



# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## Maseches Pesachim, Daf 70 – Daf 71

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 70-----

V'NE'ECHILES LISHNEI YAMIM...

- Our Mishna does not follow **Ben Teima**, because he says in a Braisa, the Chagigah brought on Erev Pesach can only eaten like the Pesach (only during that first night of Pesach). He learns this from the pasuk that says “v'lo yalin laboker zevach chag haPasach”. The words “zevach chag” refer to the Chagigah and “haPasach” refers to the Pesach. The pasuk says that both may not be left over till the morning.
  - **Q:** According to **Ben Teima**, must the Chagigah be roasted like the Pesach as well? **A:** A Mishna says that one of the questions asked by the child in the “mah nishtanah” is “why is everything we eat tonight roasted”. **R' Chisda** said, this Mishna follows **Ben Teima**. We see that he says the Chagigah must be roasted as well.
  - **Q:** According to **Ben Teima**, must the Chagigah be “tzon” (sheep or goat), a male, and within its first year, like a Pesach or not? **A:** A Braisa says that a Chagigah is like a Pesach in that it must be “tzon”, a male, within its first year, must be eaten by that night, must be roasted, and must be eaten by members of the ownership group. This Braisa must be following **Ben Teima**, because it says it must be roasted and eaten by that night. We see that he says it must also be brought from “tzon”, a male, and within its first year.
  - **Q:** According to **Ben Teima**, is there a lav against breaking a bone of the Chagigah as there is regarding the Pesach or not? **A:** A Braisa says, a knife that is found on the 14<sup>th</sup> of Nisson is presumed tahor, because if it was tamei, the owner surely placed it in a mikvah on the 13<sup>th</sup> so that it would be ready for use on the 14<sup>th</sup>. However, the Braisa says, that a meat cleaver (which is used to chop through bones) found on the 14<sup>th</sup> is presumed as tamei, because there is no use for a cleaver on the 14<sup>th</sup> (bones may not be broken), so if it was tamei, the owner had no reason to place it in a mikvah on the 13<sup>th</sup> to have it ready to use on the 14<sup>th</sup>. This Braisa can't be following the **Rabanan** (who don't compare the Chagigah to the Pesach), because according to them the cleaver has a use on the 14<sup>th</sup>, to chop up the Chagigah. The Braisa must be following **Ben Teima**, and we see that he must hold that one may not break bones of the Chagigah, which is why there is no use for the cleaver on the 14<sup>th</sup>.
    - **Q:** It could be that the Braisa follows the **Rabanan** and the reason there is no use for the cleaver is because the Braisa is discussing when Erev Pesach falls on a Shabbos, in which case a Chagigah is not brought! **A:** The next part of the Braisa discusses Erev Pesach that fell on a Shabbos, so the first part of the Braisa is obviously not discussing Shabbos.
    - **Q:** It could be that the Braisa follows the **Rabanan** and the reason there is no use for the cleaver is because the Braisa is discussing where the Pesach was large enough to satisfy the hunger of all the owners!? **A:** That can't be, because there is no way that he would know that to be the case on the 13<sup>th</sup> of Nisson.
    - **Q:** It could be that the Braisa follows the **Rabanan** and the reason there is no use for the cleaver is because the Braisa is discussing where the Pesach was brought while most of the tzibur was tamei!? **A:** That can't be, because there is no way that he would know that to be the case on the 13<sup>th</sup> of Nisson.
      - It could be that the Nasi died, so he knew that most of the Yidden would become tamei and that a Chagigah would therefore not be brought.
        - **Q:** If he knew it would be brought when tamei, why did he bother placing the knife to be used for the shechita into the mikvah!? **A:** The Nasi was at death's door on the 13<sup>th</sup>. Regarding the Pesach, which would certainly be brought, the only question being whether it would be brought when tamei or when tahor, he

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

goes through the bother of placing it in the mikvah. Regarding a Chagigah, which is questionable whether it will even be brought, he does not bother to place the cleaver into a mikvah.

- A Braisa says, **Yehuda ben Durtai**, and his son **Durtai**, held that the Chagigah of the 14<sup>th</sup> of Nisnon overrides Shabbos as well. **Rav** explained, they learned this from the pasuk that says one should shecht a Pesach to Hashem “of tzon or cattle”. Now, a Pesach may not be brought from cattle. The “cattle” must be referring to the Chagigah, and the pasuk refers to it as a Pesach, to teach that it too overrides Shabbos.
  - **R’ Ashi** explained, that all who argue on **Yehuda ben Durtai**, and his son **Durtai** will darshen this pasuk like **R’ Nachman**, who said that the pasuk teaches that an animal designated as a Pesach which was not ultimately brought as a Pesach gets the status of a Shelamim.
  - The **Rabanan** argue on **Yehuda ben Durtai** and say that the Chagigah of the 14<sup>th</sup> and the Chagigah brought on Yom Tov itself do not override Shabbos. **R’ Illa’a in the name of R’ Yehuda ben Safra** said, they learn this from the pasuk regarding the Chagigah to be brought on Succos. The pasuk says it can be brought any of the 7 days of Succos. That seems to be incorrect, because Succos has 8 days! It must be that it can’t be brought on Shabbos, and thus can only be brought on 7 of the 8 days.
    - **Q: Ravin** asked, in a year when the first day of Succos is Shabbos, there will only be 6 days, so why does the Torah say 7 days? **A: Abaye** said, most of the time it will be 7 days, but will never be 8 days. That is why the Torah says 7 days.
- **Ulla in the name of R’ Elazar** said, if one brings a Shelamim on Erev Yom Tov and saves the meat to be eaten on the first day of Yom Tov, that does not fulfill his obligation to bring a “Shalmei Simcha” that must be brought every Yom Tov (because the pasuk says “v’zavachta...v’samachta” which teaches it must be shechted on Yom Tov), or his obligation to bring a “Shalmei Chagigah” which must be brought on every Yom Tov (because the Chagigah is an obligation and therefore must be brought from a chullin animal, not this animal which already had the status of a Shelamim).

