



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

Pesachim Daf Tzaddik Vuv

MISHNA

- In what way was the Pesach in Mitzrayim different than the Pesach brought in later generations? The Pesach in Mitzrayim was taken on the 10th of Nisson, had its blood smeared on the doorposts with a bundle of grass, was eaten as if they were in a hurry to leave, and lasted for one night, whereas the later Pesach lasts for 7 days.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that only the Pesach of Mitzrayim had to be taken on the 10th of Nisson? **A:** The pasuk says, "b'asor lachodesh *hazeh* v'yikchu". It is only that Pesach ("zeh") that needed to be taken on the 10th of Nisson, but no other Pesach.
 - **Q:** If that is how the word "zeh" is understood, then when the pasuk says that the Pesach in Mitzrayim needed to be checked for a mum for 4 days "ahd arba'ah assar yom lachodesh *hazeh*", it too should mean that no other korbon needs to be checked for 4 days. Yet, we learn that a gezeirah shava teaches that a Tamid must be checked for 4 days as well!? **A:** The gezeirah shava tells us that a tamid needs to be checked, regardless of any other drasha we would have said. Additionally, later Pesachim also need to be checked for 4 days, because the pasuk says "v'avadita es ha'avodah hazos bachodesh *hazeh*", which teaches that the Avodah of each Pesach is the same as it was in Mitzrayim. The word "hazeh" written in regard to the checking requirement comes to exclude this requirement from applying to Pesach Sheini.
 - **Q:** If that is how the word "zeh" is understood, then when the pasuk says that the Pesach in Mitzrayim needed to be eaten "balayla *hazeh*", it should be understood to mean that no other Pesach needs to be eaten at night, which we know is not the case!? **A:** The pasuk says "v'avadita es ha'avodah", which teaches that a later Pesach must be eaten as the Pesach of Mitzrayim (at night). The "balayla *hazeh*" is used for a drasha by **R' Elazar ben Azarya** (that the Pesach may only be eaten until chatzos) and **R' Akiva** (that the Pesach may only be eaten for that one night).
 - **Q:** Based on this way of understanding, when the pasuk says "v'chol areil lo yochal *bo*", it should be taken to mean that a person without a bris may only not eat from the Pesach in Mitzrayim!? **A:** The pasuk says "v'avadita es ha'avodah", which teaches that a later Pesach has the same halachos as the Pesach of Mitzrayim. The word "*bo*" teaches that a person without a bris may not eat a Pesach, but he may eat the matzah and marror.
 - **Q:** Based on this way of understanding, when the pasuk says "v'chol ben neichar lo yochal *bo*", it should be taken to mean that a person who doesn't follow the mitzvos may only not eat from the Pesach in Mitzrayim!? **A:** The pasuk says "v'avadita es ha'avodah", which teaches that a later Pesach has the same halachos as the Pesach of Mitzrayim. The word "*bo*" teaches that such a person may not eat a Pesach, but he may eat Terumah.
 - It was necessary for the Torah to tell us that a person without a bris may not eat a Pesach and to tell us that one who does not keep mitzvos may not eat a Pesach. If the Torah would just tell us about a person without a bris, we would say that only he can't eat the Pesach, because he is physically "repulsive" to Hashem. If the Torah would only tell us about the person who doesn't keep mitzvos, we would say that only he can't eat a Pesach, because he doesn't believe in Hashem.

- **Q:** Based on this way of understanding, when the pasuk says “*umalta oso, uz yochal bo*”, it should be taken to mean that a person whose sons and servants do not have a bris may only not eat from the Pesach in Mitzrayim!? **A:** The pasuk says “*v’avadita es ha’avodah*”, which teaches that a later Pesach has the same halachos as the Pesach of Mitzrayim. The word “*bo*” teaches that such a person may not eat a Pesach, but he may eat Terumah.
- **Q:** Based on this way of understanding, when the pasuk says “*v’etzem lo yishbiru bo*”, it should be taken to mean that bones may only not be broken from the Pesach in Mitzrayim!? **A:** The pasuk says “*v’avadita es ha’avodah*”, which teaches that a later Pesach has the same halachos as the Pesach of Mitzrayim. The word “*bo*” teaches that the issur only applies to a valid Pesach.
- **Q:** Based on this way of understanding, when the pasuk says “*ahl tochlu mimenu nah*”, it should be taken to mean that eating a Pesach when only partially roasted is only problematic for the Pesach in Mitzrayim!? **A:** The pasuk says “*v’avadita es ha’avodah*”, which teaches that a later Pesach has the same halachos as the Pesach of Mitzrayim. The word “*mimenu*” is used by **Rabbah in the name of R’ Yitzchak** for a gezeirah shava.

