by a *mechusar kippurim* (one who is lacking atonement) that he is permitted to eat *terumah*, nevertheless, he is forbidden from eating *kodesh* (this indicates that we are stricter in respect to *kodesh* than we are in regards to *terumah*); so a *shlishi*, which is *pasul* by *terumah*, should certainly have the ability to render a *revi'i* by *kodesh*.

The *Gemora* explains: A *shlishi* by *kodesh* is derived through the following Scriptural verse: *And any kodoshim meat that touches anything tamei shall not be eaten*. Since we are speaking about a case where the meat touched something which is a *sheini*, and the Torah states that the meat cannot be eaten. Evidently *kodoshim* meat can become a *shlishi*. And we can derive that a *revi'i* by *kodesh* is unfit from the *kal vachomer* mentioned above.

Now, if you should think that he holds as Rabbi Akiva, let him also state a *revi'i* in the case of *terumah* and a *chamishi* (fifth degree) in the case of *kodesh*? But how do we know that Rabbi Akiva does not agree with Rabbi Yosi?

Rav Kahana said to him: It is because a *Tanna* could not completely refrain from teaching that there is a *revi'i* in

the case of *terumah* and a *chamishi* in the case of *kodesh*, and we would say that it agrees with Rabbi Akiva.

Rav Ashi asks: And shall we stand and rely upon this (as proof that R' Akiva does not hold of this)?

Rav Ashi, and others say, Rav Kahana, went out, searched, and found the following *Mishna* (proving that R' Akiva does not hold that *terumah* is subject to a fourth level of tumah, and that *kodesh* is not subject to a fifth level of tumah): A utensil combines all of its contents together for *kodesh* (if one piece becomes *tamei*, they all become *tamei* even if they are not touching each other), but not for *terumah*. Tumah of *kodesh* extends to a fourth level (*revi'i*), while that of *terumah* extends only to a third level (*shlishi*). And Rabbi Chiya bar Abba said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: This *Mishna* was taught as a result of Rabbi Akiva's testimony, for we learned in a *Mishna*: Rabbi Akiva added the fine flour of *kodesh*, the incense, the frankincense and the coals to the rule that if a *tevul yom* (one who has immersed in a mikvah but still has tumah on him until nightfall) touched part of it, it renders all of it unfit. Evidently, there is a fourth (in *kodesh*), but not a fifth; a third (in the case of *terumah*), but not a fourth. (18b2 – 19a3)

The *Gemora* notes that this proves that he holds that the power of combining is Rabbinical. Now he differs from Rabbi Chanin who maintained that the power of combining is Biblical, for it is written [Bamidbar 17:14]: *One gold ladle of ten shekels, filled with incense*. By the fact that the Torah said “one ladle,” and not “a ladle,” this

teaches us that all the incense of *kodesh* was regarded as one. [Since the verse is referring to *kodesh*, the rule is restricted to *kodesh* and not to *terumah*.] (19a3)

We learned in a *Mishna* elsewhere: [R' Chanina Sgan HaKohanim testified] concerning a (*tamei*) needle which is found in the flesh (*of a sacrifice*), that the knife (*which was used to cut the flesh*) and the hands (*of the Kohen*) are *tahor*, while the flesh is *tamei*; if found in the excrements, it is all *tahor*.

Rabbi Akiva said: We have been fortunate in that there is no *tumah* of the hands in the Temple.

The *Gemora* asks: Then let him say that there is no *tumah* of the hands or of vessels in the Temple?

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav, or as others stated, Rabbi Yosi son of Rabbi Chanina: [The decree of] hands (*that they are Rabbinically tamei*) was taught before the enactment concerning vessels (*and when this testimony was given, the latter was not yet in existence at all*).

Rava asked: Surely both were enacted on that very same day, for we learned in a *Mishna*: The following render *terumah* unfit: a holy Scroll (*containing Scriptural text*); one's hands (*that were not washed*); a *tevul yom*, and food or utensils which were defiled by a liquid.

