



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Pesachim, Daf טז – Daf נז

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
v'l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf טז-----77-----

MISHNA

- There are 5 things which may be brought while tamei (if most of the tzibbur or Kohanim are tamei) but may not be eaten when so brought: the Omer (on Pesach), the "Shtei Halechem" (on Shavuos), the Lechem Hapanim (every Shabbos), the communal Shelamim ("zivchei shalmei tzibbur" brought on Shavuos), and the chatas brought on Rosh Chodesh. In contrast, a Pesach that is brought while tamei may be eaten while tamei, because the Pesach is only brought for the purpose of eating it.

GEMARA

- **Q:** When a Mishna gives a specific number it generally comes to exclude something we would otherwise think is included. What does the number 5 in the Mishna come to exclude? **A:** The Chagigah brought on Pesach itself. We would think that it is brought by all (and thus considered a korbon tzibbur) and has a set time to be brought, and therefore should be brought even while tamei. The Mishna therefore teaches that since it can be brought any day of Pesach it does not override Shabbos. Since it does not override Shabbos, it also is not brought while tamei.
- **Q:** Why doesn't the Mishna include the chatas brought as part of the mussaf on every Yom Tov, which is brought while tamei, but not eaten!? **A:** This is considered to be included under the "zivchei shalmei tzibbur".
 - **Q:** Why is the chatas of Rosh Chodesh not also considered to be included in that? **A:** We list it separately, because we would have thought that since it doesn't say the word "moed" (which is what teaches us that a korbon overrides Shabbos and tumah) by Rosh Chodesh, it should not be brought while tamei. The Mishna teaches that it is brought because Rosh Chodesh itself is referred to by the pasuk as "moed".
 - **Q:** How do we know that the word "moed" written regarding a korbon teaches that the korbon overrides Shabbos and tumah? **A:** A Braisa says, we would only know that Tamid and Pesach override Shabbos and tumah because the pasuk says "moed" regarding them. The pasuk regarding the mussafim of Yom Tov therefore ends off "eileh ta'asu LaShem b'moadeichem", to teach that they too override Shabbos and tumah. We still don't know that the Omer and its accompanying items, and the Shtei Halechem and their accompanying items (which are not written in the parsha with the mussafim) override Shabbos and tumah, therefore the pasuk says "vayidaber Moshe ess moadei Hashem" (written at the end of the parsha that discusses these korbanos as well as the mussafim of Yom Tov).
 - All these pesukim are necessary, because one could not be learned from the other. If the Torah would just write moed by Tamid, we would say Tamid is different because it is brought every day and is totally burned on the Mizbe'ach. If it was only written regarding Pesach, we would say that Pesach is different because it carries the kares penalty. If it was only written regarding those two, we would say those two are different because they each have a certain stringency. If it would also write it by the mussafim, we would say the mussafim are different because they bring forgiveness, but the Omer and Shtei Halechem, which simply permit things, do not override Shabbos and tumah. If it would be written by those two and not the mussafim, we would say that permitting things is more important than forgiveness and that's why only they are brought even on Shabbos and even when tamei.
- **Q:** They (the people learning in the Yeshiva) presumed that our Mishna holds that communal tumah **overrides** the tumah prohibition, rather than the prohibition being fully lifted in the case of communal tumah (which is the view of only **R' Yehuda**). They further assumed that our Mishna holds that the "tzitz" (which brings acceptance for korbanos brought while tamei) accomplishes acceptance for the korbon, but not for the parts of the korbon

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

that are eaten (which is the view of only **R' Yose**). Based on this, they said that our Mishna can't follow **R' Yehoshua**, because he says if even the edible part of a korbon is not valid, the entire korbon becomes invalid as well. If so, the korbanos listed in our Mishna should be passul!? **A: R' Yehoshua** holds that the tzitz makes the pieces of the korbon that will be offered on the Mizbe'ach (the "eimorim") acceptable, and since the eimorim are acceptable, the blood of the korbon may be offered on the Mizbe'ach.

- **Q:** The Omer and Shte Halechem don't have eimorim, so how can they be offered on the Mizbe'ach!? **A:** **R' Yehoshua** only said that there needs to be 2 parts of the korbon acceptable by animal korbanos, not for menachos.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says, according to **R' Yehoshua**, if the remaining parts (the part left over after the kemitza is taken) of the mincha become tamei or are lost, the mincha becomes passul. We see that that **R' Yehoshua** says his halacha by a korbon mincha as well!? **A:** The Mishna means that to hold the mincha is passul in that case is somewhat like **R' Yehoshua's** shita, but not completely so. It is like **R' Yehoshua** who necessitates that 2 things be valid (e.g. the blood and the meat or eimurim), but is unlike **R' Yehoshua**, because he only says that halacha regarding animals, not menachos.
 - **Q1:** We don't find a Tanna who holds that way!? **Q2:** In a Braisa, **R' Yose** clearly says that **R' Yehoshua** says his halacha even in regard to menachos!? **A:** **R' Yehoshua** actually holds that the tzitz brings acceptance for the parts of the korbon that are eaten as well. That is why he may be the Tanna of our Mishna, and why the Mishna allows the Omer and Shte Halechem to be offered when tamei.
 - **Q:** If this is true, why does the Mishna quoted above say that according to **R' Yehoshua** a mincha whose leftovers became tamei or lost is passul!? **A:** The Mishna meant that where it got *lost* **R' Yehoshua** would say the mincha is passul, but when it became tamei he would agree that it is valid because the tzitz makes it acceptable.
 - **Q:** If so, according to who does the Mishna say that the tamei leftovers make the korbon passul? It can't be **R' Eliezer**, because he says that even if it is lost the korbon is valid, surely when it is tamei he would say it is valid!? It must be that it was said according to **R' Yehoshua**, and we see that he must hold that the korbon is passul even if the leftovers are only tamei!? **Q2:** We see from a Braisa that **R' Yehoshua** says that the tzitz does not create acceptance for the parts of the korbon that are eaten, which became tamei!? **A:** Our Mishna follows **R' Yehoshua**. His halacha prohibiting bringing the korbon was said regarding bringing the korbon l'chatchila. Our Mishna is discussing considering it valid once it was already brought (i.e. b'dieved). We see this differentiation attributed to a **R' Yehoshua** in a Braisa as well.
 - **Q:** The Mishna quoted earlier is mashma that **R' Yehoshua** says his halacha even b'dieved!? Also, our Mishna is mashma that the korbanos may be brought even l'chatchila!? **A:** When dealing with the korbon of an individual, **R' Yehoshua** says it is valid only b'dieved. When dealing with the korbon of the tzibbur, **R' Yehoshua** says it is valid even l'chatchila.

