

25 Kislev 5781  
Dec. 11, 2020



Pesachim Daf 20

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

‘While the flesh is tamei’ — By what was this flesh made fit? Shall we say that it was made fit by the blood? — surely Rabbi Chiya bar Abba said in Rabbi Yochanan's name: How do we know that the blood of sacrifices does not make [anything] fit [to become tamei]? Because it is said, you shall pour it out [sc. the blood] upon the earth as water: blood which is poured out as water renders fit; blood which is not poured out as water does not render fit. Again, if it was made fit by the liquids of the slaughter-house,<sup>1</sup> — surely Rabbi Yosi bar Rabbi Chanina said: The liquids of the [Temple] slaughterhouse, not enough that they are tahor, but they cannot even make [eatables] fit? Again, if it was made fit through the esteem of sacred objects,<sup>2</sup> — say that the prizing of sacred objects is efficacious in rendering that itself unfit, is it also [sufficient] that first and second degree should be counted from it?<sup>3</sup> [In that case] you may solve what Rish Lakish asked: The dry portion of meal-offerings,<sup>4</sup> do we count first and second degrees from it or not?<sup>5</sup> — Said Rav Yehudah in Shmuel's name: E.g., if it was an animal for a shelamim

and it was led through a river and then slaughtered, and the water is still dripping upon it.<sup>6</sup> (20a1 – 20a2)

‘If found in the excrements, it is all tahor.’ But let the excrements render tamei the flesh in their turn?<sup>7</sup> Said Rav Adda bar Ahavah: It refers to thick [solid] excrements. Rav Ashi said: You may even say that it refers to loose [fluidlike] excrements, [its non-render tumah being] because it is a putrid liquid. (20a2)

A teacher of Baraisos recited before Rav Sheishes: A sheretz contaminates liquids, and the liquids contaminates a utensil, and the utensil contaminates eatables, and the eatables contaminates liquids, and [thus] we learn three [stages of] tumah in the case of a sheretz. But there are four? — Delete liquids in the first clause. On the contrary, delete liquids in the last clause? — We find no other Tanna who maintains [that] liquids contaminate utensils save Rabbi Yehudah, and he retracted.<sup>8</sup> And your sign [for remembering the order] is the brewing process.<sup>9</sup> (20a3)

<sup>1</sup> E.g.. the water with which it was washed down.

<sup>2</sup> Sacred objects were prized so highly that they were fit to become tamei even without a liquid having been upon them.

<sup>3</sup> For ‘the flesh is tamei’ implies that it can make other flesh tamei as well.

<sup>4</sup> That which has not been touched by oil.

<sup>5</sup> But if the prizing of sacred objects is so efficacious, obviously we do.

<sup>6</sup> That water makes it fit to contract tumah. — The animal was led through the water immediately prior to its slaughter in order to facilitate flaying

<sup>7</sup> It is assumed that the excrements rank as a fluid, since the animal was watered immediately before slaughter. The needle should therefore render tamei the excrements, and that in turn should render tamei the flesh.

<sup>8</sup> Hence if we retain liquids in the first clause, there is no authority for the second clause, ‘and liquids contaminate a utensil’. By deleting it, however, the reading becomes: a sheretz contaminates utensils.

<sup>9</sup> First there is the vessel; an eatable (sc. dates) is put inside, from there the liquid (sc. beer) is manufactured.

We learned elsewhere: If a sheretz is found in an oven, the bread inside is a second, because the oven is a first.<sup>10</sup> Rav Adda bar Ahavah said to Rava: Let us regard this oven as though it were full with tumah,<sup>11</sup> and let the bread be a first? — Said he to him: You cannot think so, for it was taught: You might think that all utensils become tamei through the air space of an earthen vessel [which is tamei]: therefore it is stated, whatsoever is it, it shall be tamei, and immediately following this it states: of any food which 'may be eaten; food becomes tamei through the air space of an earthen vessel [which is tamei], but no utensils become tamei through the air space of an earthen vessel [which is tamei].<sup>12</sup> (20a3 – 20b1)

Rav Chisda contrasted two teachings of Pesach, and reconciled [them]. Did Rabbi Yehoshua say: Both of them [may be burnt] together?<sup>13</sup> But the following contradicts it: Rabbi Yosi said [to Rabbi Meir]: The conclusion is not similar to the premise. For when our Masters testified, concerning what did they testify? If concerning flesh which was rendered tamei through a derivative tumah, that we burn it together with flesh which was rendered tamei through a father of tumah, [then] this is tamei and that is tamei. If concerning oil which was rendered unfit by a tevul yom, that it is lit in a lamp which was rendered tamei by one tamei through a corpse, — one is unfit and the other is tamei. So too do we admit in the case of terumah which was rendered tamei through a derivative tumah, that we may burn it together with terumah which was rendered tamei through an av hatumah. But how can we burn even that which is doubtful together with that which is tamei;

<sup>10</sup> The sheretz touches the oven, which in turn touches the bread.

