

9 Shevat 5781  
Jan. 22, 2021



Pesachim Daf 62

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

Rather, said Rav Ashi, Rav Chisda and Rabbah differ in this verse: And it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him: ‘for him’, but not for his companion. Rabbah holds, His companion must be like himself: just as he is capable of atonement, so must his companion be capable of atonement, thus excluding this uncircumcised person, who is not capable of atonement. But Rav Chisda holds: This uncircumcised person too, since he is subject to the obligation, he is [also] subject to atonement, **since** if he wishes he can make himself fit.

The Gemara asks: And does Rav Chisda maintain the principle of “since”? But it was stated: One who bakes on Yom Tov for the purpose of using the food during the week, Rav Chisda says that he incurs lashes, while Rabbah says that he does not incur lashes. Rabbah says that he does not receive lashes. Rabbah maintains: ‘Since’ it is possible that guests might come to his house (and he would now be able to feed them food), it is considered suitable for him now (so he does not clearly transgress preparing for a weekday on Yom Tov as he still might use the food today). Rav Chisda says that he does not incur lashes, for we do not say “since.”<sup>1</sup> The *Gemora* asks: As for Rabbah, it is understandable, and there is no difficulty, for here (*in the case of circumcision*), an action is wanting (the act of

circumcision, and therefore the korban is invalid), whereas there, an action is not wanting (for he merely needs to orally invite guests). But Rav Chisda is self-contradictory (if he holds the principle of ‘since’ or not)?

The *Gemora* answers: I will tell you: Rav Chisda rejects the argument of ‘since’ where it leads to a greater leniency; but where it results in a stringency, he accepts it. (61b3 – 62a2)

Mar Zutra son of Rav Mari said to Ravina: The braisa teaches: since (intention for) uncircumcision invalidates, and (intention for) tumah invalidates; then just as tumah, part tumah was not made tantamount to entire tumah, so uncircumcision, part uncircumcision was not made tantamount to entire uncircumcision. The *Gemora* explains: How is this tumah meant? Shall we say that it means tumah of the person, and the meaning of ‘part tumah was not made tantamount to entire tumah’ means that if there are four or five tamei people and four or five tahor people, the tamei do not invalidate the korban pesach for the tahor. But then in the case of uncircumcision as well, they do not invalidate, for we learned in a Mishnah: for circumcised and uncircumcised . . . it is fit: how then is tumah different, that he is certain about it, and how is uncircumcision different, that he is uncertain (about its

<sup>1</sup> Rav Chisda argues that this possibility is not enough to save this sinner from what he is actually doing, which is preparing for a weekday on Yom Tov, punishable by lashes.

law)? Rather, it must refer to tumah of the meat, and the meaning of 'part *tumah* was not made tantamount to entire *tumah* is referring to a case where one of the limbs becomes *tamei*; that which becomes *tamei* we burn, while the others we eat.

The *Gemora* asks: To what have you referred it? To tumah of the meat! Then consider the end of the *braisa*: you judge that which does not apply to all sacrifices by that which does not apply to all sacrifices; and do not allow time to disprove it, since it applies to all sacrifices. Now what does '*tumah*' mean? Shall we say, tumah of the meat; why does it not apply to all sacrifices? Rather, it is obvious that it refers to tumah of a person, and 'it does not apply to all sacrifices' means as follows: For whereas in the case of all other sacrifices, an uncircumcised person and a *tamei* person can send their sacrifices, in the case of the *korban pesach*, an uncircumcised person and a *tamei* person cannot send their sacrifices. Shall we say then that the first clause refers to tumah of the meat, while the second clause refers to tumah of the person?

