

13 Shevat 5781
Jan. 26, 2021



Pesachim Daf 66

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

The Mishna enumerates what Shabbos prohibitions are permitted on Erev Pesach for offering the Pesach and which are not. The permitted ones are slaughtering, applying the blood, clearing waste from the intestines, and offering the fats, but one may not roast it or rinse the intestines. The Mishna says that one may not carry the Pesach into the courtyard, bring it from outside the techum, or remove a wart, which is a blemish which makes it invalid, but Rabbi Eliezer says that one may do these. Rabbi Eliezer says that it is logical to allow these. If slaughtering, which is a Torah prohibited act, is permitted, certainly these, which are al Rabbinic, should be permitted. Rabbi Yehoshua challenged this argument from the case of Yom Tov, where one may do Torah prohibited work for the purpose of food preparation, but one may not do a Rabbinic prohibition, like going outside the techum, for food preparation. Rabbi Eliezer rejected this, as offering a Pesach is a mitzvah, while eating on Yom Tov is not. Rabbi Akiva challenged Rabbi Eliezer from the sprinkling of the ashes of the red heifer on one who is tamei, which is only Rabbinically prohibited, and is still prohibited on Shabbos which is Erev Pesach. Rabbi Eliezer responded that he says that sprinkling is permitted, from the same logical argument. Rabbi Akiva responded that perhaps we should use this argument to prove that slaughtering the Pesach is prohibited – if sprinkling, which is only Rabbinically prohibited, is prohibited, surely slaughtering, which is prohibited from the Torah, is prohibited. Rabbi Eliezer rejected this, as this would uproot the verse which says that one must offer the Pesach *b'moado* – in its time, i.e., whether it is Shabbos or not. Rabbi Akiva asked Rabbi Eliezer where there is a

similar verse to explicitly include Rabbinic prohibitions. Rabbi Akiva says that the rule is any act which couldn't have been done before Shabbos is permitted, but anything else is prohibited. (65b4 – 66a1)

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: This halachah (slaughtering the korban pesach on Shabbos) was hidden from the sons of Beseirah. On one occasion, the fourteenth (of Nissan) fell on the Shabbos, and they forgot and they did not know whether the korban pesach overrides the Shabbos or not. They said: Is there any man who knows whether the korban pesach overrides the Shabbos or not. They were told: There is a certain man who has come up from Babylonia, Hillel the Babylonian by name, who served the two greatest men of the time, Shemayah and Avtalyon, and he knows whether the korban pesach overrides the Shabbos or no. They summoned him and said to him, “Do you know whether the korban pesach overrides the Shabbos or not?” He replied to them, “Have we then only one korban pesach during the year which overrides the Shabbos?” replied he to them, “Surely we have many more than two hundred korban pesachs during the year which override the Shabbos! [During the year more than two hundred sacrifices are offered on the Shabbos, viz., the two daily olos of the tamid and the two additional sacrifices of every Shabbos, besides the extra sacrifices offered on the Shabbos which occurs in the middle of Pesach and the middle of Sukkos.] They to him, “How do you know it?” He answered them, ‘In its appointed time’ is stated in connection with the korban pesach, and ‘In its appointed time’ is stated in connection with the tamid; just as ‘Its appointed time’ which is said in connection with the tamid

overrides the Shabbos, so 'Its appointed time' which is said in connection with the korban pesach overrides the Shabbos. Additionally, there is a kal vachomer: if the tamid, which is not punished by kares (if it is not offered), overrides the Shabbos, then the korban pesach, which is punished by kares (when it is not offered), is it not logical that it overrides the Shabbos! They immediately set him at their head and appointed him Nasi over them, and he was sitting and lecturing the entire day on the laws of Pesach.

He began rebuking them with words. He said to them, "What caused it for you that I should come up from Babylonia to be a Nasi over you? It was your laziness, because you did not serve the two greatest men of the time, Shemayah and Avtalyon." They said to him, 'Master, what if a man forgot and did not bring a knife (to the Beis Hamikdash) on the eve of the Shabbos?' He answered, "I have heard this law, but have forgotten it. But leave it to Israel; if they are not prophets, they are the children of prophets (and will figure out what is proper)!" The next day, he whose korban pesach was a sheep, stuck it (the knife) in its wool; he whose korban pesach was a goat, stuck it between its horns. Hillel saw the incident and recollected the halachah and said, "I have received the tradition from the mouths of Shemayah and Avtalyon." (66a1 – 66a3)

The master had stated: 'In its appointed season' is stated in connection with the korban pesach, and 'in its appointed time' is stated in connection with the tamid: just as 'its appointed time' which is said in connection with the tamid overrides the Shabbos, so too 'its appointed time' which is said in connection with the korban pesach overrides the Shabbos.