<sup>11</sup> For immediately the sheretz enters the air space of the oven.

perhaps Eliyahu will come and declare it tahor! And he answered: one agrees with Rabbi Shimon, and in accordance with Rabbi Yehoshua, while the other agrees with Rabbi Yosi, and in accordance with Rabbi Yehoshua. For it was taught: If the fourteenth falls on the Shabbos, everything [sc. chametz] must be removed before the Shabbos, and terumos that are tamei, doubtful, and tahor are burnt [together]; this is Rabbi Meir's view. Rabbi Yosi said: The tahor [terumah must be burnt] separately, the doubtful [terumah] separately, and the tamei separately. Said Rabbi Shimon: Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua did not differ concerning tahor and tamei, that they must not be burnt [together], and concerning doubtful [terumah] and tahor [terumah] that they may be burnt [together]. Concerning what did they differ? Concerning doubtful [terumah] and tamei [terumah], Rabbi Eliezer maintaining: This must be burnt separately, and this separately; while Rabbi Yehoshua ruled: Both of them, [may be burnt] together. - But our Mishnah is according to Rabbi Yosi? — Rabbi Yosi says thus to Rabbi Meir: Even Rabbi Shimon, who in stating Rabbi Yehoshua's opinion is lenient, is lenient only in respect of doubtful [terumah] and tamei [terumah], but not in the case of tahor and tamei. (20b1 – 20b2)

Rabbi Yosi son of Rabbi Chanina contrasted terumah to Pesach, and reconciled them. Did then Rabbi Yehoshua say: Both together: But the following contradicts it: A cask of terumah wherein a doubt of tumah is born, Rabbi Eliezer said: If lying in an exposed place, it must be laid in a hidden place; and if it was uncovered, it must be covered. Rabbi Yehoshua said: If it is lying in a hidden place, one may lay it in an exposed place, and if it is

<sup>12</sup> But if the sheretz, were regarded as completely filling the oven, utensils inside as well should be tamei, for direct contact with it does render them tamei.

<sup>13</sup> Sc. tamei terumah and doubtful terumah.

covered, it may be uncovered. Thus only an indirect action [is permitted], but not [defiling] with [one's own] hands? — And he answered: one agrees with Rabbi Shimon and according to Rabbi Yehoshua's view, while the other agrees with Rabbi Yosi and according to Rabbi Yehoshua's view.<sup>14</sup> (20b2 – 20b3)

Rabbi Elozar contrasted two teachings of terumah and reconciled them. Did Rabbi Yehoshua say: only an indirect action [is permitted], but not with [one's own] hands? But the following contradicts it: If a cask of [wine of tahor] terumah is broken in the upper vat, while [in] the lower there is tamei chullin: Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua agree that if a revi'is of it can be saved in purity, one must save it. But if not, — Rabbi Eliezer ruled: Let it descend and become tamei, yet let him not rendered tamei it with [his own] hands; Rabbi Yehoshua said: He may even render it tamei with his own hands? — And he answered: There it is different, because there is the loss of chullin. To this Rava demurred: In our Mishnah too there is the loss of wood? — Said Abaye to him: They cared about a substantial loss, but not about a slight loss. - And from where do you know that they cared about a substantial loss but not about a slight one? Because it was taught: If a cask of oil of [tahor] terumah was broken in the upper vat, while in the lower is tamei chullin: Rabbi Eliezer concedes to Rabbi Yehoshua that if a revi'is of it can be saved in purity, one must save it. But if not, let it descend and become

tamei, yet let him not render it tamei with [his own] hands.<sup>15</sup> Why is oil different: because it is fit for lighting? Then wine too is fit for sprinkling?<sup>16</sup> And should you answer, sprinkling is of no account, — surely, Shmuel said in Rabbi Chiya's name: You drink [wine] at a sela per log, whereas you sprinkle [with wine] at two selas per log?<sup>17</sup> — It refers to new [wine].<sup>18</sup> But it is fit for ageing? — one will come to a stumbling-block through it.<sup>19</sup> Then oil too, one will come to a stumbling-block through it? — He pours it into a dirty vessel.<sup>20</sup> Wine too can be poured into a dirty vessel? — Seeing that it is required for sprinkling, will he pour it into a dirty vessel! (20b3 – 20b4)

Now a stumbling-block itself is dependent on Tannaim.<sup>21</sup> For it was taught: A cask of wine of terumah which was rendered tamei, — Beis Shammai maintain: It must be poured out all at once; while Beis Hillel rule: It may be used for sprinkling. Rabbi Yishmael son of Rabbi Yosi said: I will make a compromise. [If it is] in the field, it must be poured out all at once;<sup>22</sup> in the house, it can be used for sprinkling. Others state: In the case of new [wine], it must be poured out all at once; in the case of old, it can be used for sprinkling. Said they to him: The compromise of a third [view] is not a compromise.<sup>23</sup> Rabbi Yosi son of Rabbi Chanina said: The controversy is where it falls into less than one hundred se'ahs of tamei chullin;<sup>24</sup> but if it falls into one hundred [se'ahs] tamei chullin, all agree that it must

<sup>14</sup> Who says, how can we burn even doubtful terumah together with tamei terumah? Thus he will certainly not permit more than indirect action.