### -----Daf נטז-----71-----

- **Q: R’ Yosef** asked, how could **R’ Elazar** say that one can only fulfill his obligation of the Shalmei Simcha with a korbon shechted on Yom Tov? A Braisa clearly says that one can fulfill his obligation with the Chagigah shechted on Erev Pesach!? **A: R’ Idi bar Avin** said, the Braisa is discussing where the animal designated as the Chagigah of Erev Pesach was not shechted until Yom Tov. **R’ Ashi** said, this has to be the case, because we said earlier that this Braisa follows **Ben Teima**, and according to **Ben Teima**, this Chagigah can only be eaten for a day and a night. Therefore, if it was shechted on Erev Yom Tov, it could not be eaten on Yom Tov and cannot even be thought to be used as the Shalmei Simcha.
- **Q: Rava** asked, a Mishna says that the mitzvah of Simcha applies to all 8 days of Succos. A Shalmei Simcha cannot be brought on Shabbos, which means that when the first day of Succos falls on a Shabbos, if we say that the korbon may not be brought before Yom Tov, we can only have 7 days of Simcha, because a korbon can’t be brought until the second day of Yom Tov. It must be that the korbon can be brought the day before Yom Tov, which makes its meat available for the first day of Yom Tov, even if it falls on a Shabbos!? **A: R’ Huna the son of R’ Yehuda** said, one can perform the mitzvah of Simcha with the meat of the korbanos of Yom Tov that do override Shabbos.
  - **Q: Rava** asked, first, the meat of these korbanos can’t be cooked until after Shabbos (and would therefore have to be eaten raw if one was to eat them on Shabbos), and one can’t fulfill the Simcha obligation with raw meat!? Second, only the Kohanim eat the meat of these korbanos, so how would a non-Kohen fulfill his obligation!? **A: R’ Pappa** said, one can fulfill the Simcha obligation by wearing clean clothing and drinking aged wine. This can be done all 8 days of Succos, every single year.
- **Ravin said in the name of R’ Elazar**, one *can* fulfill his Simcha obligation with a korbon that was shechted on Erev Yom Tov.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that the pasuk of “vehayisa ach sameach” comes to include the last night of Yom Tov as part of the Simcha obligation. Presumably, the reason the Braisa says it comes to include the last night instead of the first night is because one can’t shecht a korbon for the Simcha obligation until the

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

morning of the first day of Yom Tov (which is after that first night)!? **A:** The Braisa says the last night is included because it comes after many days of Simcha, rather than the first night which has no days of Simcha obligation before it.

- **R' Kahana** said, the pesukim teach us that if the parts of the Chagigah of the 15<sup>th</sup> (the Chagigah brought on Yom Tov) that are supposed to go on the Mizbe'ach are left off the Mizbe'ach overnight, it becomes passul. The pasuk says “v'lo yalin cheilev chagi ahd boker” and the pasuk afterwards says “reishis” (first). This teaches that the cheilev cannot be left over even until the *first* morning after the shechita.
  - **Q: R' Yosef** asked, even without the word “reishis” we would not have thought that “morning” in the pasuk means the second morning after the shechita, because even the meat of the korbon becomes assur to eat by the second night, so there is no way we could have thought that the cheilev would be mutar until the morning after that second night!? **A: Abaye** said, we find that **R' Elazar ben Azarya** says that the Pesach may only be eaten until chatzos, and yet the cheilev does not become passul until the morning. So the same concept may apply here.
    - **Rava** explained that **R' Yosef** was asking as follows. A Braisa says, when the pasuk says “lo yalin min habassar...bayom harishon laboker”, it teaches that the Chagigah meat may not be left over until the second morning. The only reason the Braisa says it refers to the second morning is because the pasuk says “bayom harishon laboker”. However, “boker” by itself would have meant the *first* morning, even though there is no word “reishis” along with it!

