

14 Shevat 5781
Jan. 27, 2021



Pesachim Daf 67

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 Chisda said: If a metzora entered within his barrier,¹ he is exempt [from lashes],² because it is said, he shall dwell solitary; without the camp shall his dwelling be; Scripture transformed it [his prohibition] into a positive command.³ An objection is raised: A metzora who entered within his barrier [is punished] with forty lashes; zavim and zavos who entered within their barrier [are punished] with forty lashes; while he who is tamei by the dead is permitted to enter the Levitical camp;⁴ and they said this not only [of] him who is tamei by the dead but even [of] the dead himself, for it is said: And Moshe took the bones of Yosef with him, ‘with him’ [implying] within his barrier [precincts]!⁵ — It is [a controversy of] Tannaim. For it was taught: ‘He shall dwell solitary’: [that means,] he shall dwell alone so that other tamei people should not dwell with him.⁶ You might think that zavim and tamei people are sent away to one [the same] camp; therefore it is stated, that they ‘not defile their camps: [this is] to assign a camp for this one and a camp for that one; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. Rabbi Shimon said: It is unnecessary. For behold, it is said: ‘[Command the children of Israel] that they send out of the camp every metzora, and every zav, and whoever is tamei by the dead’. Now, let

[Scripture] state those who are tamei by the dead and not state zav, and I would say, if those who are tamei by the dead are sent out, how much the more zavim! Why then is zav stated? To assign a second camp to him. And let [Scripture] state zav and not state metzora, and I would say, if zavim are sent out, how much the more metzoraim! Why then is a metzora stated? To assign a third camp to him. When it states, ‘he shall dwell solitary’, Scripture transforms it [the prohibition] into a positive command.⁷ (67a2 – 67a4)

What is the greater stringency of a zav over he who is tamei by reason of the dead?⁸ — Because tumah issues upon him from his own body. On the contrary, he who is tamei by the dead is more stringent, since he requires sprinkling on the third and the seventh [days]? — Scripture said [instead of] ‘the tamei,’ ‘and whoever [kol] is tamei,’ to include he who is tamei through a sheretz – a reptile, and a zav is more stringent than he who is tamei through a sheretz; and what is his greater stringency? As we have stated.⁹ On the contrary, a sheretz is more stringent, since it defiles [even] accidentally?¹⁰ I will tell you: To that extent, a zav too is certainly defiled through

¹ I.e., into the precincts that are forbidden to him.

² Though he thereby transgressed the negative injunction, that they defile not their camp.

³ Only a negative command involves lashes, but not a positive command. Though a negative command is stated in this connection, this verse teaches that he is regarded as having violated a positive command only.

⁴ The whole of the Temple Mount outside the walls of the Temple Court is so called.

⁵ Moshe was a Levite.

⁶ This shows that his tumah is greater and stricter than theirs.

⁷ Since according to Rabbi Shimon this can have no other purpose; thus we have a controversy of Tannaim.

⁸ That the former could be deduced as stated through a kal vachomer from the latter.

⁹ That the tumah emanates from himself. Hence the reference to a zav is superfluous, and therefore it teaches as above.

¹⁰ I.e., even if it touches the person by accident. But a discharge makes a man tamei as a zav only if it issues of its own accord. If,

an accident, in accordance with Rav Huna. For Rav Huna said: The first discharge of a zav defiles [when it is caused] by an accident.¹¹ (67a4 – 67b1)

What is the greater stringency of a metzora over a zav? Because he requires peri'ah¹² and rending [of garments], and he is forbidden [to engage in] marital relations. - On the contrary, a zav is more stringent, because he defiles couch and seat,¹³ and he defiles earthen vessels by hesset?¹⁴ — Scripture said, [instead of] 'a metzora', 'and every [kol] metzora' to include a ba'al kerī;¹⁵ and a metzora is more stringent than a ba'al kerī, and what is his greater stringency? As we have stated. On the contrary, a ba'al kerī is more stringent, because he defiles by the smallest quantity [of semen]?¹⁶ — He agrees with Rabbi Nassan. For it was taught, Rabbi Nassan said on the authority of Rabbi Yishmael: A zav requires [a discharge of matter] sufficient for the closing of the orifice of the [male] organ, but the Sages did not concede this to him. And he holds that a ba'al kerī is compared to a zav.¹⁷ What is the purpose of 'and every [kol] metzora'? — Since 'every one [kol] that has an issue' is written, 'every [kol] metzora' too is written. (67b1 – 67b2)

however, It is caused by an 'accident', e.g.. physical over-exertion or highly-seasoned food, he is not tamei.

¹¹ He is not tamei as a zav, for a period of seven days, but only until evening, while a sheretz too defiles until evening only.

¹² Letting the hair grow long and neglected.

¹³ This is a technical phrase. He defiles that which he lies or sits, imposing such a high degree of tumah on it that if a man touches it he in turn becomes so tamei as to defile his garments, even if they did not touch it. But a metzora, though he too defiles couch and seat, the degree of tumah is less, and the man who touches it becomes tamei only in so far that he in turn defiles food and drink, but not his garments, nor can he defile any other utensils by touch.

¹⁴ Lit., 'shaking'. A zav defiles an earthen vessel when he causes it to move through his weight. e.g., if it is standing on one end of a rickety bench and he sits down on the other, causing it to move upwards, as on a see-saw.