Ravina answered to him: he argues from the designation of *tumah* (in general). Alternatively, the end of the *braisa* as well refers to the tumah of meat. And when the *braisa* said that 'it does not apply to all sacrifices,' it meant as follows: for whereas in the case of all other sacrifices, whether the fat (the sacrificial parts) became *tamei* while the meat remained *tahor*, or the meat became *tamei* while the fat remained *tahor*, the Kohen sprinkles the blood; in the case of the *korban pesach* if the fat became *tamei* while the meat remained *tahor*, he sprinkles the blood; but if the meat becomes *tamei* while the fat remained *tahor*, he must not sprinkle the blood.

The *Gemora* asks: To what have you referred it - to tumah of the meat? Then consider the end of the *braisa*: 'you derive something (an uncircumcised person) which was not granted an exception from its general interdict by something which was not granted an exception from its general interdict, and do not let tumah disprove it, seeing that it was granted an exception from its general interdict.' What type of *tumah* is being referred to? Shall we say that it refers to the case of tumah of the meat; where was it permitted? Rather, it obviously refers to tumah of the person, and where was it permitted? It was permitted in the case of a community? It emerges that the first clause refers to tumah of meat, while the second clause refers to the tumah of the person!?

The *Gemora* answers: Yes; he argues from the designation of tumah. Alternatively, the entire *braisa* refers to tumah of the meat; and pertaining to the question of 'where was it permitted,' it was permitted in the case of the tumah of the *korban Pesach*, for we learned in a *Mishnah*: The *korban pesach* which comes (if offered) in tumah is eaten in tumah, for at the very outset it did not come for anything except to be eaten. (62a2 – 62b1)

Rav Huna son of Rabbi Yehoshua raised an objection from the following *braisa*: A *pesach* offering whose year has passed (*and is therefore considered a shelamim*) and it was slaughtered in its set time (*the fourteenth of Nissan*) for its own sake (*for a pesach*), and similarly, if one slaughters other sacrifices for the sake of a *pesach* offering in its set time, Rabbi Eliezer disqualifies them, while Rabbi Yehoshua says that they are valid. [The *Gemora* in *Zevachim* explains: Rabbi Eliezer proposed the following argument: We find that a residual *pesach* comes as a *shelamim*, whereas a residual *shelamim* does not come as a *pesach* offering. Now if the *pesach*

offering, whose residual comes as a *shelamim*, is invalid if one slaughters it in its set time as a *shelamim*; then a *shelamim*, whose residual does not come for a *pesach* offering, is it not logical that if it was slaughtered in its set time for the sake of a *pesach* that it should be invalid?!] Now, the reason that Rabbi Eliezer invalidates it is that it is in its specific time, but if it were slaughtered at a different time, it would be valid; yet why would that be so? Let us say that since he invalidates it in its own time, he also invalidates it at a different time?

Rav Pappa said: There it is different, because the Torah has written: Then you shall say: It is the *pesach* sacrifice. Let it retain its own nature: neither may it be slaughtered for the sake of other sacrifices, nor may others be slaughtered for its sake; in its time when it is disqualified if slaughtered for the sake of others, others are disqualified if slaughtered for its sake; at a different time, when it is valid if slaughtered for the sake of others, others are valid if slaughtered for its sake. (62b1)

Rav Simlai came before Rabbi Yochanan [and] requested him, Let the Master teach me the Book of Yochasin.<sup>2</sup> Said he to him, From where are you? — He replied, From Lod. And where is your dwelling? In Nehardea. Said he to him, We do not discuss it either with the Lodians or with the Nehardeans, and how much more so with you, who are from Lod and live in Nehardea! But he urged him, and he consented, Let us learn it in three months, he proposed. [Thereupon] he

<sup>2</sup> A commentary on Chronicles, presumably so called because of the many genealogical lists it contains.

<sup>3</sup> Why is it disqualified in the first case but fit in the second?

<sup>4</sup> The illegitimate intention is in respect of the sacrifice itself.

