

2 Adar 5781
Feb. 14, 2021



Pesachim Daf 85

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

We learned elsewhere: Piggul and nossar defile the hands.¹ Rav Huna and Rav Chisda, — One maintained: It was on account of the suspects among the Kohanim;² while the other maintained: It was on account of the lazy Kohanim.³ One recited [the reason] in reference to piggul, while the other recited it in reference to nossar. He who recited it in reference to piggul [gave the reason as being] on account of the suspects among the Kohanim. While he who recited it in reference to nossar [stated that it was] on account of the lazy Kohanim. One recited: As much as an olive;⁴ while the other recited: As much as an egg. He who recited, as much as an olive [took the same standard] as its prohibition,⁵ while he who recites, as much as an olive, [takes the same standard] as its tumah.⁶ (85a1 – 85a2)

The scholars asked: Did the Rabbis enact tumah in respect of what goes outside⁷ or not? Do we say, they imposed tumah on nossar because they [the Kohanim] might come to be lazy about it; but [concerning] that which goes outside, they will [certainly] not carry it out with [their own] hands, [and so] the Rabbis did not decree tumah in connection with it. Or perhaps there is no difference? — Come and hear: If part of a limb went outside, he cuts [the meat] as far as the bone

¹ By Rabbinic law.

² Who were suspected of maliciously making the sacrifice piggul to hurt its owner, who would have to bring another; therefore, the Kohen who handles it was declared tamei, since defilement was regarded as very serious even by the wicked.

³ Who were too lazy to consume the meat within the permitted period and allowed it to become nossar.

⁴ Of these defiled the hands.

⁵ That quantity involves punishment if it is eaten.

⁶ As much as an egg is the smallest quantity which defiles by Biblical law. Hence when the Rabbis enacted that this defiles the hands, they adopted the same standard.

and peels it until he reaches the joint and then cuts it off. Now if you say that the Rabbis imposed tumah upon it, what if he does cut? Surely it defiles it?⁸ — It is concealed tumah,⁹ and concealed tumah does not defile. But according to Ravina who maintained: The connection of foodstuffs is not a real connection, and they are as though separated,¹⁰ what can be said: surely they¹¹ touch each other and it [the inner portion] is defiled? — Hence according to he who recited, as much as an olive, [we must say here] that it¹² did not contain as much as an olive; while according to he who recited, as much as an egg, [we must say] that it did not contain as much as an egg. (85a2 – 85a3)

Come and hear: If a man carries out meat of a pesach-offering from one company to another, though he [has violated] a negative injunction, it [the meat] is tahor. Now does that not mean that it is tahor yet forbidden, because that which goes out from one company to another company is like that which goes outside its boundary¹³ and is disqualified [for eating], yet even so it teaches [that] it is tahor, which proves that the Rabbis did not decree tumah! — No: it is tahor and permitted, because that which goes out from company to company is not like that which goes outside

⁷ Its appointed boundaries.

⁸ The inner portion of the meat is defiled by contact with the part which went outside.

⁹ This is a technical term: the actual point of contact is not visible in the same way that the contact of two separate pieces of meat is visible.

¹⁰ Since foodstuffs are intended to be cut up. In his view the law of concealed tumah is only applicable where the object is not intended to be cut, e.g., a piece of cloth.

¹¹ The two parts.

¹² The portion which went outside.

¹³ Within which it must be eaten. Viz., the walls of Jerusalem.



its boundary, and it is not disqualified. But surely the second clause teaches: He who eats it is subject to a negative injunction? As for he who says, as much as an egg, it is well: [this may refer to] where it contains as much as an olive¹⁴ but not as much as an egg. But according to he who says as much as an olive, what can be said? — Rather [say thus]: We do not ask in respect of what goes out in the case of a pesach-offering, for the Rabbis [certainly] did not decree tumah [there]. What is the reason? The members of a company¹⁵ are most scrupulous, and so are very careful with it.¹⁶ But we do ask in respect of what goes out in the case of sacrifices [in general]: what [is the law]? The question remains unresolved. (85a3 – 85a4)

Now he who carries out meat of the pesach-offering from one company to another company, how do we know [that he violates a negative injunction]? — Because it was taught: You shall not carry forth nothing of the meat abroad out of the house: I only know [that it must not be taken] from one house to another house; from where do we know [that it must not be taken] from one company to another company?¹⁷ Because it is stated, ‘abroad’, [meaning] outside [the place of] its consumption. (85a4 – 85b1)

Rabbi Ammi said: He who carries out meat of the pesach-offering from one company to another company is not culpable unless he deposits [it there]: ‘carrying out’ is written in connection with it as [in connection with] the Shabbos; [hence] just as [in the case of] the Shabbos, [he is not culpable] unless he removes and deposits, so here too [he is

not culpable] unless he removes it [from one company] and deposits it [with the second].

