



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

Pesachim Daf Pey Beis

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

- **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, 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 or 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, 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 HABILIM 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 korbán whose blood became passul is burned immediately. We see that even if the psul is not in the meat of the korbán 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 korbán 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**.