<sup>5</sup> I.e., you cannot say this portion of the animal was sacrificed for its own purpose, and that portion for another purpose.

took a clod and threw it at him, saying, If Beruriah, wife of Rabbi Meir [and] daughter of Rabbi Chanina ben Teradyon, who studied three hundred laws from three hundred teachers in [one] day, could nevertheless not fulfill her obligation in three years, yet you propose [to do it] in three months! As he was going he said to him, Master, What is the difference between [a *pesach* sacrifice which is offered both] for its own purpose and for a different purpose, and [one that is offered both] for those who can eat it and for those who cannot eat it?<sup>3</sup> — Since you are a scholar, he answered him, come and I will tell you. [When it is slaughtered] for its own purpose and for another purpose, its disqualification is in [respect of] itself;<sup>4</sup> [when he kills it] for those who can eat it and for those who cannot eat it, its disqualification is not in [respect of] itself; [when it is] for its own purpose and for another purpose, it is impossible to distinguish its prohibition;<sup>5</sup> [when it is] for those who can eat it and for those who cannot eat it, it is possible to distinguish its prohibition.<sup>6</sup> [Sacrificing] for its own purpose and for another purpose applies to the four services; for those who can eat it and for those who cannot eat it, does not apply to the four services.<sup>7</sup> [The disqualification of sacrificing] for its own purpose and for another purpose applies to the community as to an individual;<sup>8</sup> for those who can eat it and for those who cannot eat it, does not apply to the community as to an individual.<sup>9</sup>

Rav Ashi said: [That] its disqualification is intrinsic and [that] it is impossible to distinguish its prohibition are [one and] the same thing. For why does he say [that] its

<sup>6</sup> It is possible to allocate separately the share for those who cannot eat it.

<sup>7</sup> An intention with respect to the eaters expressed or conceived at the sprinkling has no effect.

<sup>8</sup> I.e., both to private and to public sacrifices.

<sup>9</sup> Intention in respect to eaters has effect only in the case of the *pesach* sacrifice, which is a private one, and in no others.



disqualification is intrinsic? Because it is impossible to distinguish its prohibition. (62b1 – 62b2)

Rami the son of Rav Yehudah said: Since the day that the Book of Yochasin was hidden, the strength of the Sages has been impaired and the light of their eyes has been dimmed.<sup>10</sup>

Mar Zutra said: Between 'Atzel' and 'Atzel' they were laden with four hundred camels of exegetical interpretations!<sup>11</sup> (62b2 – 62b3)

It was taught: Others say: If he put the circumcised before the uncircumcised,<sup>12</sup> it is fit; the uncircumcised before the circumcised, it is disqualified. Where does [the case where he put] circumcised before [the case where he put] uncircumcised differ, that it is fit, — because we require [them to be] all uncircumcised;<sup>13</sup> then [where he put] the uncircumcised before the circumcised too, we require all [to be] uncircumcised, which is absent? (62b3)

#### DAILY MASHAL

The Gemora states that the book of ancestry was hidden, and had a bad effect on Torah learning. This raises many questions. Why was the book of ancestry hidden? Why did it have a bad effect on the Torah learning of Bnei Yisroel?

The Maharsha explains that it is possible that this is due to the threats that started to arrive from people who were as powerful as their lineage was poor. They did

not want these facts recorded and spread. This could be why, the Maharsha explains, we find that the Chachamim only told their trusted students once every seven years which families they should stay away from.

The Maharsha explains further that we know that Torah wisdom is actually regarded as being on a higher plane than prophecy. Being that prophecy is only allowed to people of kosher lineage, it is certain, the Maharsha says, that Torah wisdom is similarly affected and does not rest (in a strong fashion) on people with unkosher lineage.

<sup>10</sup> It contained the reasons for many Scriptural laws which have been forgotten.

<sup>11</sup> I.e., on the passage commencing with 'And Atzel had six sons' (I Chron. VIII, 38) and ending with 'these were the sons of Atzel' (Ibid. IX, 44) there were such an enormous number of different

interpretations! Some comment: This too, of course, is not to be understood literally.

<sup>12</sup> I.e., if he first intended it for the former and then for the latter.

<sup>13</sup> In order to disqualify the sacrifice.