### MISHNA

- One who unintentionally shechts a Pesach not for its own sake, on Erev Pesach that falls on a Shabbos, is chayuv a chatas. One who unintentionally shechts another korbon for the sake of a Pesach on Erev Pesach that falls on a Shabbos: if the animal was not fit to be used as a Pesach, he is chayuv a chatas. If it was fit: **R' Eliezer** says he is chayuv a chatas and **R' Yehoshua** says he is patur (he holds that one who makes a mistake regarding a mitzvah, but accomplishes some mitzvah, is patur from a chatas).
  - **R' Eliezer** said, if one is chayuv for bringing a Pesach not for its own sake, when, if brought for its own sake it is mutar, then one should surely be chayuv for bringing any other korbon brought not for its own sake, since even if brought for its own sake he would be chayuv! **R' Yehoshua** said, this is not a good comparison, because the Pesach is being brought for the sake of something which is assur to bring on Shabbos, and the other korbanos are being brought for the sake of something that is mutar to be brought on Shabbos!
    - **R' Eliezer** said, this is not correct, because one may bring korbanos tzibbur on Shabbos, and yet if one brings other korbanos for the sake of the korbanos tzibbur, he is chayuv! **R' Yehoshua** responded, that is because there are a limited number of korbanos tzibbur that may be brought on any Shabbos. However, the number of Pesachim that may be brought on a Shabbos is unlimited, and therefore another korbon brought for its sake will be patur.
    - **R' Meir** says that one who shechts another korbon on Shabbos for the sake of a korbon tzibbur will be patur.
- One who shechts the Pesach on Shabbos for the sake of people who are unable to (physically) eat it, for the sake of people not part of the ownership group, for the sake of people without a bris, or for the sake of people who are tamei, he is chayuv. If he shechts it for the sake of: people who can and people who can't eat it, people part of the group and people not part of the group, people with a bris and people without a bris, or people who are tamei and people who are tahor, he is patur.
- One who shechts the Pesach on Shabbos and then realizes it had a blemish (on the outside), he is chayuv. If he shechts it and finds it to be a treifah internally, he is patur.
- One who shechts the Pesach on Shabbos and then finds out that the owners had withdrawn from their ownership, or that they died, or that they became tamei, he is patur, because at the time of the shechita, he was permitted to go ahead with the shechita.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna said, if one shechts a Pesach on Shabbos, not for its own sake, he is chayuv a chatas. If the case is discussing where he mistakenly brought it not for its own sake (he thought the animal was designated as another korbon), that would mean that our Mishna holds that changing an animal's designation by mistake is effective in changing its status (which is a machlokes elsewhere)!? We must therefore say that the Mishna is discussing where he purposefully brought the Pesach not for its own sake. However, that doesn't fit with the next part of the Mishna, because **R' Yehoshua** would not say that he is patur if he purposefully brought the Pesach for the sake of another korbon!? This part of the Mishna must be discussing where he mistakenly brought it not for its own sake!? **A: R' Avin** said, the first case of the Mishna discusses where he did it purposefully and the later part of the Mishna discusses where he did it mistakenly.
  - **Q:** In the Mishna, **R' Eliezer** poses a question to **R' Yehoshua** by comparing the case of a Pesach brought not for its sake to a case of other korbanos brought not for their sake. However, based on **Ravin's** answer, the cases can't be compared, because one was discussing when it was done intentionally and one where it was done mistakenly!? **A: R' Eliezer** says, whether brought not for its sake intentionally or mistakenly, it (the shechita) is considered to be a mistake that was done in an attempt to do a mitzvah. Therefore, he can ask by comparing the 2 cases to each other.
    - **Q:** According to **R' Yehoshua**, who says there is a difference between intentionally and mistakenly bringing it not for its sake (only mistakenly doing so is considered to be making a mistake while attempting to do a mitzvah), he should answer **R' Eliezer** by saying that the cases can't be compared for this reason!? **A: R' Yehoshua** is saying, according to me, the cases can't be compared at all (for the reason just stated). However, according to you (**R' Eliezer**) who says that they can be, they shouldn't be compared for another reason, because the Pesach was brought for the sake of something that may not be brought on Shabbos, and the other korbanos are being brought for the sake of something that may be brought on Shabbos!
- In the Mishna, **R' Eliezer** asks, one may bring korbanos tzibbur on Shabbos, and yet if one brings other korbanos for the sake of the korbanos tzibbur, he is chayuv! **R' Yehoshua** responded, that is because there are a limited number of korbanos tzibbur that may be brought on any Shabbos. However, the number of Pesachim that may be brought on a Shabbos is unlimited, and therefore another korbon brought for its sake will be patur.
  - **Q:** It seems that **R' Yehoshua** says when there are a limited number to be brought (so he should not have made the mistake) he will be chayuv. However, we find that **R' Yehoshua** says, if a mohel made a mistake and gave a bris on Shabbos to a baby who was born on Friday, instead of giving it to another baby who was born on Shabbos, he is patur. That is a case of a limited number, and yet **R' Yehoshua** says he is patur!? **A: R' Ami** said, the case with the baby is where he gave a bris to the Friday baby, and the Shabbos baby was still around, needing a bris. In that case, we say that when he gave the bris to the Friday baby, he is still preoccupied with having to give a bris to the Shabbos baby, and therefore he is patur. In our Mishna, the case is where he first shechted the korbanos tzibbur and only afterwards brought other korbanos for the sake of a korban tzibbur. In that case, he was no longer preoccupied with the mitzvah (because the mitzvah had already been done). Therefore he is chayuv.
    - **Q:** This would mean that **R' Meir** argues and says that he is patur even when he brings the other korbanos *after* the korbanos tzibbur have already been brought. However, in a Braisa **R' Chiya of Avel Aruv said in the name of R' Meir** that all would agree that where the mohel gave a bris to the Shabbos baby first and then to the Friday baby, that he is chayuv, because the true mitzvah was already done. They only argue when he gave a bris to a Sunday baby before the Shabbos baby!? **A:** The **Yeshiva of R' Yannai** said, the first case of the Braisa is where he gave a bris to the Shabbos baby on Friday and gave a bris to the Friday baby on Shabbos. In that case, Shabbos had no right to be overridden (because the Shabbos baby already had a bris before Shabbos). In our Mishna, Shabbos was allowed to be overridden by the korbanos tzibbur, and therefore, he is patur when bringing the other korbanos.
      - **Q: R' Ashi** asked, in the case of the bris Shabbos also stands to be overridden for any other baby in the world whose 8<sup>th</sup> day fell out on that Shabbos!? **A: R'**

