

1 Teves 5781
Dec. 16, 2020



Pesachim Daf 25

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

Rabbi Yaakov said in Rabbi Yochanan's name: We may cure ourselves with all things, save with the wood of the asheirah. How is it meant? If we say that there is danger, even the wood of the asheirah too [is permitted]; while if there is no danger, even all [other] forbidden things of the Torah too are not [permitted]? — After all [it means] that there is danger, yet even so the wood of the asheirah [must] not be used. For it was taught, Rabbi Eliezer said: If ‘with all your soul’ is said, why is ‘with all your might’ said? Or if ‘with all your might’ is said, why is ‘with all your soul’ said? But it is to teach you: if there is a man to whom his person is dearer than his wealth, therefore, ‘with all your soul’ is stated; and if there is a man to whom his wealth is dearer than his person, therefore ‘with all your might’ [i.e.. substance] is stated. (25a2 – 25a3)

When Ravin came, he said in Rabbi Yochanan's name: We may cure [i.e., save] ourselves with all [forbidden] things, except idolatry, illicit relations, or murder. The source for idolatry was stated above. Concerning illicit relations and murder, it was taught in a Baraisa: It is said regarding a betrothed naarah (maiden) who is not punished for committing adultery against her will: for like a man who rises up against his fellow and murders him, so is this thing (the raping of a betrothed naarah). Now, what connection has a murderer with a betrothed maiden? Thus this comes to throw light, and is itself illumined. The Torah likens the laws regarding a murderer to the laws regarding the betrothed naarah, which teaches us that just like a

betrothed naarah should be saved from the rape even at the expense of her attacker’s life, so too if someone will fall prey to murderer, the victim should be saved even at the expense of the murderer’s life.

The law regarding the betrothed naarah is learned from the law of a murderer, as just like one must forfeit his life rather than to murder another Jew, also a betrothed naarah should forfeit her life rather than commit adultery.

From where do we know this regarding murder itself? We know that one must forfeit his life rather than murder someone else based on logic, because a person came to Rava and told him, “The governor of my town has ordered me, ‘Go and kill So-and-so, if not, I will kill you’.” He answered him: ‘Let him kill you rather than that you should commit murder; what [reason] do you see [for thinking] that your blood is redder? Perhaps his blood is redder.’¹ (25a3 – 25b1)

Mar son of Rav Ashi found Ravina rubbing his daughter with undeveloped olives of orlah. Said he to him: Granted that the Rabbis ruled [thus] in time of danger; was it [likewise] ruled when there is no danger?’ ‘This inflammatory fever is also like a time of danger,’ he answered him. Others say, he answered him: ‘Am I then using it in the normal manner of its usage?’ (25b1 – 25b2)

¹ Since one does not know whose life Hashem values more, he cannot murder someone else in order to save his own life.



It was stated: [As to forbidden] benefit that comes to a man against his will, — Abaye said: It is permitted; while Rava maintained: It is forbidden. Where it is possible [to avoid it], while he intends [to benefit], or if it is impossible [to avoid it], yet he intends [to benefit], none dispute that it is forbidden. If it is impossible [to avoid it], and he does not intend [to benefit], none dispute that it is permitted. They differ where it is possible [to avoid it] and he does not intend [to benefit]; now, on the view of Rabbi Yehudah, who ruled: That which is unintended is forbidden, none dispute that it is forbidden. Where do they differ? On the view of Rabbi Shimon, who maintained: That which is unintended is permitted. Abaye rules as Rabbi Shimon. But Rava [argues]: Rabbi Shimon rules thus only where it is impossible [to do otherwise], but not where it is possible.²

Others state: If it is possible [to avoid it], and he does not intend [to benefit], that is [the case of] the controversy between Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Shimon. If it is impossible [to avoid it], and he does not intend [to benefit], none dispute that it is permitted. When do they differ? Where it is impossible [to avoid it] and he intends [to benefit]. Now, on the view of Rabbi Shimon, who regards the intention, none dispute that it is forbidden. Where do they differ? On the view of Rabbi Yehudah, who maintained: It makes no difference whether he intends or does not intend, if it is possible [to avoid it] it is forbidden. Abaye rules as Rabbi Yehudah.³ Rava says thus: Rabbi Yehudah rules that the unintentional is the same as the intentional only in the direction of stringency, but he did not rule that the intentional is the same as the

² The controversy of Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Shimon is with respect to dragging a bench over an earthen floor on the Shabbos, because it is needed in another part of the room. The dragging may make a rut in the earth, which is forbidden. Now in Abaye's view, Rabbi Shimon permits the unintentional even when the whole act is avoidable, e.g., the bench is light enough to be carried. But in Rava's view Rabbi Shimon permits it only when the bench is too heavy for this, so that the dragging is

unintentional where it is in the direction of leniency. (25b2 – 26a1)

DAILY MASHAL

The Evil Eye

The Gemara states that one is forbidden to spread out a lost article that he is watching when he has guests because when the guests see the article being displayed, they may be envious and they will cast an evil eye on the article.

One must wonder why one should be concerned of someone else's jealousy, especially if it is said: and the rotting of the bones is jealousy. Why should one be concerned that someone else's envy will harm his belongings and property?

We find that the gentile prophet Balaam, when blessing the Jewish people, declared, how good are your tents, Yaakov, your dwelling places, O Israel. The Gemara states that Balaam saw that every Jewish tent was aligned in a way that no one could see inside his neighbors' tent. Besides for the issue of privacy, there was another dimension to this blessing. Balaam had an evil eye, and Balaam wished to curse the Jewish People with his influence. By casting an evil eye on a neighbor, one is essentially influencing his Jewish friend with the character of Balaam, and this is detrimental to one's well-being. For this reason one should avoid casting an evil eye on someone else, and one must also be careful to avoid

unavoidable. — An action is regarded as unavoidable when its purpose — here to have the bench elsewhere — is permissible or necessary. Similarly below, lecturing to the masses is regarded as unavoidable.

³ Since Rabbi Yehudah rules thus, we see that the matter always depends on whether it is avoidable or not; therefore if it is unavoidable it is permitted.



allowing others to cast an evil eye on himself or on his possessions.