

27 Shevat 5781
Feb. 9, 2021



Pesachim Daf 80

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

It was stated: If the Israelites were half [of them] tahor and half [of them] tamei, — said Rav: we defile one of them with a sheretz.¹ But why so: let the former sacrifice by themselves and the latter by themselves, for surely Rav said: These sacrifice by themselves and those sacrifice by themselves? — I will tell you: what do we discuss here? E.g., where the tamei exceeded the tahor by one. If so, the majority are tamei, [then] let them all sacrifice in tumah? — He holds as Rabbi Elozar ben Masya, who maintained: A single individual cannot overbalance the community to tumah. If so, our difficulty returns in full force: let the former sacrifice by themselves and the latter by themselves? Rather this is what he means: If there is a Tanna who agrees with the first Tanna who rules: [When there is] half against half they must not all sacrifice in tumah, and [also] he agrees with Rabbi Yehudah who said: A public sacrifice cannot be divided, then we defile one of them with a sheretz. But Ulla maintained: We send away one of them on a journey afar off.² But let us defile him with a sheretz? — He holds: We slaughter [the pesach-offering] and sprinkle [its blood] for a man who is tamei through a sheretz.³ Then let us defile him through a corpse? — Then you disqualify him from his chagigah.⁴ But

¹ So that there is a majority tamei, and all can now sacrifice in tumah.

² Which is tantamount to being tamei and effects the same result.

³ Since he can immerse himself and be fit to eat in the evening.

⁴ The reference is to the chagigah brought on the fifteenth, and he would be disqualified from it, since a man defiled by a corpse is tamei for seven days. [But when he is sent away on a ‘journey afar off’, he might manage to be back in Jerusalem on the following day to offer the chagigah, v. Tosafos.]

now too you disqualify him from his pesach-offering? — It is possible to sacrifice at Pesach Sheini. Then in the case of [defilement by] a corpse too it is possible to sacrifice [the chagigah] on the seventh [day of Pesach] which would be his eighth [day after defilement]? — Ulla holds: They are all a compensation for the first [day]:⁵ [hence] he who is eligible on the first is eligible [to sacrifice] on all of them, but wherever one is not eligible on the first, he is not eligible on any of them. Rav Nachman said to them [his disciples], Go and tell Ulla: Who will obey you to uproot his stakes and tent and speed away!⁶ (80a1 – 80a2)

It was stated: If the majority were zavin⁷ and the minority tamei though a corpse, — Rav said: Those tamei through a corpse cannot sacrifice either on the first or on the second. They do not observe the first [Pesach], because they are a minority, and a minority do not observe [it] on the first. They cannot observe it on the second either: whenever the community observes [it] on the first, individual[s] observe [it] on the second; [but] whenever the community does not observe it on the first, individual[s] do not observe [it] on the second. Said Shmuel to them [his disciples], Go out and say to Abba:⁸

⁵ All the days of the Festival, though fit for the sacrificing of the chagigah, are only regarded as a compensation for the first day, this being the day when it should really be brought. This question is disputed in Gemara Chagigah.

⁶ None will consent to depart on a distant journey! Hence Rav's expedient is preferable.

⁷ They are tamei, but the law that an tamei majority sacrifice in tumah applies only to those who are tamei through a corpse.

⁸ Rav.

How do you dispose of: Let the children of Israel keep the Pesach in its appointed season! — He [Rav] answered them: Go and say to him: [yet] how do you dispose of it [the verse] when they are all zavin?⁹ But [you must say] since it is impossible [to carry it out], it is impossible; so here too it is impossible. (80a3)

It was stated: If the majority were tamei through a corpse and a minority were zavin, — Rav Huna said: There is no compensation for a pesach-offering which comes in tumah;¹⁰ while Rav Adda bar Ahavah said: There is compensation for a pesach-offering which comes in tumah.

Shall we say that they differ in this, viz., he who maintains [that] there is no compensation for a pesach-offering which comes in tumah holds: Tumah is overridden in the case of the community; while he who maintains [that] there is compensation for a pesach-offering which comes in tumah holds: Tumah is permitted in the case of a community!¹¹ — I will tell you. It is not so, for all hold [that] tumah is overridden in the case of a community, and they differ in this: one Master holds: Taharah defers, [whereas] tumah does not defer;¹² while the other Master holds: Even tumah defers. (80a3 – 80b1)

It was stated: If a third were zavin, a third tahir, and a third tamei through a corpse, — Rabbi Mani bar Pattish said: Those tamei through a corpse observe neither the first [Pesach] nor the second. They do not sacrifice on the first, [because] the zavin swell the number of the tahir

⁹ When obviously the precept cannot be fulfilled.