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

**Kahana** answered, Shabbos was not allowed to be overridden by this particular mohel, and that's why he is chayuv.

U'SHAR KOL HAZVACHIM SHESHACHTAN LESHUM PESACH...

- The Mishna makes a difference between whether the animal is fit to be used as a Pesach or not. This follows **R' Shimon** in a Braisa. **R' Meir** argues with **R' Shimon** and says that in either case he is patur because he made a mistake while attempting to do a mitzvah.
  - **R' Bibi in the name of R' Elazar** said that **R' Meir** said he is patur even if he brought a calf (where it is very obvious that it can't be used as a Pesach) for the sake of a Pesach.
    - **Q: R' Zeira** asked, **R' Yochanan** said that **R' Meir** agrees that one who brings an animal with a "mum" as a Pesach on Shabbos will be chayuv. Why is that different than bringing a calf!? **A: R' Bibi** said, when he brings an animal with a "mum", he is not preoccupied with any mitzvah (because such an animal can never be brought as a korban). When bringing a calf as a Pesach he is preoccupied, because the calf must be brought as a Shelamim.
  - **Q: Rava** asked, according to **R' Meir**, if he brings a chullin animal as a Pesach, will he be chayuv? **A: R' Nachman** said, he would be patur.
    - **Q:** Why is that different than bringing an animal with a "mum" in which case **R' Meir** agrees that he would be chayuv!? **A:** People can get confused between an animal of chullin and of kodesh, therefore he is patur (because he was trying to do a mitzvah). People don't get confused between an animal with a mum and one without a mum.
      - **Q:** The reason of **R' Meir** is because he is preoccupied with attempting to do a mitzvah, not because of confusion, like we see he says that one who brings a calf for a Pesach is patur even though there is no confusion in that case!? **A:** Confusion and preoccupation, each on its own, is enough of a reason for **R' Meir** to say he is patur. An animal with a mum, which has neither of these concepts, will make the one who brings it chayuv.
- **R' Zeira and R' Shmuel bar R' Yitzchak** said: **Reish Lakish** said, if one mistakenly eats nossar meat, thinking it was regular kodashim meat, he is chayuv. Although he was attempting to do a mitzvah (of eating kodashim), since there was no mitzvah actually done, he is chayuv. **R' Yochanan** said, if a person mistakenly lived with his wife while she was a niddah, he is chayuv, but one who mistakenly lives with his yevamah (the widow of his childless brother) while she is a niddah, is patur.
  - **Some explain** that **R' Yochanan** would agree with **Reish Lakish** in his case, because absolutely no mitzvah was done by eating nossar (whereas being with his wife is at least somewhat of a mitzvah). **Others explain** that **R' Yochanan** would say the person is patur in **Reish Lakish's** case. It is different than the case of the niddah, because in that case he should have asked his wife if she was a niddah. Since he didn't, he is chayuv. In the case of the meat, this concept doesn't apply.
  - **Q:** According to **R' Yochanan**, the reason he is patur in the case of the yevamah is because through living with her he performs the mitzvah of "yibum". Living with his wife is also a mitzvah, and he should therefore be patur there as well!? **A:** The case being discussed is where his wife is pregnant, and therefore there is no mitzvah of "pru u'rvu".
    - **Q:** There is still the mitzvah of "onah" (the obligation for a person to live with his wife)!? **A:** The case discussed is where it is not one of the required times of "onah".
    - **Q: Rava** taught that being with one's wife is a mitzvah even when not during the onah requirement!? **A:** It was at the time that the woman expected herself to become a niddah, at which time it is assur to live with her, and therefore is not a mitzvah at all.
      - **Q:** If so, why is he patur when it is his yevamah? **A:** He is embarrassed to ask her if she is a niddah, and is therefore patur. A man is not embarrassed to ask his wife, and therefore if he doesn't, he is chayuv.
  - **Q:** Who does **R' Yochanan** follow when he says that the person is patur by the case of yevamah because he did a mitzvah?
    - It can't be **R' Yose** who says that one who carries a lulav into the reshus harabim on Shabbos on Succos is patur, because it could be that he is patur in that case because there is a time

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

requirement with lulav (must be done by day) and that leads to nervousness, confusion and mistakes. With regard to a yevamah, that doesn't have a time requirement, maybe he would not agree that he would be patur!?