Rather, said Rava: Leave the *tumah* of the knife, for even in the case of *chullin* it would not be *tamei*, for what did this knife touch that it should be *tamei*? Shall we say that it touched the flesh, surely food cannot contaminate vessels; and if it touched the needle, surely one vessel cannot defile another one?

The *Gemora* asks: What is the condition of this needle? Shall we say that it is a doubtful needle (*if it is tamei or not, and the Rabbis declared that it must be treated as being tamei*); surely it was stated: Rabbi Elozar and Rabbi Yosi

the son of Rabbi Chanina (*taught a rule*): One said: They did not decree *tumah* for doubtful saliva in Yerushalayim (*if saliva is found, and we do not know whose it is, though it might be that of a zav or a zavah, which by Biblical law is an av hatumah and contaminates human beings and vessels*), while the other one said: They did not decree *tumah* for doubtful vessels (*including needles*) in Yerushalayim (*so how, here, when it was found in a sacrifice in the Temple, can it be regarded as tamei*)?

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: It is referring to a case where one lost a needle that became *tamei* through a person contaminated by a corpse (*which renders the needle an av hatumah*), and he recognized it in the flesh (*of the sacrifice*).

Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Avin said: It is referring to a case where the cow was muzzled and came from outside Yerushalayim. [*It therefore must have swallowed it outside, where a doubtfully unclean vessel is tamei, and it remains so even when it enters Yerushalayim.*] (19a3 – 19b2)

It was stated above: Rabbi Elozar and Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Chanina (*taught a rule*): One said: They did not decree *tumah* for doubtful saliva in Yerushalayim (*if saliva is found, and we do not know whose it is, though it might be that of a zav or a zavah, which by Biblical law is an av hatumah and contaminates human beings and vessels*), while the other one said: They did not decree *tumah* for doubtful vessels (*including needles*) in Yerushalayim.

The *Gemora* asks: But we have learned (*in a Mishna about*) saliva, and we have learned (*in a Mishna about*) vessels (*so what was the necessity of these statements*)?

The *Gemora* cites the source: We have learned (*about*) saliva, for it was taught in a *Mishna*: All saliva found in Yerushalayim is *tahor*, except that of the upper marketplace (*which was frequented by the zavim, and*

avoided by others, in order not to contaminate other people)?

The *Gemora* answers: It is necessary to state that this is so (*the saliva is tahor*), even though a *zav* was known to have passed there (*and this would not have been known from the Mishna alone*).

The *Gemora* cites the source: We have learned (*about*) vessels, for it was taught in a *Mishna*: All vessels which are found in Yerushalayim on the way down to the ritual bathhouse are *tamei*. It may be inferred from there that those found elsewhere are *tahor*!?

The *Gemora* counters: Then according to your reasoning, consider the second clause: those found on the way up (*from the bathhouse*) are *tahor*. It may be inferred from here that those found elsewhere are *tamei*!?! [*It is self-contradictory!*?] Rather, the first clause is precise, whereas the second is not precise, and it is to exclude the narrow alleyways (*near the mikvah*). [*These were used indifferently for both going down and going up; therefore, vessels found there were declared tamei, since they were certainly tamei in the first place, and our only doubt is whether they were lost on the way to the mikvah or on the way from the mikvah. But vessels found in the rest of Yerushalayim, where it is not known whether they have been tamei at all, are tahor.*] (19b2 – 19b3)

Now according to Rav who said, ‘E.g., if one lost a needle [tamei through] a person defiled by the dead, and he recognized it in the flesh? — [But] surely since a Master said: The [verse] ‘one slain by the sword’ [teaches that] the sword is as the slain, let it defile human beings and utensils too? — Said Rav Ashi: This proves that the Temple Court ranks as public ground; so that it is a doubt of uncleanness¹ in public ground, and every doubt of tumah