-----Daf פ"ז-----78-----

- **Q:** It would seem that our Mishna cannot follow **R' Yose**, because he argues with **R' Eliezer** and says that the tzitz does not accomplish acceptance for the parts of the korbon that are eaten. Presumably he also holds like **R' Yehoshua** that a tamei korbon would therefore be entirely passul, which is not what our Mishna said! **A:** It could be that **R' Yose** holds like **R' Eliezer**, that even if only the blood of a korbon is valid it may be offered on the Mizbe'ach. Therefore, since the tzitz does accomplish acceptance for the blood, the korbon is valid.
 - **Q:** If **R' Yose** holds that the korbon is valid, what is the significance of holding that the tzitz doesn't help for the parts that are eaten? The korbon is valid in any case!? **A:** You can ask the same question according to **R' Eliezer**. He holds that the tzitz does help for the parts that are eaten, but he also holds that as long as the blood of the korbon is valid, the blood can be offered even if there is no meat.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

According to him, what does the tzitz accomplish regarding the meat since the korbon is kosher without the meat anyway!? We must say that the tzitz makes the meat acceptable so that it becomes subject to the halachos of piggul and removed from the halachos of me'ilah. We can say the same thing (only reverse) according to **R' Yose**. The tzitz does not help for the meat, and therefore it is *not* subject to piggul, and *is* still subject to me'ilah.

- **Q:** We can answer that **R' Yose** holds like **R' Eliezer**, which is why as long as the blood is valid, it may be offered even if the meat is not valid. But that only works for animal korbanos, or the Omer which has the kometz (in place of the blood) and the leftovers (in place of the meat), or the Lechem Hapanim which has the levonah (in place of the blood) and the bread (in place of the meat). However, it doesn't explain why **R' Yose** would allow the Shte Halechem to be brought!? It can't be because of the Shalmei Tzibbur that are brought along with them (and as long as they are valid the Shte Halechem may be offered as well), because the Shalmei Tzibbur were listed separately in the Mishna, and not as part of the permit to bring the Shte Halechem!? **A:** **R' Yose** holds that tumah is **permitted** for the tzibbur (not just overridden). Therefore, he allows the Shte Halechem to be brought without having to rely on the tzitz to permit them.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Yose** requires the Kohen Gadol to be sprinkled with the parah adumah before Yom Kippur. Now, if he held that tumah was permitted for the tzibbur, there would be no reason for the Kohen Gadol to do so!? **A:** We must say that our Mishna does *not* follow **R' Yose**.
- **Q:** In a Braisa quoted earlier, **R' Yose** said, I "see" the words of **R' Eliezer** regarding animal korbanos (that the blood may be offered even if the meat is passul) and I "see" the words of **R' Yehoshua** regarding animal korbanos (that the blood may not be offered if the meat is passul). He then said, I "see" the words of **R' Eliezer** regarding menachos (that the kometz may be offered even if there are no leftovers of the mincha), and I "see" the words of **R' Yehoshua** regarding menachos (that the kometz may not be offered if there are no leftovers of the mincha). **R' Pappa** asked, these words are self-contradictory!? **A:** **Abaye** answered, when **R' Yose** was learning Zevachim he said, it is likely that just as they argue regarding animals they argue regarding menachos as well. When he was learning Menachos he said, it is likely that just as they argue regarding menachos they argue regarding animals as well. That is what **R' Yose's** statements meant.
 - **Q:** **R' Pappa** asked, the psukim at the source of their machlokes are written regarding zevachim. Therefore it would make sense for **R' Yose** to state that they argue regarding menachos just as they do regarding zevachim. However, to say the other half of the statement doesn't make sense!? **A:** **R' Yose** meant to say that he holds like **R' Eliezer** in the case of where the meat was tamei (and the korbon is valid), and holds like **R' Yehoshua** in the case where the meat was lost or destroyed (and the korbon will therefore be passul).
 - **Q:** The reason he would hold like **R' Eliezer** when the meat is tamei would be because the tzitz makes it acceptable. However, that can't be, because **R' Yose** says the tzitz doesn't make the meat acceptable!? **A:** **R' Yose** meant to say that he holds like **R' Eliezer** when dealing with the tzibbur, and holds like **R' Yehoshua** when dealing with an individual.
 - **Q:** The reason he would treat the tzibbur differently would have to be because he holds that tumah is permitted for the tzibbur. The issue is that **R' Yose** holds tumah is not permitted, but is only overridden for the tzibbur (and since the tzitz doesn't make the meat acceptable, it would be passul)!? Also, that would mean that **R' Yose** is saying that **R' Yehoshua** argues and says that it is passul for the tzibbur as well. We know that not to be the case!? **A:** **R' Yose** meant to say that he holds like **R' Eliezer** b'dieved, and holds like **R' Yehoshua** when dealing l'chatchila.
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Yehoshua** agrees that b'dieved it is a valid korbon!? **A:** **R' Yehoshua** only agrees when the meat became tamei, not when the meat was lost or destroyed. **R' Yose** was saying that he holds like **R' Eliezer** b'dieved even when the meat was lost or destroyed.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- If the meat of a Pesach became tamei, but the cheilev did not, its blood should not be offered. If the cheilev became tamei, but the meat did not, its blood may be offered. When dealing with other korbanos, if the meat became tamei and the cheilev did not, the blood may still be offered on the Mizbe'ach.