- It can't be **R' Yehoshua** of our Mishna who says one who brings another korbon for the sake of a Pesach on Shabbos is patur, because there too there is a time requirement which makes errors understandable!?
- It can't be **R' Yehoshua** where he says one who give a bris to the wrong baby on Shabbos is patur, because there too there is a time requirement which makes errors understandable!?
- It can't be **R' Yehoshua** where he says that a Kohen who was eating Terumah and found out that he is passul to eat Terumah (his mother was a divorced woman who had married a Kohen) is patur from having to pay, because **R' Bibi bar Abaye** said, that case discusses Terumah of chametz on Erev Pesach, which would mean that there too there is a time requirement which makes errors understandable!? Or, it could also be, the reason why he is patur there is because eating Terumah is referred to as "Avodah", and **R' Yehoshua** learns from a pasuk that a passul Kohen who mistakenly does the Avodah does not make that Avodah passul.
  - We find that **R' Tarfon** referred to eating Terumah as "Avodah" based on a pasuk.

### -----Daf ל"ג-----73-----

#### SHACHTO SHELO L'OCHLAV

- **Q:** It is obvious that this would be a passul Korbon Pesach, and he would therefore be chayuv for bringing it on Shabbos!? **A:** Since the next part of the Mishna says, if he brought it for people who can and people who cannot eat the Pesach he is patur, we say this obvious halacha in the beginning of the Mishna as well.
  - **Q:** The next part of the Mishna is also obvious! Since it is a valid Pesach, he will not be chayuv for bringing it on Shabbos!? **A:** Since the Mishna first gives the case of a Pesach shechted not for its sake, it also gives the case of shechting it for people who can't eat it (although this case is obvious).
    - **Q:** Why does the Mishna need to say the case of the Pesach brought not for its sake? **A:** To teach the machlokes between **R' Eliezer** and **R' Yehoshua**.
- **Q: R' Huna bar Chininah** said to his son, when you go to **R' Zerika**, ask him, according to the shita who holds that one who acts destructively by making a wound (e.g. not for a kosher shechita, or not for its blood) is patur, why is one who shechts the Pesach for people who can't eat it chayuv? The Pesach is passul and the wound he made has not accomplished anything and should therefore not make him chayuv!? **A:** The shechita accomplished that if the pieces of the korbon are brought onto the Mizbe'ach (although they should not be so brought), they will not be taken down (and will be burned on the Mizbe'ach). Therefore he has accomplished something and is chayuv.
  - **Q:** Why is he chayuv if he shechts the animal and then finds it to have a mum? His shechita has not accomplished anything!? **A:** He has accomplished that a mum of cataracts (according to **R' Akiva**) will not be taken off the Mizbe'ach if it is brought up.
  - **Q:** The Mishna says if he shechts it and finds it to be a treifah in a hidden way, he is patur. It is mashma that if it is an external treifah he would be chayuv. Why is he chayuv? He has not accomplished anything!? **A:** The shechita accomplishes that the animal is not a neveilah.
  - **Q: Ravina** asked, a Braisa says, one who shechts a chatas, outside the Azarah, on Shabbos, for avodah zarah is chayuv 3 chataos. What has he accomplished? **A: R' Avira** said, he has accomplished removing the animal from the status of "eiver min hachai".

#### SHACHTO V'NODA...

- **R' Huna said in the name of Rav**, if an Asham had been resigned to grazing until it gets a mum (which is what happens when, for example, its owners brought another Asham in its place, or the owners died), and a person takes the animal and shechts it without a specific intention, it is valid as an Olah.
  - **Q:** It must be that **Rav** holds that a korbon's designation can be changed without a specific intent to uproot it (because he shechted it without a specific intent). If so, why does **Rav** say his din only once the asham has been resigned to grazing? As soon as the asham is not needed (e.g. because its owners died)

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

it should be valid if brought for an olah right then!? **A:** It is a gezeirah to wait until then so that people don't take an ashm that will be used as an ashm and bring it for an olah. We see this to be true from a Mishna that says that the ashm whose owners have died or used another ashm should be let to graze, and when it gets a mum it should be sold and the proceeds are to be used for an olah. The Mishna is mashma that the animal itself should not be used as an olah, only the money from its sale. We see that a gezeirah was instituted so that people would not bring the animal for an olah when it still may be used as an ashm by the owners (e.g. when they didn't die or use another animal for their ashm).