¹ It is doubtful whether the Kohen or knife have touched the needle.

in public ground, the doubt is *tahor*. But in private ground, its doubt is *tahor*? Consider: this needle is an object which has no understanding to be questioned, and everything which has no understanding to be questioned, both in public and in private ground, its doubt is *tahor*? — Because it is a doubt of *tumah* which arises through a person,² and Rabbi Yochanan said: A doubt of *tumah* which arises through a person, we inquire about it, even in the case of a utensil lying on the ground, just as though it were an object which has the understanding to be questioned. (19b3 – 20a1)

DAILY MASHAL

THE SMALL MIRACLES by: Our friends at Hakhel

Many of us may be familiar with the famous question of the P’nei Yehoshua--if the Halacha is that “*tuma hutra b’tzibur*”--impure objects are permitted to be used by the *tzibur*--then what was the problem using all of the oil rendered impure by the Greeks? The Menorah had to be lit for all of K’lal Yisrael and, accordingly, the impure oil was perfectly permissible for use by the *tzibur*--in a word, the miracle of the oil was simply not necessary--according to Halacha! There is a beautiful answer to this question given by HaRav Chaim Shmuelevitz, Z’tl. HaRav Shmuelevitz asks why we place such a great emphasis on the miracle of finding the oil--even over and above the previously unimaginable victories in the wars against the Greeks themselves. After all, it is much easier to find an item one would not expect to find-- than for a handful of *chaloshim*--people who were physically weak to defeat the mightiest army in the world! Furthermore, with the finding of the small jug of oil, a miracle happened for only an additional seven days. Yet, because of the successful wars, the Jewish people retained the Bais HaMikdash for

² A man has been engaged about this animal, and if the knife had touched the needle it would have been through him.

more than 200 years--and their fulfillment of the Torah was saved forever.

To answer this question, HaRav Shmuelevitz notes that the Torah goes out of its way to teach us that when Yosef was brought down to Egypt by the merchants, they were carrying all kinds of fine-smelling spices, rather than the malodorous items that they usually carried (See Bereishis 37:25, and Rashi there). At first glance, it is difficult to understand why what they were carrying mattered at all. Yosef is at the nadir of his life. A few days ago, he had been learning Torah with his father, the Gadol HaDor, and now he was surrounded by idol worshippers who are going to sell him into slavery in a morally bereft country. In a time of darkness such as this, would it make any difference at all what the odors were around him?

The answer is a most definitive "Yes!" The sweet smell of the spices and fragrances were intended to be a sign to Yosef that even in his darkest hour Hashem was with him, and that he was not lost or forgotten. Yosef now understood that there was purpose and plan to what was going on around him. Every miracle, large or small, indicates a "Haoras Panim"--a light from Hashem which shines upon the person and reminds him that he is at all times in Hashem's embrace.

So too here, the miracle of finding a jug of pure oil does, in fact, pale in significance to the miracles that took place during the incredible wars, and the glorious result for the Torah and the Jewish people. Nonetheless, we celebrate the small jug because it demonstrates Hashem's "Haoras Panim"--His singular love, His unique care, His special concern for us as His children at all times and in all circumstances.

A parent who does not appreciate his child will only provide him with the absolute essentials that he really needs. On the other hand, a parent who truly loves his child will go beyond what the child absolutely requires,

and will go overboard and indulge the child. If the miracle of Chanukah had only been to give the "mighty into the hands of the weak" or the "many into the hands of the few," this would have exemplified Hashem providing for our absolute needs only, for He had assured our forefathers that we would continue to exist as a Torah people, and His word must be kept. But the miracle of Chanukah went well beyond that--it reached to the jug of oil. It is this Haoras Panim that we celebrate--that Hashem's affection for us is so great that it extended to that little jug.

Yes, *tuma* may be *hutra b'tzibur*--but His love for us goes so much beyond that, and we can and should reciprocate this feeling.