GEMARA

- **R' Gidal in the name of Rav** said, if the meat of a Pesach became tamei and one anyway offered the blood, the korbon is acceptable (and the owners have fulfilled their Korbon Pesach obligation).
 - **Q:** The Pesach has to be eaten! How can he be yotzei when the meat is tamei!? **A:** Eating the Pesach is not essential to fulfilling the Pesach obligation.
 - **Q:** The pasuk says "ish l'fi achlo"! **A:** That creates a mitzvah to eat it, but doesn't make it essential to its fulfillment.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that the pasuk repeated the requirement of the ownership groups for the Pesach twice to teach that it is essential. We then learn from there through a hekesh that the eating requirement is also essential!? **A: Rav** said his din according to **R' Nosson**, who uses this pasuk for something else and therefore does not learn that the eating requirement is essential.
 - **Q:** Where do we find that **R' Nosson** says this? It can't be where he says that all of Klal Yisrael can be yotzeh with one Pesach (and since there is not enough meat for everyone we see that eating is not essential), because it could be that he allows that, because if people pull out of the korbon, there will end up being enough for other people to have a kezayis (in that way everyone has a potential kezayis of the korbon). However, it could be that he holds it must be eaten by somebody in order for the obligation to be fulfilled. It can't be where he says that if there is only enough meat for one ownership group and then a second group comes along and adds themselves to the korbon and the korbon is offered, both groups have fulfilled their obligation "because the blood has already been offered". It could be he says that because if the first group pulls out there will be enough for the second group. However, it could be that he holds it must be eaten by somebody in order for the obligation to be fulfilled! **A:** It is this second statement of **R' Nosson**. If his reason is because the first group may pull out, he wouldn't have said "because the blood has already been offered", he would have said "because they may pull out".
 - **Q:** Why did **Rav** say our Mishna only prohibits offering the blood l'chatchila, but says the Pesach is valid b'dieved (and then have to follow **R' Nosson**)? Why didn't he say the Pesach is passul even b'dieved and the Mishna could then follow the **Rabanan**!? **A:** The Mishna says "the blood should not be thrown", which is mashma only l'chatchila.
 - **R' Nosson** uses the pasuk of "ish l'fi achlo" to teach that each owner of the group must be fit to eat a kezayis of the Korbon Pesach.
 - **Q:** Who is the Tanna of the Braisa which says that if a Pesach was shechted with intent for people who can eat it, but the blood was offered with intent for people who cannot, the Pesach is valid? Presumably it must be **R' Nosson** who says that eating is not essential? **A:** It may even follow the **Rabanan**, because an intent regarding eating which is had during the offering of the blood is not considered significant.
 - **Q:** Who is the Tanna of the Braisa that says the owner of a Pesach must be fit to eat it at the time of the shechita and the time of the zerika? Presumably it follows the **Rabanan**? **A:** It may even be **R' Nosson**. Although he says eating is not essential, he agrees that the person must be fit to eat the entire time.
 - **Q:** Who is the Tanna of the Braisa that says, if after the shechita of a Pesach the owners became tamei, the blood should be offered, but the meat should not be eaten? **A: R' Elazar** said, it follows **R' Nosson**, who says that eating is not essential. **R' Yochanan** says it may follow the **Rabanan**, and the Braisa is discussing a case where most of the tzibbur became tamei after the shechita. The reason they don't allow the meat to be eaten is because they are afraid that the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

people will get confused and would allow eating even where the tzibbur becomes tamei after the zerika (which is not permitted because the Pesach may only be eaten while tamei if the zerika was done when the owners were already tamei as well).

- **A:** It could be that **Rav** holds like **R' Yehoshua**, who says in a Braisa that eating is not essential to fulfilling the Korbon Pesach obligation.

-----Daf 79-----

BIMUKDASHIN EINO KEIN...

- Our Mishna (which says that korbanos other than the Pesach are offered even if the meat is tamei, as long as the cheilev is not tamei) follows **R' Yehoshua**, who says in a Braisa that all other korbanos are offered as long as there is at least a kezayis left over of meat *or* of cheilev. However, a half kezayis of each will not combine to allow offering of the blood. If the korbon is an Olah, it will combine (since both are to be burned on the Mizbe'ach). One does not offer the blood based on having some of the accompanying mincha still intact.
 - **Q:** How do we know that a korbon is offered if there is at least a kezayis of cheilev that is tahor? **A:** **R' Yochanan in the name of R' Yishmael** said, the pasuk says “v'zarak haKohen ess hadam...v'hiktir hacheilev l'rei'ach nicho'ach”. This teaches that as long as there is cheilev, even if there is no meat, the blood is offered.
 - **Q:** How do we know that the blood is offered even if there is only kidneys or the diaphragm remaining? **A:** **R' Yochanan** said, the pasuk says “l'rei'ach nicho'ach”, which teaches that anything that is considered a “rei'ach nicho'ach” allows for the offering of the blood.
 - The pasuk still had to write “cheilev”, because “l'rei'ach nicho'ach” alone would include a mincha as well. “Cheilev” teaches us that a mincha does not allow the offering of the blood.