- **Q: R' Chisda** asked, the Mishna said, if one shechted the Pesach and then found out that the owners had given up their ownership in the animal (making it ownerless) he is patur. A Braisa says, if this were to happen on a weekday, the animal must be immediately burned (which is what must be done to a korbon with an internal invalidity). If we say that a korbon's designation can only be changed by specifically uprooting it, that is why this korbon, even after there are no longer any owners, is considered to be a Pesach, and a Pesach brought without owners is internally passul. However, if we say like **Rav**, that a korbon's designation changes on its own when circumstances change, when the owners removed themselves from the animal it automatically becomes a Shelamim, (which does not become passul when it has no owners) which would be passul only because it was brought after the Tamid. Since it is passul because of an external factor, it would not be immediately burned, but would rather be left overnight and burned in the morning!? **A: Rav** must have said that if the Asham was specifically shechted with intent that it be an Olah, it is a valid Olah. Specific intent *is needed* to uproot the designation.
  - **Q:** We have said earlier that **R' Chiya bar Gamda** said, that a specific uprooting is only needed in a case when the animal was going to be used as a Korbon Pesach for Pesach Sheini. However, in general no specific uprooting is necessary. How will he explain the above Braisa that says uprooting is necessary!? **A: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** said, the reason the Braisa said the korbon must be immediately burned was not because it was considered an ownerless Pesach. It is because the case was where it was designated before chatzos, and became ownerless after chatzos. It was therefore considered to be fit as a Pesach and then unfit, in which case it can no longer become fit again.
    - **Q: Rav** says that a live animal that was fit and then became unfit *can* become fit again!? **A: R' Pappa** said, the Braisa follows **R' Eliezer** who says that another korbon brought for the sake of a Pesach is passul. Therefore, although the ownerless Pesach automatically becomes a Shelamim, since it is brought as a Pesach, it becomes passul (and is considered to have an internal psul) and must be immediately burned.
      - **Q: R' Eliezer** would say one should be chayuv a chatas for bringing this on Shabbos (he holds that one who mistakenly does a melacha on Shabbos in the course of attempting to do a mitzvah is chayuv), but our Mishna says he is patur. So how can we say that the Braisa which is explaining our Mishna follows **R' Eliezer**!? **A: R' Yosef the son of R' Sala Chasida** said, the Braisa follows **R' Yosef ben Chonai**, who says that another korbon brought for the sake of a Pesach is passul (and would be immediately burned), but he could hold like **R' Yehoshua** that one who does so on Shabbos would be patur.
    - **R' Ashi** said, **Rav** follows the view of **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yochanan ben Broka**, who says that if there was time for the shochet to find out that the owners removed themselves from this animal or became tamei, the shochet is chayuv and the animal is left overnight and burned in the morning. Presumably it must be left for the morning because he holds that it automatically became a Shelamim and is therefore only an external invalidity!
      - **Q:** It could be that **R' Yishmael** says that even internal invalidities are left overnight. He must hold that way because he says that even if the owners become tamei it must be left overnight. In that case we have said that he certainly needs to specifically uproot the designation! It must be that he holds

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

that even internal invalidities are left overnight and there is no proof that he would agree with **Rav's** view!? **A:** We must say like we said above, that the Braisa follows the view of **R' Yosef ben Chonai**.

**HADRAN ALACH PEREK EILU DEVARIM!!!**

-----Daf 74-----

**PEREK KEITZAD TZOLIN -- PEREK SHEVI'I**

## MISHNA

- How do we roast the Korbon Pesach? We use a spit of pomegranate wood and stick it from the mouth all the way out the back end of the animal. **R' Yose Haglili** says we take the legs (that were cut off) and the insides (that were taken out and washed) and put them back into the animal for roasting. **R' Akiva** says, that is too similar to “cooking” (which is assur for a Pesach), rather they are put onto the spit above the head.
- One may not use a metal spit or roast the Pesach on a grill. **R' Tzadok** said, **R' Gamliel** once instructed his servant Tavi to roast a Pesach on a grill.

## GEMARA

- **Q:** Why can't one use a metal spit? **A:** Metal conducts heat well. If one were to use a metal spit, the part of the spit exposed to the fire would cause the entire spit to become heated and the heat of the spit would roast the meat around it. That would not be proper, because the Torah says “tzli aish” – the Pesach must be roasted by fire, not by something else (e.g. heated metal).
  - **Q:** Why can't palm wood be used? **A:** Palm wood has grooves which secrete liquid, which would be considered to “cook” the animal.
  - **Q:** Why can't fig wood be used? **A:** Fig wood is hollow and therefore secretes its sap, which would “cook” the Pesach.
  - **Q:** Why can't “alon” wood, carob wood, or sycamore wood be used? **A:** They have knots which must be cut off, and when they are cut, the area of the cut secretes liquid.
    - **Q:** Pomegranate wood also has knots!? **A:** Those knots are smooth and need not be cut off. **A2:** The Mishna refers to wood from a pomegranate tree within its first year, which has no knots.
    - **Q:** The place where it is cut off from the tree will secrete liquid even by pomegranate wood!? **A:** That end is kept outside of the animal, so the liquid does not touch the Pesach.
- Our Mishna does not follow **R' Yehuda**, because he says in a Braisa, just like a wooden spit doesn't burn when the meat is being roasted, so too a metal spit doesn't get heated up and may therefore be used. The **Rabanan** said to him, metal conducts heat and therefore is treated differently than wood.