The *Gemora* asks: And how do we know that the tamid itself overrides the Shabbos? Shall we say that it is because 'in its appointed time' is written in connection with it; then the korban pesach as well, surely 'in its appointed time' is

written in connection with it? Therefore you must say that 'in its appointed time' has no significance for him (Hillel); then here as well, 'in its appointed time' should have no significance for him? Rather, the Torah said: This is the olah of every Shabbos, beside for the olah of the tamid offering; where it follows that the olah of the tamid offering is offered on the Shabbos. (66a3)

The master had stated: Additionally, there is a kal vachomer: if the tamid, which is not punished by kares (if it is not offered), overrides the Shabbos, then the korban pesach, which is punished by kares (when it is not offered), is it not logical that it overrides the Shabbos!

The *Gemora* asks: But this can be refuted: as for the tamid, that is because it is brought frequently and entirely consumed?

The *Gemora* answers: He first told them the kal vachomer argument, but they refuted it; so then he told them the gezeirah shavah.

The *Gemora* asks: But since he had received the tradition of a gezeirah shavah, what was the need of the kal vachomer argument?

The *Gemora* answers: Rather, he (Hillel) spoke to them (the sons of Beseirah) on their own ground: It is understandable that you do not learn a gezeirah shavah, because a man cannot expound a gezeirah shavah of his own accord, but through a kal vachomer, which a man can expound of his own accord, you should have argued!

They said to him: It is a faulty kal vachomer argument. (66a3 – 66a4)

The master had stated: The next day, he whose korban pesach was a sheep, stuck it (the knife) in its wool; he whose korban pesach was a goat, stuck it between its horns.



The *Gemora* asks: But he performed work with consecrated animals?

The *Gemora* answers: They did as Hillel, for it was taught in a *braisa*: we learned in a *braisa*: They said about Hillel the Elder that no person committed *me'ilah* (one who has unintentionally benefited from *hekdash* or removed it from the ownership of the *Beis Hamikdosh* has committed the transgression of *me'ilah*, and as a penalty, he would be required to pay the value of the object plus an additional fifth of the value; he also brings a *korban asham*) with their *korban olah* in his days. Hillel would bring an unconsecrated animal into the (entrance of the) Temple Courtyard and only then, would he consecrate it, place his hands upon it (for the *mitzvah of semichah*) and slaughter it. (This way, there was hardly any time for *me'ilah*; this was the method that the righteous employed to make a *nedavah*.)

The *Gemora* asks: How might a person consecrate the *korban pesach* on the *Shabbos*? Surely we learned in a *Mishna*: One cannot consecrate an animal for a *korban* or donate items to the *Beis Hamikdosh*. One is not allowed to pledge the value of himself or others to the treasury of the *Beis Hamikdosh*. One is prohibited from separating *terumah* and *maasros*. They said all this of Festivals, how much the more of the *Shabbos*!?

The *Gemora* answers: That applies only to obligations whose time is not fixed; but in the case of obligations whose time is fixed, you may consecrate, for R. Johanan said: One may consecrate his *korban pesach* on *Shabbos*, and similarly, one can consecrate his *korban chagigah* on *Yom Tov*.

¹ Though his rebuke was probably justified and timely, he should not have drawn attention to his own promotion.

The *Gemora* asks: But he is leading a laden animal?

The *Gemora* answers: He leads it in an unusual way.

The *Gemora* asks: But even leading it in an unusual manner, granted that there is no Scriptural prohibition, there is nevertheless a Rabbinical prohibition!?

The *Gemora* answers: That is precisely what they (the sons of Beseirah) inquired of him (Hillel): An action which is permitted by Scripture, while a Rabbinic injunction stands before it to render it impossible, such as an action performed in an unusual manner, (standing,) in the way of a *mitzvah*, what is the *halachah*? He said to them, "I have heard this law, but have forgotten it. But leave it to Israel; if they are not prophets, they are the children of prophets (and will figure out what is proper)!" (66a4 – 66b2)

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: Whoever is boastful, if he is a Sage, his wisdom departs from him; if he is a prophet, his prophecy departs from him. If he is a Sage, his wisdom departs from him: [we learn this] from Hillel. For the Master said, 'He began rebuking them with words,' and [then] he said to them, 'I have heard this *halachah*, but have forgotten it'.¹ If he is a prophet, his prophecy departs from him: [we learn this] from Devorah. For it is written: The rulers ceased in Israel, they ceased, until that I arose, Devorah, I arose a mother in Israel; and it is written: Awake, awake, Devorah, awake, awake, utter a song.²

Rish Lakish said: As to every man who becomes angry, if he is a Sage, his wisdom departs from him; if he is a prophet, his prophecy departs from him. If he is a Sage, his wisdom departs from him: [we learn this] from Moshe. For

² Thus after boasting that she was a mother in Israel, she had to be urged to awake and utter song. i.e., prophecy, the spirit having departed from her.

it is written: And Moshe became angry with the officers of the army etc.; and it is written: And Elozar the Kohen said unto the men of war that went to the battle: This is the statute of the law which Hashem has commanded Moshe etc., from where it follows that it had been forgotten by Moshe. If he is a prophet, his prophecy departs from him: [we learn this] from Elisha. Because it is written: 'were it not that I regard the presence of Yehoshafat the king of Judah, I would not look toward you, nor see you', and it is written: 'But now bring me a musician,' And it came to pass, when the musician played, that the hand of Hashem [i.e., the spirit of prophecy] came upon him.