MISHNA

- If the entire tzibbur or the majority became tamei, or even if only the Kohanim are tamei, all make the Pesach b'tumah. If only a minority of the tzibbur is tamei, the tahor people bring the Pesach in its normal time and the tamei people bring it on Pesach Sheini.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, if a majority of Klal Yisrael is tamei, but the Kohanim and keilim are tahor, or if the majority are tahor, but the Kohanim and keilim are tamei, or if even only the keilim are tamei, all people (whether they are tamei or tahor) bring the Pesach in tumah, because we don't differentiate regarding the tzibbur.
 - **R' Chisda** said, this is only true if the knives (the keilim) are tamei from a tamei meis, which (because they are metal) makes them an “av hatumah” and gives them the ability to make anyone who touches them tamei as well. However, if the knives are only tamei from a sheretz, which makes the meat tamei but not the people, only tahor people may bring the Pesach at that time. We allow the eating of tamei kodashim which is typically only a lav, but don't allow a tamei person to eat the kodashim, which is typically subject to kares.
 - **R' Chisda** must hold that tumah is *overridden* for the Pesach, which is why we must minimize the tumah as much as possible. **R' Yitzchak** holds this way as well.
 - **Rava** argued on **R' Chisda** and said that even in that case tamei people may bring a Pesach. He says the issur to eat tamei kodashim and the issur for a tamei person to eat kodashim are written in the same pasuk to teach that if one of the issurim doesn't apply (like for Pesach), neither does the other.
- If half of the tzibbur is tamei and half is tahor: **Rav** says each half is considered a “majority” and each half therefore brings their Pesach by themselves (the tahor people bring it in taharah, the tamei people bring it in tumah). **R' Kahana** says neither is treated like a majority (therefore the tahor people bring the Pesach at its normal time and the tamei people bring it on Pesach Sheini). **Others** say that **R' Kahana** said, the tahor people bring the Pesach at its normal time, and the tamei people do not bring it at all (they are not the majority so can't bring it at the normal time, and they are not a minority so can't bring it on Pesach Sheini).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Our Mishna says, if the majority is tamei the Pesach is brought in tumah. It seems that if only half are tamei they would not bring the Pesach in tumah. This is problematic according to **Rav!**? **A:** The Mishna means that if a majority is tamei, the entire tzibbur bring the Pesach in tumah. If only half are tamei, the tahor people bring the Pesach in taharah, and the tamei people bring it in tumah. This even seems right based on the next part of the Mishna, which says that if a minority are tamei, they bring it on Pesach Sheini. It would seem, that if half were tamei they would not bring it on Pesach Sheini, but would rather bring it in its normal time, with the tahor and tamei people bringing it separately.
 - **R' Kahana** will explain the Mishna as saying, when there is a minority that is tamei, they bring it Pesach Sheini. If exactly half are tamei, the tahor people bring it in its normal time and the tamei people do not bring it at all.
 - According to the **first version of R' Kahana**, he will explain the Mishna to mean that even when exactly half are tamei they bring the Pesach on Pesach Sheini. The reason the Mishna says that a “minority” brings the Pesach on Pesach Sheini is because it is staying stylistically consistent with the first part of the Mishna that speaks about the “majority”.
- There is a Braisa that says like **Rav** (if half are tahor and half are tamei, both groups bring the Pesach in its normal time, but in separate groups). There is a Braisa that says like **R' Kahana** (that in this case the tahor people will bring the Pesach at its regular time and the tamei people will bring it Pesach Sheini). There is a Braisa that says like the **second version of R' Kahana** (the tahor people bring the Pesach at its normal time and the tamei people do not bring the Pesach at all).
 - **Rav** and the **second version of R' Kahana** will explain the middle Braisa as discussing the case where the tzibbur is half tahor and half tamei only when the women are taken into account on the tamei side. However, since women are not obligated to bring the Pesach, they are not taken into account, and the tamei people are therefore a minority, which rightfully bring their Pesach on Pesach Sheini.
 - **Rav** and the **first version of R' Kahana** will explain the last Braisa as follows. **Rav** will say the Braisa is discussing a case where the tzibbur is half tahor and half tamei, but when the women are taken into account, they make the tahor group into the majority. He says that women are obligated in a Pesach brought at its proper time, but not to bring one on Pesach Sheini. Therefore, regarding regular Pesach the women are taken into account, thereby making the tamei people into the minority and not allowing them to bring the Pesach at its proper time. Regarding Pesach Sheini women are not taken into account, and therefore, regarding Pesach Sheini the tamei people are not the minority, and can't bring their Pesach at that time. The **first version of R' Kahana** will say, the case of the Braisa is where there are half tahor and half tamei only when taking the tahor women into account. He also holds that women are only obligated in bringing a Pesach at its proper time. Therefore, regarding the regular Pesach, there is exactly half and half and only the tahor people bring the Pesach. However, regarding Pesach Sheini we do not take the women into account, and the tamei people are therefore the majority. A majority cannot bring the Pesach on Pesach Sheini.
 - **R' Kahana** will say the first Braisa (which says like **Rav**) follows a different Tanna that argues on the Tanna of the Braisa that supports his own view.
- A Braisa says, if exactly half the tzibbur are tamei and half are tahor, they each bring the Pesach at its regular time, but in separate groups. If there is even only one more tamei person than tahor people, the Pesach is brought in tumah by everyone. **R' Elazar ben Masya** learns from a pasuk that the majority must be a majority by at least 2 people to allow the Pesach to be brought in tumah. **R' Shimon** says, even if one “sheivet” is tamei and the other 11 shevatim are tahor, the tamei sheivet brings the Pesach in its normal time in its own group, because a sheivet is considered to be a “kahal”. **R' Yehuda** says, if one sheivet is tamei and the others are tahor, all Yidden bring the Pesach in tumah (since a “kahal” is tamei, it is considered to be a case of half and half).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 5--80-----