V’NECHAL B’CHIPAZON...

- The pasuk says “*v’achaltem oso b’chipazon*”. Only the Pesach of Mitzrayim needed to be eaten as if in a hurry, not other Pesachim.

UPESACH DOROS NOHEIG KOL SHIVAH...

- This can’t be referring to the Pesach, because that does not apply for 7 days. It refers to the issur of chametz.
 - **Q:** This would mean that the issur of chametz in Mitzrayim only applied for one night. However, **R’ Yose Haglili** says in a Braisa that it applied the entire next day as well!? **A:** The Mishna means that the Pesach was eaten for one night, as it is for later generations as well. With regard to the issur of chametz, in Mitzrayim it only applied for one day, but for Pesachs afterwards, it applies for 7 days.

MISHNA

- **R’ Yehoshua** said, I have heard that at times the “*temurah*” (when one tries to move the kedusha off a kadosh animal onto an animal of chullin, with the result that both animals become kadosh) of a Pesach itself is offered as a Shelamim, and at times the *temurah* of a Pesach is allowed to get a mum and sold, with the proceeds used for a Shelamim (however it itself is not offered), but I don’t recall the different cases in which these halachos are applied. **R’ Akiva** said, I can explain. If a Pesach was lost, causing the owners to separate a new animal for a Pesach, and the original animal was then found, the halacha is as follows: If it is found before the new animal was shechted (in which case both animals stood able and ready to be offered), the original animal is left to develop a mum, sold, and its proceeds used to buy a Shelamim. The same halacha applies to the *temurah* animal of this original animal. However, if the original animal is found after the new animal was already shechted, the original animal itself is offered as a Shelamim. The same halacha applies to the *temurah* animal of this original animal.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why wasn’t **R’ Yehoshua** taught that at times an animal separated as a Pesach is itself offered as a Shelamim and at times it is not? Why was this framed in reference to the *temurah*? **A:** The chiddush is, that even the *temurah* of a Pesach is not always offered as a Shelamim. One may think, since it can never be offered as a Pesach, it was never able and ready and should therefore always itself be offered as a Shelamim.
- **Rabbah** learned our Mishna to mean that the determining factor is whether the original Pesach was found before or after the actual shechita (which is the way the **T”K** of a Braisa says). **R’ Zeira** learned our Mishna to mean that the determining factor is whether the original Pesach was found before or after the *time* for the shechita (i.e. chatzos, which is how **R’ Eliezer** learns in a Braisa).

ACHAR SHECHITAS HAPESACH YAVI SHELAMIM

- **Rava** said, this is true only if the animal was found after the shechita and the *temurah* was done after the shechita. However, if the animal was found before the shechita, even if the *temurah*

was done after the shechita, both animals may not themselves be offered as a Shelamim, because even the kedusha of the temurah comes from a rejected kedusha.

- **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says, the words “ihm kesev” teach that the temurah of a Pesach after the replacement Pesach was already shechted, is brought as a Shelamim. Now, if the Braisa is discussing where the original Pesach was found after the shechita, this halacha would be obvious. It must be, that the Braisa is discussing where the original animal was found *before* the shechita, and still, the temurah is offered as a Shelamim!? **A:** The Braisa is discussing where the animal was found after the shechita, and the pasuk is not actually teaching this obvious halacha, but is rather an “asmachta”. The pasuk actually teaches us something else, as taught in a Braisa (“kesev” teaches that the tail of a sheep brought as a Pesach must be offered, and “ihm kesev” teaches that a Pesach which is ultimately offered as a Shelamim is offered with all the halachos of a Shelamim).
- **Others** taught **Rava’s** halacha regarding the first part of **R’ Akiva**: that the temurah is not itself offered as a Shelamim only when the original animal is found before the shechita *and* the temurah is done before the shechita. However, if the temurah is done after the shechita, the temurah itself is offered as a Shelamim (even though the original animal is not).
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says that “ihm kesev” teaches that the temurah of a Pesach after the replacement Pesach was shechted, is offered as a Shelamim. We would think that the same would apply for the temurah of a Pesach found before the replacement was shechted, the pasuk therefore says “hu”, which teaches that only the replacement is shechted, not the temurah. Now, if the Braisa discusses where the animal was found before the shechita and the temurah was done before the shechita, that would be obvious! It must be that the Braisa is discussing where the original Pesach was found before the shechita and the temurah was done after the shechita, and still, the temurah itself is not offered as a Shelamim!? **A:** This is a **TIYUFTA** of **Rava**.