¹⁰ Hence the zavin cannot observe the Pesach Sheini.

¹¹ Hence it is really the same as any other pesach-offering, and therefore permits of compensation.

¹² I.e., when the sacrifice comes in a state of taharah, it relegates the tamei to Pesach Sheini; but when it comes itself in a state of tumah, it cannot relegate those who are otherwise tamei to Pesach Sheini.

¹³ Rashi: The offering — i.e., the meat-or the blood. In the former case the tzitz makes it acceptable only in the sense that

who do not sacrifice in tumah; [hence] the tamei through a corpse are a minority, and a minority do not sacrifice on the first. They do not sacrifice on the second, [because] the zavin combine with those who are tamei through a corpse who did not sacrifice on the first; [hence] they are a majority, and a majority is not relegated to the Pesach Sheini. (80b1)

MISHNAH: If the blood of a pesach-offering is sprinkled and then it becomes known that it¹³ was tamei, the tzitz effects acceptance; if the person [the owner] became tamei,¹⁴ the tzitz does not effect acceptance, because they [the Sages] ruled: [in the case of] a nazir, and he who sacrifices the pesach-offering, the tzitz effects acceptance for the tumah of the blood, but the tzitz does not effect acceptance for the tumah of the person. If he was defiled with the tumah of the deep,¹⁵ the tzitz effects acceptance.¹⁶ (80b2)

GEMARA: Thus it is only because it was [first] sprinkled and it became known afterwards [that it was tamei]; but if it [first] became known and [the blood] was sprinkled afterwards, it does not effect acceptance. But the following contradicts it: For what does the tzitz effect acceptance? For the blood, meat, and fat which were defiled, whether in ignorance or deliberately, accidentally or intentionally, whether in the case of an individual or of

the owner is not liable to another offering and the eimurim are burnt on the altar; yet the meat itself may not be eaten.

¹⁴ Through a corpse.

¹⁵ This is a technical term denoting the hidden tumah of a corpse which is now discovered for the first time. E.g., if he was in a house and it is subsequently learned that a corpse had been buried in it.

¹⁶ And he is not liable to a second offering. This is a traditional law.

a community?¹⁷ — Said Ravina: [With regard to] its defilement, whether [it occurred] in ignorance or deliberately, [the offering] is made acceptable;¹⁸ [but as to its] sprinkling, [if done] in ignorance [that the blood was tamei], it is acceptable; if deliberately, it is not acceptable.

Rabbi Shila said: [With regard to] its sprinkling, whether [done] in ignorance [that the blood was tamei] or deliberately, it is accepted; [but as to] its tumah, [if it occurred] in ignorance, it is acceptable; if [caused] deliberately, it is not acceptable. But surely he states, ‘whether in ignorance or deliberately?’ This is what it means: If it was defiled in ignorance, and he [the Kohen] sprinkled it, whether unwittingly or deliberately, it is accepted. Yet surely it is taught: If the blood was sprinkled and then it became known; thus it is only because it was sprinkled [first] and it became known afterwards; but if it became known [first] and it was sprinkled afterwards, it is not so? — The same law holds good even if it became known [first] and it was sprinkled afterwards, and the reason that he states: If it was sprinkled and then it became known is because he wishes to teach in the second clause: If the person became tamei, the tzitz does not effect acceptance, where even if it was sprinkled [first] and it became known afterwards [it does] not [effect acceptance]; therefore he teaches the first clause too: If it was sprinkled and then it became known. (80b3)

If he was defiled with ‘the tumah of the deep’ etc. Rami bar Chama asked: The Kohen who effects acceptance with their sacrifices, is the ‘tumah of the deep’ permitted to him or not?¹⁹ Do we say, when have we a tradition about the ‘tumah of the deep’²⁰ [it is] in the case of the owners, but we have no tradition in respect of the Kohen; or perhaps we have a tradition in respect of the sacrifice,²¹ no matter whether the owners or the Kohen [are thus defiled]? — Said Rava, Come and hear: For Rabbi Chiya taught: They [the Sages] spoke of the ‘tumah of the deep’ in respect of a corpse alone. What does this exclude? Surely it is to exclude ‘tumah of the deep’ caused by a sheretz; and to what [then] do we refer? Shall we say, to the owners [who are thus defiled]? Then in the case of whom? If we say, in the case of a nazir? Does it [a sheretz tumah] affect him,²² [seeing that] the Divine Law said, and if any man die beside him [etc.].²³ Hence it must refer to him who sacrifices the pesach-offering. Now that is well on the view [that] we may not slaughter [the pesach-offering] and sprinkle [its blood] for those who are tamei through a sheretz.²⁴ But on the view [that] we slaughter and sprinkle on behalf of those who are tamei through a sheretz, what can be said? Seeing that known tumah was permitted to him [who sacrifices at Pesach], how much more so regarding ‘tumah of the deep’! Hence it must surely refer to the Kohen, from there it is proved that ‘tumah of the deep’ was permitted to him! — Said Rav yosef, No: After all it refers to the owners and the pesach-offering, and it excludes ‘tumah of the deep’ of zivah.²⁵