- **Rav** said, if exactly half of the tzibbur was tahor and the other half was tamei, we make one of the tahor people tamei with a sheretz, thereby making the majority tamei, and the Pesach is then brought in tumah.
 - **Q:** Why can't each half bring the Pesach separately, as **Rav** has said previously!? **A:** We are talking about a case where there is one more tamei person than tahor people. **Rav** holds like **R' Elazar ben Masya**, who says that the majority must be a majority by at least 2. Therefore we need to make one person tamei.
 - **Q:** That means that **Rav** holds that a majority of one is treated as being equal. If so, why doesn't **Rav** say that each half brings the Pesach separately!? **A:** **Rav** was saying, that if there is a Tanna who holds that when the tamei and tahor are equally split they make two separate Pesach groups, and who also holds like **R' Yehuda** who says that we can't have part of the tzibbur bring the Pesach in taharah and part bring it in tumah, what will have to be done is to make one tahor person tamei so that all will then bring the Pesach in tumah.
 - **Ulla** said, we send one of the tahor people away so that the majority of those who remain are tamei people.
 - **Q:** Why don't we just make him tamei? **A:** He holds that one who is tamei sheretz can be part of an ownership group for a Pesach, since he will be able to eat from the Pesach at night.
 - **Q:** Why not make him tamei meis? **A:** That would prevent him from bringing a Chagigah on Yom Tov itself. We don't want to prevent him from fulfilling an obligation.
 - **Q:** Now too (by sending him away), we are preventing him from fulfilling his Pesach obligation!? **A:** He can bring the Pesach on Pesach Sheini.
 - **Q:** If we make him tamei meis, he can also bring the Chagigah on the last day of Yom Tov (which will be more than 7 days after his becoming tamei and he will therefore be tahor)!? **A:** **Ulla** holds that bringing a Chagigah the rest of Yom Tov is only a makeup for the first day. Therefore, only someone who can bring it the first day may bring it the rest of Yom Tov.
 - **R' Nachman** said, ask **Ulla**, who will run away just because we ask him to?
- **Rav** said, if the majority of the tzibbur were zavim, and a minority were tamei meis, that minority does not bring a Pesach at its normal time (they are a minority who is tamei meis) and do not bring a Pesach on Pesach Sheini (Pesach Sheini is only an option when the tzibbur brings their Pesach at the normal time). **Shmuel** said, the pasuk says a Pesach must be brought, so we should allow the minority tamei meis to bring the Pesach in its proper time!? **Rav** said, if they were all zavim you would agree that no Pesach is brought. Now too, no Pesach will be brought.
- If the majority of the tzibbur were tamei meis (so the Pesach is brought in tumah) and a minority were zavim, **R' Huna** said there is no Pesach Sheini that year, because Pesach Sheini does not apply when the Pesach was brought in tumah. **R' Ada bar Ahava** said, there is a Pesach Sheini even when the regular Pesach was brought in tumah.
 - **Q:** Maybe they argue as to whether tumah is overridden (**R' Huna**) for the tzibbur or totally permitted (**R' Ada bar Ahava**) for the tzibbur? **A:** It could be all agree that tumah is only overridden. They may just argue regarding whether a Pesach brought in tumah has the power to defer people to Pesach Sheini.
- **R' Mani bar Patish** said, if 1/3 of the tzibbur were zavim, another 1/3 were tahor, and the remaining 1/3 were tamei meis, those who are tamei meis do not bring a Pesach at all. They can't bring on the first Pesach because the tahor people and the zavim combine to make a majority of people for whom the Pesach may not be brought in tumah. They also won't bring a Pesach on Pesach Sheini, because regarding Pesach Sheini they are combined with the zavim and are part of a majority of people who did not bring a Pesach, and Pesach Sheini is only for a minority.

MISHNA

- If the blood of a Pesach was thrown on the Mizbe'ach, and then afterwards it became known that the Pesach or the blood was tamei, the tzitz makes it acceptable and no additional Pesach need be brought. If it became

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

known that the owner had been tamei, the tzitz does not help to make it acceptable. They said this din with regard to the korbanos of a Nazir and a Pesach. However, if it became known that the owner became tamei with “tumas tehom” (a tumah that is completely unknown to anyone at the time the owner became tamei, or even if the possibility of its existence is known, it is impossible to be certain that there is any tumah), the tzitz does make it acceptable.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna seems to say that the tzitz makes it acceptable, because he found out about the tumah after the zrika of the blood. It seems that if he would have found out before, and went ahead with the zrika anyway, it would not be acceptable. However, a Braisa says that the tzitz makes acceptable the blood “whether it is done b’shogeg or b’meizid”. Presumably this means that it is acceptable even if thrown onto the Mizbe’ach b’meizid (i.e. knowing that it was tamei)!? **A: Ravina** said, the Braisa means that if it became tamei b’shogeg or b’meizid, it can still be acceptable if the zrika was done b’shogeg. **R’ Shila** said, it is acceptable even if the zrika was done b’meizid. The reason why the Mishna says that it is acceptable if it became known after the zrika is because it is being consistent with the end of the Mishna which says that if the owner became tamei, the korbon is passul even if he finds out after the zrika.

NITMA TUMAS HATIHOM...

- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked, does the permit of tumas tehom only apply to the owners, or does it apply to the Kohanim dealing with the korbon as well? **A: Rava** said, a Braisa says that the permit of tumas tehom only applies to tumas meis. Presumably this is coming to teach that it does not apply to tumas sheretz. Now, if the owners are tamei from a sheretz, it would not cause a problem even if it was certain tumah, not tumas tehom, because a nazir’s count and korbanos are not effected by sheretz tumah, and according to the shita that one who is tamei from a sheretz may have a Pesach brought for him to eat that night, it doesn’t effect a Pesach either. If so, the Braisa must be teaching that there is tumas tehom for sheretz tumah for the Kohanim. We see that the tumas tehom does apply to the Kohanim as well!
 - **R’ Yosef** said, that is not a valid proof. It could be that the Braisa means to teach that there is no tumas tehom of “zivah” for the owners of a Pesach. If so, this doesn’t teach anything about the Kohanim.