## V'NOSEIN ES KERA'AV...

- **R' Yishmael** would call the roasting Pesach “tuch tuch” (he held the legs and insides were put back inside the animal, which made a sound while being roasted). **R' Tarfon** would call it a “helmeted goat” (he held they were put on the spit above the head, giving the appearance of a helmet on the goat).
- A Braisa asks, what is considered a “helmeted goat” which is assur to eat on Pesach after the Churban (so that people don't think one has offered a Korbon Pesach)? It is only assur if the entire animal is roasted as one piece. However, if a limb was cut off (even if it is then roasted with the rest of the animal), or if a limb was cooked, it is not assur.
  - **Q:** If when a limb is cut off it is not assur, surely when it is cut off and cooked it is not assur!? **A:** The case of the cooked limb is discussing where the limb was never cut off. It was cooked while attached.
- **Rabbah** says, meat that is only salted enough for roasting may be used as stuffing for an animal that will be roasted. **Abaye** asked, but the animal will absorb the blood that is purged by the stuffing meat!? **Rabbah** said,

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

the same way the roasting causes the animal to absorb the blood, it also causes the animal to purge the blood that it absorbed from the stuffing.

- **Q:** Maybe we can say that our Mishna is a proof to **Rabbah**. The Mishna says that the legs and insides are put back into the animal and roasted there. We see that we are not concerned with the animal absorbing the blood from those pieces, because we say the same way it absorbed the blood, it purges the blood! **A:** It may be that the case of the Pesach is different because the open neck (from the shechita) allows the blood to exit, which may be why we are not concerned that it will get absorbed.
- **Q:** Maybe we can say that a Braisa is a proof. The Braisa says that to eat the heart of an animal one must tear open the heart before cooking it. If he did not tear it open before cooking, he may tear it open after cooking it. Presumably this is because we say the same way it absorbed the blood it purges the blood, and is a proof to **Rabbah!** **A:** It may be that a heart is treated differently because its walls are smooth and do not even absorb the blood at all.
- **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from **Ravin**, who prepared a bird in batter and then roasted it for **Rav**, who held it was mutar. It must be because we say that the same way the blood is absorbed by the batter it is purged! **A:** The batter was of fine flour, which is full of cracks and allows the blood to flow out without being absorbed.
  - **Q:** When **Rava** was offered a bird prepared in that way he said he would eat it only because he saw that the liquid absorbed in the batter was clear. If we say it purges just as it absorbs, even it was reddish in color we should assume that it is not blood!? **A:** The batter was made of a thick flour which wouldn't purge easily.
- The halacha is: if the batter is made of fine flour, whether the absorbed liquid is red in color or clear, it is mutar. If it is made of thicker flour, if the absorbed liquid is clear, it is mutar. If not, it is assur. If made of other types of flour, if it turned red, it is assur. If not, it is mutar.
  - With regard to the meat stuffing, the one who says it is assur, says so even if the opening faces down. The one who says it is mutar, says so even if the opening is facing up. The halacha is that it is mutar even when the opening faces up.
  - With regard to a piece of meat, "beitzim", or arteries which have become red (from absorbing blood when still part of the animal), there is machlokes between **R' Acha** and **Ravina**, and we pasken like **R' Acha** who is lenient, as follows: if they are cut and salted, they may even be cooked. If roasted, they are mutar because the blood flows out. If placed onto coals, one says they are assur (the coals cause them to shrivel and retain the blood) and one says they are mutar (the coals draw the blood out). We pasken they are mutar.
- A piece of meat that became red from absorbed blood, the juice that flows from it after the roasting is assur (Rashi's second pshat is that the vinegar that it is soaked in after the roasting is assur). If the meat hadn't turned red from absorbing blood, the juice that flows from it is mutar. **Ravina** said, even if the meat had not turned red, the juice (or vinegar) is assur, because it is not possible that it does not contain some blood.
  - **Mar bar Ameimar** said to **R' Ashi**, my father would swallow this juice (or vinegar) of **Ravina's** case. Others say that **R' Ashi** himself would swallow this juice or vinegar.
  - **Mar bar Ameimar** said to **R' Ashi**, my father would not reuse vinegar to draw out blood a second time.
    - **Q:** Why is it any worse than weak vinegar, which can be used to draw blood!? **A:** If never used, the grapes give the vinegar the ability to draw blood, even if weak. Once used, it loses that ability.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Why is the Mishna bringing a story that refutes the halacha it just stated!? **A:** The Mishna should say, if the grill has large spaces so that the animal can be hung over the open fire without touching the metal grates, it is mutar to roast the Pesach on it. The story was also with such a grill and therefore acts as a proof to the halacha.
- **Q: R' Chinina bar Idi** asked, if one heats an oven with peels of “orlah”, but then sweeps out all the coals and bakes bread with the heat remaining in the oven, according to the shitah who holds that bread baked when those coals are present would be assur (because it is made by benefitting from orlah), would this bread be mutar? **A: R' Ada bar Ahava** said, it would be mutar.