¹⁷ ‘In ignorance’ and ‘deliberately’ are assumed to mean respectively: ignorance of the tumah of the blood, and deliberately sprinkling it with that knowledge.

¹⁸ The tzitz effects acceptance.

¹⁹ If the Kohen who offers the Pesach sacrifice or the sacrifices of a nazir on behalf of their owners was defiled with the ‘tumah of the deep,’ does the tzitz effect acceptance, so that the sacrifice is valid, or not?

²⁰ That the tzitz effects acceptance for it.

²¹ Viz., that in the case of the pesach-offering and the sacrifice of a nazir the tzitz effects acceptance for personal defilement caused by the ‘tumah of the deep.’

²² Even if he is certainly defiled by a sheretz.

²³ Thus his nezirus is affected only by tumah through a corpse.

²⁴ Hence Rabbi Chiya can mean that when one is defiled through the ‘tumah of the deep’ of a sheretz the pesach-offering must not be sacrificed for him.

²⁵ A zav is tamei seven days and the pesach-offering may not be offered on his behalf. Now, if Erev Pesach marks the seventh day of his tumah, he is in a state of a doubt; for if he does not discharge on that day he will be tahor in the evening; while if he does discharge he becomes tamei for a further seven days. Thus he too is tamei with the ‘tumah of the deep,’ and Rabbi Chiya teaches that the tzitz does not effect acceptance in his case and

Yet does it [the tzitz] not effect acceptance for the ‘tumah of the deep’ of zivah? Surely it was taught, Rabbi Yosi said: A woman who watches from day to day on whose behalf they slaughtered [the pesach-offering] and sprinkled [its blood] on her second day, and then she saw [a discharge], may not eat [of the sacrifice] and is exempt from observing the Pesach Sheini.²⁶ What is the reason? Is it not because the tzitz effects acceptance?²⁷ — I will tell you: It is not so, [the reason being] because Rabbi Yosi holds: She is defiled from now and henceforth.²⁸ But it was taught, Rabbi Yosi said: A zav of two discharges²⁹ on whose behalf they slaughtered [the pesach-offering] and sprinkled [its blood] on the seventh day,³⁰ and then he discharged

the offering must not be slaughtered or its blood sprinkled on his behalf.

²⁶ During the eleven days following the seven days of niddah (menstruation) which are called the eleven days between the menses, a woman cannot become a niddah again, it being axiomatic that a discharge of blood in that period is not a sign of niddah, but may be symptomatic of zivah. A discharge on one or two days within the eleven renders her tamei for that day or those days only, but she cannot perform tevillah to become tahor until the evening of the following day, and she must wait for the third to see whether another discharge will follow, rendering her a zavah, or not. Thus on the first or second day of her discharge within these eleven days she is called ‘a woman who watches from day to day.’ Should another discharge follow on the third day, she cannot regain taharah until seven days have passed without any issue at all. Now in the present instance Erev Pesach occurred on the second day of her discharge; the sacrifice was offered and its blood was sprinkled on her behalf before she had a discharge on that day, so that if she had not discharged later she would have been fit to eat in the evening. Since, however, she subsequently discharged, she cannot eat of the sacrifice, as she cannot perform tevillah until the following evening.

²⁷ For when the blood was sprinkled she was doubtfully tamei, since she might discharge again on that day. Thus she is assumed to be tamei with the ‘tumah of the deep,’ and is exempt from observing Pesach Sheini because the tzitz effects acceptance and makes her sacrifice valid, though she cannot partake of it.

²⁸ If she discharges on one day, waits part of the following and performs tevillah, she is tahor, and if she subsequently

again; similarly, a woman who watches from day to day on whose second day they slaughtered and sprinkled on her behalf, and then she discharged again, — these defile their couch or their seat retroactively,³¹ and they are exempt from observing Pesach Sheini.³² — I will tell you: what does ‘retroactively’ mean? By Rabbinical law.³³ (80b4 – 81a1)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Rashi explains that the tzitz worn by the kohen gadol atones for blood or meat of korbanos that are brought when they are impure. However, Tosfos (DH “Nizrak”) argues at length that the Mishna cannot be talking about

discharges on the same day she becomes tamei anew, but does not continue her previous tumah. Hence when the sacrifice was slaughtered she was actually tahor, having already performed tevillah, so that no acceptance is required.