-----Daf נד---81-----

- **Q:** How can **R’ Yosef** say that the Braisa is teaching that tumas tehom of zivah is not made acceptable by the tzitz? A Braisa says, **R’ Yosef** says, if a Pesach was shechted and offered for a woman on the day after she had seen blood in her ziva days (to become fully tahor she must now pass a day without seeing any blood), and she ultimately sees blood on that second day as well, she may not eat the Pesach, but has fulfilled her obligation and need not bring another Pesach. During this second day it is impossible to know if she will see blood and become tamei, therefore it has the status of tumas tehom of ziva. Yet, we see that the Pesach brought at that time is acceptable!? **A:** The reason **R’ Yosef** says it is a valid Pesach is because he holds the woman is considered tamei only from the time she sees the blood on the second day, and the sighting on the second day does not make her retroactively tamei from the first time she saw the blood. If so, the Pesach was brought while she was tahor, which is why it is valid.
 - **Q:** A Braisa clearly says that **R’ Yosef** says, that when the woman sees blood on the second day, anything she sat on since the first sighting is tamei, but the Pesach that she brought before the second sighting is valid. We see that he holds she is tamei retroactively and yet the Pesach is valid!? **A:** He holds she is tamei retroactively only D’Rabanan. Therefore, the Pesach is valid.
 - **Q:** According to **R’ Yosef**, when the Braisa that was quoted (on the last amud) said that the permit of tumas tehom only applies to tumas meis, should we now say that it comes to teach that tumas tehom applies to the Kohen who is performing the Avodah on the korbon as well? **A: R’ Yosef** holds that one may not offer a Pesach for one who is tamei with tumas sheretz. Therefore, the Braisa is teaching that if the owners become tamei with tumas tehom of a sheretz, the Pesach is not valid.
 - **Q:** According to **R’ Yosef**, that the second sighting does not connect to the first, how can a woman ever become a “zavah gedolah” (a woman who sees blood on 3 consecutive days of her zivah days)!? **A:** She

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

would have to see a straight flow of blood for 3 days. **A2:** If she sees blood throughout the bein hashmashos period of 2 consecutive days, that would be considered as her seeing blood on 3 days, with no break between the seeing on one day and its consecutive day.

- **Q: R' Yosef** asked, does the permit of tumas tehom apply to the Kohen who does the Avodah for the Tamid? Even if we say that it applies to the Kohen who does the Avodah of a Pesach, maybe the Halacha L'Moshe M'Sinai says it only applies there and not by the Tamid!? Or maybe we learn the Tamid from the Pesach? **A: Rabbah** said, we learn Tamid from Pesach via a kal v'chomer.
 - **Q: R' Eliezer** says in a Braisa that we may not employ a kal v'chomer to learn from a Halacha L'Moshe M'Sinai!? **A: Rava** said, we learn Tamid from Pesach via a gezeirah shava.
- **Q:** From where do we learn the halacha of tumas tehom by Nazir and Pesach? **A: R' Elazar** said, the pasuk by nazir says "v'chi yamus meis *alav*", which we say means it is known to him.
 - **Q:** That is by nazir. From where do we learn Pesach? **A: R' Yochanan** said, the pasuk by Pesach says "tamei lanefesh oy b'derech rechoka *lachem*", which we say means it is known to "you". **Reish Lakish** said, the pasuk teaches that the meis must be like the "derech" (the road), which is out in the open.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that tumas tehom is tumah which is not known to anyone in the world. According to all the above sources, it wouldn't be a problem if other people in the world know of the tumas tehom!? **A:** Tumas tehom is a Halacha L'Moshe M'Sinai. These pesukim are only an "asmachta".
- **Mar bar R' Ashi** said, the tzitz provides acceptance for tumas tehom that became known after the zrika, because the zrika was done properly. However, if it became known before the zrika, and the zrika was done anyway, the tzitz does not provide acceptance.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that if a person became tamei with tumas tehom he is tamei with regard to Terumah, but is tahor with regard to Nazir and Pesach. Presumably this means that although he is now aware of the tumah he may go ahead and have the zrika performed!? **A: Mar bar R' Ashi** must have said that even if he became aware before the zrika, the zrika *may* be performed, as long as it became known after the shechita.
 - The Braisa quoted above continues and says that he is tamei with regard to Terumah only if there was no way that he was able to pass the road without having walked over the meis at the source of the tumas tehom. If there is place for him to have possibly walked around it, he is tahor for Terumah as well. However, this is only if the meis is complete. If the meis is dismembered, he is tahor because he may have walked in between the pieces. But, if in a kever, even if the meis is dismembered he is tamei because the kever joins the pieces into one. Also, this is only if he was walking on foot. If he was riding or walking while carrying a burden he is tamei (because he bends over and likely made himself as an "ohel" over the meis). Finally, the only time he is considered tahor for the nazir or Pesach is when it is tumas tehom, which means that no one in the world knows of its existence. We can assume that to be the case when the meis is covered with straw, earth or rocks. If covered by water, in darkness or in the crevices of rocks, it is surely somewhat noticeable and therefore not considered to be tumas tehom. Tumas tehom only applies for tumas meis.

-----Daf כב-----82-----

MISHNA

- If the entire Pesach, or most of the Pesach, became tamei, it must be burned at the Beis Hamikdash with wood of the Mizbe'ach. If less than half became tamei as well as any nossar, is burned using privately owned wood, not in the Beis Hamikdash. The cheap people would even burn this in the Beis Hamikdash, to be able to use the wood of the Mizbe'ach and not have to use their own wood.

GEMARA

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yose bar Chanina** said, when most of the Pesach becomes tamei it must be burned at the Beis Hamikdash, because we want to embarrass this person and have all see that this person was negligent and allowed his Pesach to become tamei.

NITMA MI'UTO...