Rabbi Abba bar Mammel raised an objection: If they were carrying them on staves, the front bearers having gone outside the walls of the Temple Court while the rear ones had not [yet] gone out, those in front defile [their] garments while those behind do not defile their garments.¹⁸ But it has not come to rest?¹⁹ He raised the objection and he himself answered it: It refers to [carcasses] which are dragging [along the ground].²⁰ (85b1 – 85b2)

MISHNAH: If part of a limb went outside, he cuts [the meat] as far as the bone and peels it until he reaches the joint and cuts it away. But in the case of [other] sacrifices he cuts it off with a chopper, because they are not subject to the [prohibition of] breaking a bone. From the doorjamb and within ranks as within [the city];²¹ from the doorjamb and outward is as outside [the city]. The windows²² and the thickness of the wall are as the inside. (85b2)

GEMARA: Rav Yehudah said in Rav's name: And it is likewise in respect of prayer.²³ He differs from Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi. For Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: Even an iron partition cannot interpose between Israel and their Father in Heaven.²⁴ Now this is self-contradictory. You say, from the doorjamb and within ranks as within [the city]; hence the [area of] the doorjamb itself is as the outside. Then consider the sequel: from the doorjamb and outward is as outside [the city]; hence the doorjamb itself is as the inside? — There is

eaten there. The Mishnah states that everywhere on the inside of this door-frame is as inside the city, while that on the outside is as the outside of the city. The Gemara discusses the status of the door-frame space itself.

²² In the city walls; these too occupied a considerable breadth.
²³ Certain portions of the service are recited only when there is a quorum of ten men (called minyan). A man standing in the inside of the doorjamb is counted with those inside the room, but not he who is standing outside the doorjamb.

²⁴ Hence even if he stands outside the doorjamb, he is counted with the others.

¹⁴ Which involves punishment.

¹⁵ Who have registered for one pesach-sacrifice.

¹⁶ Hence there is no need for a preventive measure.

¹⁷ Even in the same house.

¹⁸ This refers to the bullocks which were burnt outside the three camps; Jerusalem itself is the third camp but the bearers defiled their garments as soon as they left the first camp, viz., the Temple Court.

¹⁹ It was not put down, yet it defiles, though ‘carrying out’ is written there.

²⁰ Which constitutes depositing.

²¹ The door-frame in the the city walls of Jerusalem was of considerable breadth — sufficient for the pesach-offering to be

no difficulty: one refers to the gates of the Temple Court;²⁵ the other, to the gates of Jerusalem.²⁶ For Rabbi Shmuel son of Rav Yitzchak said: Why were the gates of Jerusalem not sanctified?²⁷ Because metzoraim (those afflicted with tzaraas) shelter under them in summer from the sun and in winter from the rain.

Rabbi Shmuel son of Rav Yitzchak also said: Why was the gate of Nikanor²⁸ not sanctified? Because metzoraim stand there and insert the thumbs of their hands [into the Court]. (85b2 – 85b4)

The windows and the thickness of the wall etc. Rav said: The roofs and the upper chambers were not sanctified.²⁹ But that is not so, for Rav said on the authority of Rabbi Chiya: There was [only] as much as an olive of the pesach-offering [to eat],³⁰ yet the Hallel split the roofs!³¹ Does that not mean that they ate on the roof and recited [the Hallel] on the roof? No: they ate on the ground and recited [it] on the roof. Yet that is not so, for surely we learned: You must not conclude after the pesach-offering with afikoman, and Rav said: [That means] that they must not remove from one company to another? — There is no difficulty: there it is at the time of eating;³² here it is not at the time of eating.³³ (84b4 – 85a1)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

The Mishna states that pigul causes one's hands to become impure. The reason they declared this should be the case by pigul is in order to deter kohanim from causing a korban (of their enemies) to become pigul. Being that they will have to immerse their hands before touching other kodesh, they will not do so.

²⁵ There the space of the doorjamb itself is as the inside.

²⁶ There it is as the outside.

²⁷ I.e., the space occupied by the thickness of the gates.

²⁸ The east gate of the Temple Court.

²⁹ The roofs of the houses of Jerusalem are not sanctified, in the sense that sacrifices which are eaten anywhere in Jerusalem may not be eaten on them. Similarly, the sacrifices which had to be

Tosfos points out that causing one's korban to become pigul is a serious sin. If they are already sinners, why would they care about serving when impure? Tosfos answers that although these Kohanim were sinners, they were more stringent when it came to becoming impure.