Rabbi Mani bar Pattish said: Whoever becomes angry, even if greatness has been decreed for him by Heaven, is cast down. From where do we know it? From Eliav, for it is said: and Eliav's anger was kindled against David, and he said: 'Why is this that you came down? and with whom did you leave those few sheep in the wilderness? I know your presumptuousness, and the naughtiness of your heart; for you came down that you might see the battle.' And when Shmuel went to anoint him [sc. A king], of all [David's brothers] it is written: neither has Hashem chosen this, whereas of Eliav it is written: But Hashem said unto Shmuel, 'Look not on his countenance, or on the height of his stature; because I have rejected him': hence it follows that He had favored him until then. (66b2 – 66b3)

We have [thus] found that the tamid and the pesach sacrifice override the Shabbos; how do we know that they override tumah?³ — I will tell you: just as he learns the pesach sacrifice from the tamid in respect to the Shabbos, so also does he learn the tamid from the pesach sacrifice in respect to tumah. And how do we know it of the pesach sacrifice itself? — Said Rabbi Yochanan. Because the verse states: If any man of you shall be tamei by reason of a dead body; a man [i.e.. an individual] is relegated to Pesach

Sheini, but a community is not relegated to Pesach Sheini, but they must offer it in [a state of] tumah. Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said to Rabbi Yochanan: Say, a man is relegated to the Pesach Sheini, [whereas] a community has no remedy [for its tumah]. neither on the first Pesach, nor on Pesach Sheini? Rather, said Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish: [It is deduced] from here: [Command the children of Israel,] that they send out of the camp of every metzora, and every one that has an issue, and whosoever is tamei by the dead; let [Scripture] state those who are tamei by the dead, and not state zavin and metzoraim (those afflicted with tzaraas), and I would argue: if those who are tamei by the dead are sent out [of the camp], how much the more zavin and metzoraim!⁴ But [it intimates,] there is a time when zavin and metzoraim are sent out, whereas those who are tamei by the dead are not sent out; and when is that? It is [when] the pesach offering comes [is sacrificed] in tumah. Said Abaye: If so, let us also argue: 'Let [Scripture] state a zav and those who are tamei by the dead, and let it not state a metzora, and I would argue: If a zav is sent out, how much the more a metzora; but [the fact that a metzora is stated intimates] there is a time when metzoraim are sent out, whereas zavin and those who are tamei by the dead are not sent out, and when is that? It is [when] the pesach offering comes in tumah'? And should you say: That indeed is so-surely we learned: The pesach offering which comes in tumah, zavin and zavo, niddos and women in childbirth must not eat from it, yet if they ate, they are not liable [to kares]? Rather, said Abaye: After all, [it is derived] from the first verse; [and as to the question raised, the reply is]: If so, let the Divine Law write, 'If any man of you shall be tamei'; what is the purpose of 'by reason of a dead body'? And should you say, this [phrase] 'by reason of a dead body' comes for this [purpose, viz..] only he who is tamei by reason of a dead body is relegated to Pesach Sheini, but not other tamei [people], surely it was taught: You might think that

³ If the larger part of the community is tamei, these offerings are still sacrificed.

⁴ Their tumah is more stringent, since it emanates from themselves.



only those who are tamei by the dead and he who was on a distant journey keep Pesach Sheini; from where do we know [to include] zavim and metzoraim and those who cohabited with niddos? Therefore it is stated, 'any man'. - Then what is the purpose of [the phrase] 'by reason of a dead body' which the Divine Law wrote? But this is what [Scripture] states: A man [i.e.. an individual] is relegated to Pesach Sheini, whereas a community is not relegated to Pesach Sheini, but they keep [the first Pesach] in tumah. And when do the community keep [the first Pesach] in tumah? When [they are] tamei by reason of the dead; but in the case of other forms of tumah, they do not keep [it thus]. (66b3 – 67a2)

DAILY MASHAL

The Gemora states that whoever gets upset, even if he was destined for greatness, can have it taken away from him. This is apparent from Eliav, the brother of David, who the verses apparently indicate was fitting to be king of Israel, but apparently lost the right to the throne because he got angry at David Hamelech.

The Sfas Emes notes that according to the Gemora (and Rashi), it indeed seems that Eliav was supposed to be king, were it not for his episode of getting angry at David. Why, then, did David deserve to be king just because Eliav got angry at him?

The Sfas Emes suggest that this is indeed the way it works. The person who was the victim is supposed to take away what otherwise would have been the gift of the perpetrator. However, this would mean that David was originally chosen because it was known that Eliav would later get upset at David, which is slightly difficult.

The Sfas Emes concludes that this is incorrect. He says that the Gemora merely notes that Eliav was "destined for greatness," not that he was king or going to be king. It must mean that David was supposed to be king all along.

Eliav was just someone who was also destined for greatness. However, after he got angry at David, Hashem told Shmuel that this greatness was no longer pertinent to him.