- **Q:** A Mishna earlier in the Mesechta said that if one leaves Yerushalayim to head back home and realizes that he took a kezayis of kodashim meat with him, if he had not yet passed the Tzofim area, he must return and burn the meat by the Beis Hamikdash with the wood of the Mizbe'ach. We see this is the case even for a *kezayis* of meat!? **A: R' Chama bar Ukva** said, when dealing with a visitor to Yerushalayim (who doesn't have his own wood at the ready) we allow him to use the wood of the Mizbe'ach (**R' Zvid** explains that we can treat him like a cheap person who we let use the wood of the Mizbe'ach). Our Mishna is dealing with a resident of Yerushalayim, who we require to use his own wood. **A2: R' Pappa** said, both Mishnayos are dealing with a visitor. Our Mishna is dealing with a visitor who has not yet set out to head back home. The previous Mishna is dealing with one who has already set out on the road, and therefore we don't require him to obtain wood to use.
- A Braisa says, if one wanted to burn the meat at his residence with wood of the Mizbe'ach, we don't allow him. If he wanted to burn it with his own wood at the Beis Hamikdash, we also don't allow him.
 - **Q:** He can't use Mizbe'ach wood at home, because he may have leftovers which he will use for personal use, which would be assur. Why can't he use his own wood at the Beis Hamikdash? **A: R' Yosef** said, we don't allow it so as not to embarrass those who don't have their own wood. **Rava** said, we don't allow it, because using his own wood and then taking home the leftover wood will lead people to think he is taking home wood of hekdesch.
 - The difference between the reasons would be if one brings his own reeds or palm wood. These are not used on the Mizbe'ach. According to **R' Yosef** there is still a problem. According to **Rava** there is no problem.
 - A Mishna says, the tamei Kohanim of the Kohanim whose chance it was to do the Avodah on a particular day were lined up by the entrance to the Har HaBayis. **R' Yosef** said, this was done to embarrass them for becoming tamei when it was their chance to do the Avodah. **Rava** said, this was done so that people shouldn't think these tamei Koahnim simply chose not to do the Avodah because they were too busy working.
 - This difference between these reasons would be if a tamei Kohen was a person who anyway didn't work (he was very wealthy), or a Kohen who didn't make a lot of money. In these cases, **R' Yosef's** reason still applies, but **Rava's** does not.

MISHNA

- A Pesach that was taken out of Yerushalayim, or became tamei, must be burned immediately. If a Pesach became passul because the owners became tamei, or died, it is left overnight (to become nossar) and is then burned on Chol Hamoed. **R' Yochanan ben Broka** says, this is also immediately burned, because it is a Pesach that has no one to eat it.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The pasuk says that kodashim kalim that become tamei must be burned. Where do we see that the same is true for kodashim that left Yerushalayim? **A:** The pasuk says that Moshe Rabbeinu became angry at Aharon for burning the meat of the chatas (instead of eating it) after Nadav and Avihu died. The Gemara explains that Moshe said, the meat had not been brought outside its permitted boundaries (a chatas is kodashim kodashim, so it must remain within the Mikdash complex) and therefore should not have been burned. It seems that if it had been brought beyond its boundaries it would have been proper for it to be burned.
 - **Q:** That doesn't prove that the same holds true for kodashim kalim that left their boundary (i.e. Yerushalayim)!? **A:** The halacha that any passul kodashim (whether kodashim kodashim or kodashim kalim) must be burned is a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai.
 - **Q:** According to the Tanna of the Yeshiva of **Rabbah bar Avuha**, who says that even something passul as piggul must be left overnight and then burned, because he learns a gezeirah shava from piggul to nossar,

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

why doesn't he instead learn a gezeirah shava from piggul to the chatas of Aharon, that was immediately burned? **A:** He would hold that even a chatas like that of Aharon must be left overnight before being burned. Only in the case of Aharon was there a special directive for it to be burned immediately.

- **Q:** If the halacha that passul kodashim must be burned is a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai, what does the pasuk of "bakodesh...b'aish tisaref" teach? **A:** It teaches that it must be burned at the Mikdash.
 - **Q:** What does the pasuk of "b'aish tisaref" written by tamei kodashim teach? **A:** We would think that other invalidities, which only effect kodashim, must be burned. However, tumah, which effects chullin as well, can be buried and need not be burned. That's why the Torah had to tell us that tamei kodashim must be burned as well.

NITMI'U HABALIM OY SHEMEISU T'UBAR TZURASAN...

- **R' Yosef** said, the machlokes in the Mishna is where the owners became tamei after the zrika, because it was fit to be eaten at one point. However, if they became tamei before the zrika, all would agree that it is to be immediately burned.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that a korbon with a psul in the korbon itself must be immediately burned, but if the psul is in the blood or the owners, it must be left overnight and then burned. The comparison of blood to owners must teach that just as the blood is referring to before the zrika, so is the psul in the owners, and yet we see that it must be left overnight!? **A:** We must say that **R' Yosef** said, the machlokes is only where the owners became tamei before the zrika. However, if they became tamei after the zrika, all would agree that it must be left overnight and then burned, because there was a time it was fit to be eaten and is therefore clearly considered to be a psul in something other than the korbon itself.
 - **R' Yochanan** said that the machlokes is even when the owners became tamei after the zrika. We find that **R' Yochanan** says this elsewhere as well, because he says that **R' Yochanan ben Broka** (of our Mishna) and **R' Nechemya** say the same point. **R' Nechemya** had said that the chatas of Aharon was burned because Aharon and his surviving sons were in a state of "aninus", which means that he held that it was burned immediately although the zrika was valid (which is the equivalent of a Pesach after a valid zrika had been made).
 - **Rabbah** said that **R' Yose Haglili** holds this way as well, because **R' Yose Haglili** says in a Braisa that we learn from Aharon's chatas, that a korbon whose blood became passul is burned immediately. We see that even if the psul is not in the meat of the korbon itself (but rather in the blood), it is burned immediately.
 - **R' Yochanan** holds that **R' Yose Haglili** would agree that if the psul is in the owners, the korbon would be left overnight before being burned. That is why **R' Yochanan** did not list him as agreeing to **R' Yochanan ben Broka** and **R' Nechemya**.

