



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

### Pesachim Daf Samach Zayin

- **R' Chisda** said, a metzora (who must leave all 3 camps of the Yidden) who entered the Machaneh Yisrael (the outermost camp) will not get malkus (even though the pasuk says "v'lo yitamu es machaneihem", which is a lav), because the Torah attaches this lav to an aseil of "badad yeisheiv michutz lamachaneh moshavo". The rule is, that a lav attached to an aseil does not carry a malkus penalty.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that a metzora who enters the machaneh gets malkus!? **A:** It is a machlokes Tanna'im in a Braisa: **R' Yehuda** says the pasuk of "badad yeisheiv" teaches that only a metzora needs to leave all 3 machanos, but other types of tamei people need not leave all 3. **R' Shimon** says, the pasuk is not needed for that, because we learn that from the fact that the Torah wrote, a tamei meis, a zav, and a metzora must leave. If they all must leave to the same place, the Torah could have just written tamei meis and we would learn the others from it. If even a zav and a metzora must leave to the same place, the Torah could have just written "zav". From here we learn that they each have their own limits (tamei meis may enter Machaneh Leviya, zav may enter Machaneh Yisrael, metzora must exit all machanos). The pasuk of "badad yeisheiv" is teaching that the lav of the metzora is attached to an aseil, and therefore does not carry the malkus penalty.
    - **Q:** What is the chumra of zav over tamei meis? **A:** The zav's tumah comes from his own body.
      - **Q:** Tamei meis is more chamur, because it needs sprinkling by the ashes of the parah adumah on the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> day!? **A:** The pasuk says "v'chol tamei l'nefesh". The word "v'chol" comes to include one who became tamei from a sheretz as being at the same level as a tamei meis. Zav is clearly more chamur than tamei sheretz, and therefore need not be written separately unless it teaches that it must leave a separate machaneh.
      - **Q:** Sheretz is more chamur than zav, because it makes a person tamei against his will (e.g. if a sheretz falls on a person he becomes tamei, but one who sees "zivus" (the fluid that typically makes someone tamei as a zav) because of overeating, drinking, or exercise does not become tamei)!? **A:** A zav does become tamei (for one day) the first time he sees the zivus, even if it occurs against his will (i.e. through an outside stimulus). It is the seeing a second and third time (which makes him tamei for 7 days and makes him chayuv to bring a korbon) that needs to be seen without an outside stimulus.
    - **Q:** What is the chumra of a metzora over a zav? **A:** A metzora must let his hair grow, must rip his clothing, and is assur to have tashmish.
      - **Q:** A zav is more chamur, because anything he sits or lays on becomes tamei even if he doesn't touch it, and can make earthenware keilim tamei through "hasset" (by supporting its weight even without touching it)!? **A:** The pasuk says "v'chol zav". The word "v'chol" comes to include a "baal keris" as being at the same level of a zav. Metzora is clearly more chamur than a baal keris, and therefore need not be written separately unless it teaches that it must leave a separate machaneh.
      - **Q:** Baal keris is more chamur than metzora, because it becomes tamei with a "mashehu" (minute amount), whereas a metzora only becomes tamei if the negaf is the size of a "gris" (small bean)!? **A:** He holds like **R'**

**Nosson** who says in the name of **R' Yishmael** that a baal keri does not become tamei with a "mashehu".

- **Q:** Why does the pasuk say "v'chol tzaruah"? **A:** Since the pasuk had to write "v'chol zav" (as explained above), it wrote "v'chol tzaruah" as well.
- **Q:** Why doesn't **R' Yehuda** agree with **R' Shimon** that the seemingly unnecessary mention of tamei meis and zav in the pasuk teaches that they are each banished beyond different machanos? **A:** He uses this pasuk like **R' Eliezer** does, to teach that if a zav or metzora make their way into the Azarah on an Erev Pesach when the Pesach is being brought while tamei, they will not be chayuv kares. He says, the pasuk lists them all together to teach that the kares penalty only applies when the banishment of each of them applies. However, in that case, since the tamei meis are not banished, and may enter the Azarah to bring their Pesach, the kares penalty does not apply to the others at that time.
- We said earlier, "v'chol zav" comes to include a baal keri, that he too must be sent out of 2 camps (he may not enter the Machaneh Shechina and the Machaneh Leviya). This is a proof to **R' Yochanan** who says exactly this.
  - **Q:** A Mishna says that a baal keri is like one who became tamei from a sheretz. Presumably this means that he is only sent out of one machaneh!? **A:** The comparison teaches that a baal keri is only tamei for one day, like one who is tamei from a sheretz, but does not teach about which machaneh he is sent out of.
    - **Q:** The pasuk says that a baal keri is only tamei for one day, so we don't need the comparison to teach this to us!? **A:** The comparison teaches that a baal keri becomes tamei via an outside stimulus, just like a sheretz makes one tamei even if touched unwillingly.
    - **Q:** The next part of the Mishna compares one who has tashmish with a nidah to a tamei meis. The pasuk says they are each tamei for 7 days, so the comparison must be teaching that they are the same with regard to banishment. If that part of the Mishna discusses banishment, the earlier part of the Mishna must be discussing banishment as well!? **A:** Each part of the Mishna is discussing a different type of comparison, and need not be the same.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, "A metzora is more chamur than a zav, and a zav is more chamur than a tamei meis. This excludes a baal keri, because a tamei meis is more chamur than it". Presumably this means that a baal keri is "excluded" from the category of zav and is put into the category of tamei meis regarding the halachos of banishment!? **A:** The Braisa means that although tamei meis is more chamur than baal keri, baal keri is "excluded" from the halacha of tamei meis regarding banishment, and is instead banished from 2 camps, like the zav.
  - A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding baal keri which says, "he must leave the camp", teaches that he is not permitted in the Machaneh Shechina. The pasuk of "he may not enter the camp" teaches that he may not even enter the Machaneh Leviya. From here we are taught that a baal keri is banished from 2 camps.
    - **Q:** **R' Yitzchak bar Avdimi** asked, "he may not enter the camp" means that he is already outside the camp and may not enter. However, we have not yet banished him from the Machaneh Leviya, so how can we say it comes to teach that he may not enter the Machaneh Leviya!? **A:** He says, the pasuk of "he must leave the camp" teaches that he is banished from the Machaneh Leviya. The pasuk of "he may not enter the camp" teaches that he may not enter the Machaneh Shechina.

- **Q: Ravina** asked, maybe both pesukim are regarding the Machaneh Shechina, and they make it assur with a lav and an assei!? **A:** If so, there would be no need to write the word “machaneh” a second time. The fact that it does, tells us that it is discussing a second machaneh.