<sup>15</sup> All agree on this, because the loss of chullin is only slight, since the tamei terumah can be used for lighting.

<sup>16</sup> In a room, for its aroma. Hence here too there is only a slight loss.

<sup>17</sup> Thus it is even more important.

<sup>18</sup> Which lacks aroma.

<sup>19</sup> While it is ageing he may forget that it is tamei and drink it.

<sup>20</sup> So that it will not be fit for drinking.

<sup>21</sup> I.e., whether we fear it or not.

<sup>22</sup> Because there is no sprinkling in the field, nor may he bring it home, lest it become a stumbling-block in the meanwhile.

<sup>23</sup> Since Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel mention nothing about a house or a field, new or old, this is not a compromise but an independent view altogether

<sup>24</sup> The terumah in the upper vat being a se'ah. If terumah falls into one hundred times as much chullin it is nullified and permitted to a lay Israelite; if less, it is not nullified.

descend and become tamei, and he must not render it tamei with [his own] hands. It was taught likewise: If a cask [of tahor terumah] was broken in the upper vat, and beneath it there is one hundred [times as much] tamei chullin, Rabbi Eliezer concedes to Rabbi Yehoshua that if he can save a revi'is of it in purity he must save it, but if not, let it descend and become tamei, but he must not render it tamei with [his own] hands. [But instead of] this [phrase]: 'Rabbi Eliezer concedes to Rabbi Yehoshua'; 'Rabbi Yehoshua concedes to Rabbi Eliezer' is required?<sup>25</sup> — Said Rava: Reverse it. Rav Huna the son of Rabbi Yehoshua said: After all you need not reverse it: what case do we discuss here? That of a vessel, the inside is tahor while its outside is tamei; you might say: Let us enact a preventive measure lest its outside touch the terumah. Therefore he informs us [otherwise].<sup>26</sup> (20b4 – 21a2)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, OR L'ARBA'AH ASAR

### DAILY MASHAL

**THE CHANUKAH 'STORY':** HaRav Mattisyahu Salomon, Shlita, in his Sefer *Ma'amarim* emphasizes that the actual 'story' of Chanukah is not interesting to us from a historical perspective, as history could simply be viewed in a social, political and a particular historian's context. In fact, whatever has occurred throughout the world's existence has happened only because it was Hashem's express and explicit will. When Chazal (Shabbos 21b) ask *Mai Chanukah*--what is Chanukah?--they respond not by going into lengthy details of the

<sup>25</sup> It is Rabbi Eliezer who holds that he must never defile deliberately, while it is Rabbi Yehoshua who permits deliberate tumah in other circumstances

<sup>26</sup> Thus 'Rabbi Eliezer concedes to Rabbi Yehoshua' applies not to the second clause but to the first, where it is stated that if he can save a revi'is in purity he must do so. Thereupon we are told that even if the outside of the vessel in which it is to be saved is

various strategies and battles, but rather with our relationship with Hashem and the miracles He performs on our behalf. Our view of 'history' is replete with *r'l* our falling prey to sin, suffering the consequences and then returning to Hashem--Who brings about our salvation, sometimes in a clearly miraculous way, and other times hidden in the guise of politics, movements and the like. History's message of Chanukah to us in this protracted galus is to once and for all not fail and fall--so that we have the ultimate salvation that only Hashem can bring. HaRav Salomon points out that this is inherent in the term 'Macabi'--*Mi Chamocha Ba'eilim Hashem*--we realize that it is only Yeshuas Hashem that we need--and that will come about only through our own thoughts, words and actions. Let us take the lessons of Chanukah with us--committing to rid ourselves of the tzaros, of the pain and suffering, that we find ourselves in, through our own Teshuvah--so that we can witness that final and ultimate Yeshuas Hashem! Hakhel Note: Perhaps we can begin with what you might perceive as a Hellenistic influence upon you--and try to curb and eliminate it!

tamei, so that there is the slight possibility of the terumah falling thereon and becoming contaminated, yet Rabbi Eliezer, who rules that in no circumstances is deliberate tumah permitted, admits that he may use this for saving the terumah. If tamei liquid falls on the outside of a vessel it contaminates the outside, but not the inside, since the tumah of a vessel through liquids is by Rabbinical law only.