



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

Pesachim Daf Ayin Ches

- **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. 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 korbbon is valid), and holds like **R' Yehoshua** in the case where the meat was lost or destroyed (and the korbbon 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 korbbon!? **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.

MISHNA

- 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 korbbonos, 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 korbbon is acceptable (and the owners have fulfilled their Korbbon 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 he allows that because if people pull out of the korbbon there may end up being enough for people to have a kezayis. 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 enough meat for one ownership group and then a second group comes along and adds themselves to the korbbon and the korbbon 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' Nossan**. 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' Nossan**)? 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' Nossan** 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' Nossan** 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' Nossan**. 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' Nossan**, 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 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.