Tosfos references a Gemora in Yoma (23a) to this effect. The Gemora mentions how two kohanim were having a race up the ramp of the mizbe'ach in order to determine who would do the service of the Beis Hamikdash that day. When one saw the other might get ahead of him, he took out a knife and killed him. When the kohen was still writhing in his death throes, the victim of the father came and said that they should take the knife away as he still was alive and did not yet make it impure. The Gemora says that this shows that they were more concerned about impurity than the actual murder.

A Ground Floor Apartment in Yerushalayim

In our sugya, Rav says that one may not eat the Korban Pesach on the second floor, since the roofs and second floors of houses in Yerushalayim were not sanctified with the kedusha of Yerushalayim.

Forcing one's spouse to move to Yerushalayim: The holiness of Yerushalayim is so great, and the advantage of living there so pronounced, that one can force his or her spouse to move there (Kesubos 110b). According to the Tashbatz (III, 201) this applies even today, though there is no Beis HaMikdash. According to the Pri Ha'Aretz (III, Y.D. 7) a person may not leave Yerushalayim to live elsewhere without pressing reason, just as one may not leave Eretz Yisrael.

eaten within the Temple precincts might not be eaten on its roof or in its upper chambers.

³⁰ Very large companies registered for each sacrifice, so that each person could not receive more than that.

³¹ It was sung with such gusto.

³² Then a change of place is forbidden.

³³ The Hallel was recited after the meal was concluded; praise to God is then permissible anywhere.

In light of these opinions, The Tzitz Eliezer (XIV, 52) was once asked if this applies specifically to a ground floor apartment in Yerushalayim. Since the roofs and second floors were not sanctified, perhaps there is no advantage to living there over living elsewhere in Eretz Yisrael.

The Tzitz Eliezer rejected this conclusion, by distinguishing between two different aspects of the kedusha of Yerushalayim. The korbanos may only be eaten in a place conquered by Bnei Yisrael, and sanctified through their conquest. However, the eternal holiness of Yerushalayim, which Hashem bestowed upon it, rests on every area therein. It is because of this holiness that we are so encouraged us to live in Yerushalayim.

Furthermore, it is not clear that Rav's opinion is accepted in halacha. The Rashba (Teshuvos I, 34) rules that one may not slaughter a korban on the second floor of the *azara*, or eat *kodashei kodashim* korbanos there. The Korban Pesach is classified as *kodashim kalim*, which the Rashba implies may be eaten on the second floor. The Minchas Chinuch (362) also rejects Rav's ruling, and concludes that the second floors and roofs were sanctified.

Many Acharonim, including the Minchas Chinuch and the Or Samei'ach, understood from the Rambam (Beis HaBechira 6:7) that although the roofs of the courtyard were not sanctified with the kedusha of the Beis HaMikdash, the roofs of Yerushalayim were sanctified with the kedusha of Yerushalayim.

DAILY MASHAL

Insights into Hallel on Pesach Night

When our Sages made the order of the Pesach Seder, they placed the meal in between two halves of Hallel. This was in order to teach us that we must eat like we pray, with holy thoughts and joyous thanksgiving to Hashem (Imrei Emes of Ger, Likutei Yehuda, Haggada shel Pesach 110). Just as the food we eat gives strength and life to our bodies, our prayers

and mitzvos give strength to our souls. For this reason, we eat the Korban Pesach in the middle of Hallel (R' Tzadok HaKohen of Lublin, Resisei Layla 34).

The Chiddushei HaRim would say a parable in the name of the Baal Shem Tov, to explain why we eat a festive meal on Seder night. Once there was a prince who was captured and sent into exile to a city far away from his home. Years later, he received a secret message from his father the king that a rescue attempt was underway and if all went well he would soon be redeemed. The prince's joy knew no bounds. He wanted to dance and sing over the good news, but was afraid that his captors would see and be suspicious, and his rescue would be jeopardized. Instead, he invited all the other people in the work camp to join him for a round of drinks. After they had all drunk, they began to laugh and sing. The prince sang too, but his song was of entirely different nature. He sang for joy over his impending liberation, while they sang with drunken delirium. The guards could not tell the difference, so they let the prince sing and dance as he liked, until finally the king came to redeem him.

The same is true on Pesach night. We want to rejoice with the knowledge that Hashem will redeem us from Golus, but the coarse physicality of our bodies restricts us. Therefore, we give our bodies a good meal of meat and wine in order that it may also rejoice, and let the neshamah rejoice with Hashem.