Now [as for] Rabbi Yehudah. [surely] Rabbi Shimon says well? — He requires that for what was taught; Rabbi Eliezer said: You might think, if zavin and metzoraim forced their way through and entered the Temple Court at a pesach sacrifice which came in tumah,¹⁸ — you might think that they are culpable; therefore it is stated: ['Command the children of Israel,] that they send out of the camp every metzora', and every one that has an issue [zav], and whoever is tamei by the dead': when those who are tamei by the dead are sent out, zavin and metzoraim are sent out; when those who are tamei by the dead are not sent out, zavin and metzoraim are not sent out. (67b3)

The Master said: "'And every [kol] one that has an issue" is to include a ba'al kerī'. This supports Rabbi Yochanan. For Rabbi Yochanan said: The cellars [under the Temple] were not consecrated; and a ba'al kerī is sent outside of the two camps.¹⁹ An objection is raised: A ba'al kerī is like [a person defiled through] contact with a sheretz. Surely that means in respect of their camp?²⁰ No: [it means] in respect of their tumah. [You say] 'In respect of their tumah!' [Surely] tumah until evening is written in connection with the one, and tumah until evening is written in connection with the other? Hence it must surely

¹⁵ A man who has discharged semen.

¹⁶ Whereas for tzaraas there must be at least as much as a bean (geris).

¹⁷ As it is written: This is the law of he that has an issue (zav), and of he from whom the flow of seed goes out (ba'al kerī). Thus a ba'al kerī too requires a certain minimum; hence a metzora is more stringent, and therefore a metzora is mentioned in order to assign a third camp to him.

¹⁸ I.e., when the community as a whole was tamei.

¹⁹ Viz., the camp of the Shechinah (the place of the Sanctuary) and the Levitical camp, just like a zav. Rabbi Yochanan heard these two teachings from his master.

²⁰ I.e., just as a man who is defiled by a sheretz is sent out from the camp of the Shechinah only. i.e., from the Temple, so is a ba'al kerī.

mean in respect of their camp! — No: after all [it means] in respect of their tumah, and he informs us this: that a ba'al keri is like [a person defiled through] the contact of the sheretz: just as the contact of a sheretz defiles [even] accidentally, so is a ba'al keri defiled [when the semen is discharged] accidentally. An objection is raised: He who cohabits with a niddah is like he who is tamei by the dead. In respect of what: shall we say, in respect of their tumah, — but tumah for seven [days] is written in connection with the one, and tumah for seven days is written in connection with the other? Hence it must surely be in respect of their camp;²¹ and since the second clause is in respect of their camps, the first clause too is in respect of their camps? — What argument is this! the one is as stated, and the other is as stated. An objection is raised: A metzora is more stringent than a zav,²² and a zav is more stringent than he who is tamei by the dead.²³ A ba'al keri is excluded, for he who is tamei by the dead is more stringent than he. What does 'is excluded' mean? Surely [it means], he is excluded from the rule of a zav and is included in the rule of he who is tamei by the dead, seeing that he who is tamei by the dead is more stringent than he, and [yet] he is permitted within the Levitical camp? — No: [it means that] he is excluded from the camp of him who is tamei by the dead and is included in the camp of a zav; and though he who is tamei by the dead is more stringent than he, and [yet] he may enter the Levitical camp. [nevertheless] we compare him [the ba'al keri] to what is like himself.²⁴ (67b3 – 68a1)

DAILY MASHAL

There are some commentaries that seemingly say that when a completely righteous person dies, he does not

make those who come in contact with him impure. One opinion in the Rishonim that some bring to support this is Rabeinu Chaim Cohen, quoted in Tosfos in Kesuvos (103b). The Gemora there says that when Rebbi died, holiness stopped. Rabeinu Chaim Cohen interprets this to mean that the holiness of kohanim, who were not normally allowed to come in contact with the dead, was suspended on that day. Rabeinu Chaim Cohen therefore said that if he would have been present for the funeral of the greatest Torah scholar of his day, namely Rabeinu Tam, he would have become impure to him. Tosfos argues on Rabeinu Chaim, and says that only Rabbinic impurity laws were suspended, not Torah laws. In any event, there is no proof from Rabeinu Chaim Cohen to this concept. Firstly, this was only regarding his funeral. Secondly, he apparently held the impurity was present, but it was permitted for an outstanding scholar. Thirdly, he apparently only holds this is correct for the outstanding personality of a generation.

Additionally, our Gemora seems to prove otherwise. Our Gemora brings proof from the fact that the body of Yosef was allowed in the Levite camp that any dead person can be in the Levite camp. If great righteous people were not impure, what would be the proof? Rather, this should not be relied on as a practical leniency. [See Halachic World vol. 2 (Feldheim) on Parshas Chukas for an in-depth article on the subject.]

²¹ Both are sent out of the camp of the Shechinah only.

²² The metzora being sent out of all three camps, whereas the zav is sent out of two only.

²³ The last-named being sent out of the camp of the Shechinah only.

²⁴ Viz., a zav. Thus the meaning of the Baraisa is this: A metzora, a zav, and he who is tamei by the dead follow the rule that the

more stringent the tumah the further away is he sent; but a ba'al keri is excluded from this rule, and though his tumah is less than that of a person tamei by the dead, he is sent further away, because he must be compared to a zav, since both are tamei through bodily discharge.