²⁹ When a man suffers three zivah discharges within three days or less (in this respect a man differs from a woman, who becomes a zavah only if the three discharges are on three consecutive days), he becomes a full zav, i.e., he does not regain his taharah until seven consecutive days pass without a discharge, while during these seven days he is tamei as a zav; should he discharge on any of these days, he requires a further seven days, and so on. On the eighth day he brings a sacrifice, and on the evening that follows he may eat of sacred meat (having performed tevillah the previous day). If, however, he suffers two discharges only, he is likewise tamei for seven days, but does not bring a sacrifice on the eighth; hence he can partake of sacrifices on the evening following the seventh day.

³⁰ So that if the day passes without a further discharge, he is fit to partake of the pesach-offering in the evening.

³¹ Anything upon which they sit or lie, even without actually touching it, becomes tamei, its degree of defilement being that of a ‘principal tumah’ which in turn defiles people or utensils. ‘Retroactively’ means, since the tevillah on the seventh day. Before the tevillah of course, he would in any case be tamei.

³² Thus they are not tamei only for the future, and yet they are exempt from offering the korban on Pesach Sheini; the reason must be because it is a ‘tumah of the deep’ of zivah, and he holds that the tzitz effects acceptance.

³³ But according to Biblical law she was tahor during the interval between the tevillah until the third discharge.

the meat of korbanos, which is why it only says blood. After asking many questions on Rashi, Tosfos concludes that according to Rashi, the Mishna was stating that if the meat became impure and it was not previously known, the limbs could still be offered on the altar because the tzitz had atoned for the impurity. The Gemora deduces from here that if it would have been known that the impurity occurred before they did the sprinkling, the limbs of the korban would not even be allowed to be placed on the altar (see Tosfos at length).

DAILY MASHAL

The Tzitz had the power to effect forgiveness for Klal Yisrael's public indiscretion. It could also return the kedushah v'taharah, holiness and purity, to the Sanctuary. Likewise, this is the function of those who represent the epitome of spiritual leadership - those who wear the spiritual Tzitz. They too, must be circumspect in keeping the ethical and moral discipline expected of a Jew. One who seeks to wear the mantle of the Tzitz must prepare himself for the personal and communal demands of this position.

While clothes certainly do not make the man, the concept of proper attire, in addition to the Jewish code of dress - attire that brings both honor and glory to the wearer and to Heaven - is central to Jewish life and values. The following "clothing" episode, said Rabbi A. Leib Scheinbaum, convey an important lesson, which he will leave for the readers to decide.

The story occurred at the Displaced Persons Camp where the Klausenberger Rebbe, zl, was interned following World War II. It was home to thousands of survivors of Hitler's diabolical assault on Judaism. The Klausenberger understood that even the staunchest believer would be hard-pressed to retain his heretofore unshakable belief. This was a cataclysmic destruction that not only took its toll on the physical body of the Jewish People; it had

wreaked havoc with the spiritual/emotional compass of many survivors as well. Taking everything into consideration, the Klausenberger went about his business reaching out with love to all those who would listen.

One day, while walking in the camp, he chanced upon a young teenage girl who was walking barelegged. The Klausenberger made it his goal to minister to the spiritual as well as physical needs of the survivors. He looked at the girl and, in a pleasant, soothing voice, asked her why she was not wearing stockings. The girl cried out that she had none. Therefore, she was relegated to walk around barelegged. The Klausenberger was of the opinion that this was a tznius issue that required immediate resolution. He immediately took off his shoes, then removed his long black socks - the only pair that he possessed - and gave his socks to the girl! He explained to her that for a man to walk around without socks was not an infringement on tznius. For a bas Yisrael to walk barelegged was unbecoming.

She never forgot this incident with the Rebbe. Indeed, she saved those socks for years. They represented to her the message: "Someone cares about my neshamah, soul." As a result of this heartfelt act of caring, the girl remained observant, raising a beautiful family devoted to our Torah heritage. More than half a century passed before she removed those socks from their special place. The Klausenberger Rebbe had passed away in Eretz Yisrael. No longer a teenager, and beset with health issues, she made the trip to the house of the Rebbe, where his family was sitting shivah, seven-day period of mourning. With tears streaming down her face, she presented the socks to the family - and related the story to them. They did not know who she was - but, now they would never forget her.