-----Daf 83-----

MISHNA

- The bones, "gidin" (sinews) and nossar meat of the Pesach must be burned on the 16th of Nisson (the first day of Chol Hamoed). If the 16th falls out on a Shabbos, it must be burned on the 17th, because the burning does not override Yom Tov or Shabbos.

GEMARA

- **R' Mari bar Avuha in the name of R' Yitzchak** said, the bones of kodashim meat that contained kodashim (i.e. the marrow in the bones, which has since become nossar) make one's hands tamei (just like nossar itself), because the bones were a base for an assur item.
 - **Q:** Maybe our Mishna can be a proof to this. The Mishna says that the bones must be burned. If the Mishna is referring to bones without marrow, they can just be thrown out! It must be referring to bones with marrow. Even so, why can't they just be broken open (after they become nossar, because before that time it is assur to break the bones of a Pesach), remove the marrow, and then thrown out? It must be because the bones themselves are treated like nossar (like **R' Yitzchak** said) and therefore must be

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

burned as well!? **A:** It could be that the bones are not treated like nossar just because they contained nossar, but our Mishna may hold that one may not break bones of the Pesach even after it has become nossar. Therefore the bones must be burned because of the nossar marrow that it continues to contain.

- **Q:** A Mishna says that one does not get malkus for breaking the bone of a Pesach that is tamei. We see that the issur of breaking the bones does not apply to a Pesach that is passul!? **A:** If the Pesach was initially valid, the issur to break bones remains in effect even if it becomes passul. The Mishna that says he does not get malkus is referring to a case where the Pesach was passul from the get-go. We find that **R' Yaakov** makes this distinction in a Braisa.

- **Q:** A Braisa says, bones of korbanos other than a Pesach do not need to be burned, but of a Pesach must be burned. Presumably this is because the bones of other korbanos may be broken open to remove the marrow, after which the bones would not have to be burned, but the bones of a Pesach may not be broken. We see that the bones are not themselves considered nossar on account of having contained the nossar marrow, which is not like **R' Yitzchak** said!? **A:** **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, the Braisa is discussing a case where he found a pile of broken bones whose marrow had been removed. If the bones are from other korbanos, we assume that they were broken open and removed before they became nossar, and therefore the bones never contained nossar, and need not be burned. However, if they are from a Pesach, we must assume that they were not broken open until they were already nossar, which is why they must be burned. **A2:** **R' Zvid** said, the Braisa is discussing where he found a pile of bones and sees that the bones at the top of the pile had been broken and emptied of their marrow. If they are from other korbanos, we can assume that all the bones in the pile were likewise broken open and emptied, and therefore need not be burned. If they are from a Pesach, although the top of the pile were broken and emptied, we cannot assume that the rest were also broken and emptied, and they will therefore have to be burned, unless he checks through the entire pile.

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** says, all gidin have the status of meat, except for the gidin of the neck.

- **Q:** Our Mishna said that the bones, gidin, and nossar must be burned. The Mishna can't be referring to the regular gidin, because if they must be burned for having been left overnight, they would fall under the "nossar" category. It must be referring to the gidin of the neck, which people don't eat, and will therefore have to be burned in the morning. If these gidin do not have the status of meat, why do they have to be burned at all!? **A:** **R' Chisda** said, the Mishna is referring to the "gid hanasheh" according to **R' Yehuda**, who says that only the gid hanasheh of one side is assur, and although we are not certain which side is assur, it is likely the right side. Because we are uncertain according to **R' Yehuda**, both gid hanasheh may not be eaten – one as a true issur D'Oraisa and the other because we are unsure which one is the true issur. The gid hanasheh that is actually mutar and is not eaten due to the uncertainty must be burned when it is left overnight and becomes nossar. Since it is never eaten, the Mishna mentions it separately as needing to be burned.

- Even if one says that **R' Yehuda** is certain that only the right one is assur (it is a machlokes whether **R' Yehuda** is certain or not), the Mishna may be discussing where the 2 gid hanasheh became mixed up, in which case neither may be eaten.

A2: **R' Ashi** said, the Mishna's mention of "gidin" refers to the fats around the gid hanasheh, which a Braisa says is mutar but which Klal Yisrael has accepted upon themselves the custom of not eating it. **A3:** **Ravina** said, the Mishna is referring to the gid that is near, but on the outside of the gid hanasheh, which **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** says is assur D'Rabanan.

CHAL SHISHA ASSAR...

- **Q:** Why doesn't the "asei" of burning nossar override the "lo sassei" of not burning on Yom Tov!? **A:** **Chizkiya** said, the pasuk says "V'lo sosiru mimenu ahd boker, v'hanosar mimenu ahd boker ba'eish tisrofu" – the pasuk mentions the work "boker" a second time to tell us that the left over kodashim of Pesach night cannot be burned on the morning of the first day of Pesach, rather it must wait until a second boker, the morning of chol hamoed, to get burned. **A2:** **Abaye** said, the pasuk says "Olas Shabbos b'shabato" – only a korbon of Shabbos may be burned on Shabbos and only a korbon of Yom Tov may be burned on Yom Tov. Certainly then, a passul korbon may not be burned on Yom Tov. **A3:** **Rava** said, the pasuk says "Hu livado yei'aseh lachem" – "livado"

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

teaches that a milah done after the 8th day does not override Shabbos or Yom Tov, because it can be done afterwards. Similarly, burning kodashim, which can be done afterwards, will not override Shabbos or Yom Tov.

A4: R' Ashi said, the pasuk regarding Yom Tov says “Shabasson” – this word teaches that one who does melacha on Yom Tov is oiver an assei as well as the standard lo sassei of doing melacha on Yom Tov. If so, the assei of burning the kodashim on Yom Tov cannot override an assei AND a lo sassei and therefore must be done after Yom Tov.