



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

Pesachim Daf Ayin Zayin

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 "Shte Halechem" (on Shavuot), the Lechem Hapanim (every Shabbos), the communal Shelamim ("zivchei shalmei tzibbur" brought on Shavuot), 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 korban 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 korban 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 korban teaches that the korban 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 Shte 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 Shte 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 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.