  - **Q: R' Chinina bar Idi** asked, it was said in the name of **R' Yochanan**, if one roasts a Pesach in the heat of an oven of which the coals have been removed, it is passul because it was not “roasted by fire”. The Torah teaches this to us by writing “tzli aish” twice in the pasuk. It would seem from here, that elsewhere (other than Pesach) the heat of an oven from which the coals have been removed would be considered as coming “from the fire”, and the bread should be assur as having been baked by orlah!? **A: R' Ada bar Ahava** said, we learn from the psukim by Pesach to all other cases that this is not considered to be “of the fire”. **A2:** Regarding Pesach, where the concern is that it must be roasted by fire, the Torah has to tell us that heat without coals is not considered “fire”. Regarding orlah, the concern is the benefitting of the assur coals, and they are no longer here.
- A Braisa says, if one cut the Pesach (leaving it attached but facilitating quicker roasting) and placed it over coals, **Rebbi** says that is considered to be “roasted by fire”.
  - **Q: R' Achdivoi bar Ami** asked, a Braisa says, regarding tzara'as the Torah says “a burn from fire” is subject to its own set of halachos. How do I know that a burn from coals, ashes, lime, or boiling water is also included in this? The Torah says the word “michva” twice. It seems, if not for the pasuk we would say that coals are not considered “fire”!? **A: R' Chisda** answered, **Rebbi** was discussing wood coals, which are certainly considered to be “fire”. The pasuk stated “michva” twice to include even metal coals, which we would not know are considered “fire” (because they do not actually burn in the fire).
    - **Q:** When the daughter of a Kohen is sentenced to burning, the pasuk says “ba'aish tisareif”, and **R' Masnah** explains that she is burned by putting boiling metal down her throat. We see that metal is considered “aish”!? **A:** The word “tisareif” teaches that all methods of burning are considered “fire” in that case.
      - **Q:** That would mean that actual fire can surely be used to burn her. Why do we use liquid metal!? **A:** We learn a gezeirah shava from the sons of Aharon, which teaches that just like they were only burned on the inside, but their bodies remained intact, so too the daughter of a Kohen must be burned in the same way.
        - **Q:** Why not use boiling water? **A: R' Nachman** teaches that we must pick the kindest method of death. Liquid metal kills faster and less painfully.
        - **Q:** If we have **R' Nachman's** halacha, why do we need the gezeirah shava? **A:** We would not have known that a burning of only the insides is considered to be “burning”.
        - **Q:** What does “ba'aish” in the pasuk teach? **A:** That the metal must be heated in fire, not just naturally hot.
      - **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked, how can we say that “ba'aish tisareif” includes all forms of burning? The pasuk says that certain chataos must be burned “v'saraf oso ahl eitzim ba'aish”, and a Braisa says this means that it must be burned by fire, not by other methods of burning!? **A: R' Zeira** said, when the pasuk says “ba'aish tisareif”, the “tisareif” is adding methods onto the “aish”. By the chataos, where the pasuk says “aish” at the end, it is saying that only fire is permissible.
        - **Q:** By the chataos the pasuk ends off “ahl shefech deshen yisareif”, so it includes all forms of burning!? **A:** That word “yisareif” is used by a Braisa for another drasha, and is therefore not available to teach that.
      - **Ravina** says, the Braisa regarding tzara'as should be read to group a burn by coals with a burn by fire. According to that reading, the Braisa agrees with **Rebbi**.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: Rava** asked, how can **Rebbi** say that coals are referred to as “aish”? A Braisa, which discusses the “gachalei aish” that must be brought by the Kohen Gadol into the Kodesh Hakadashim says, if the pasuk were to just say “gachalei” we would think that coals with a small flame and even those without may be used. The pasuk therefore says “aish” – they must be fiery. If the pasuk were to just say “aish” we would think that even a plain flame may be brought in. The pasuk therefore says “gachalei”. We see from here that coals are not included in “aish”!? **A: Abaye** said, the Braisa means to say, if the pasuk would just say “gachalei” we would think that only coals without a flame may be used. If the pasuk would just say “aish” we would think that coals with a flame, or a plain flame may be used. The pasuk says both to teach that it should be a flaming coal, not a plain flame. We see that “aish” does include coals.
  - **Q: Rava** asked, a plain flame means that one would grease a piece of a keili, set it on fire, and bring it in. Why would we need a pasuk to teach us that it shouldn’t be done in that way? One wouldn’t present in that way to a human king, surely it shouldn’t be done for Hashem!? **A: Rava** said, we would have thought that the Kohen Gadol can take a piece of wood that is half coal and half plain flame, so that by the time he enters it will be all coal. The pasuk teaches that it must be all coal at the time the Kohen Gadol takes it, not only when he brings it in.

-----Daf 76-----

### MISHNA

- If the Pesach touches the oven walls, the part that touched the oven must be peeled off. If some of the animal’s exuding juices fell onto the oven wall and splashed back onto the animal, he must remove that area (more than just “peeling”). If some of the juice fell onto flour, one must remove a handful of the flour from that area and have it burned.
- If one smeared the Pesach with oil of terumah, if the ownership group is made up of Kohanim, they can eat it. If they are non-Kohanim: if the Pesach is still raw, they should rinse it off, if it is already roasted, they must peel off the outside layer.
- If one smeared the Pesach with oil of ma’aser sheini, he may not charge the people for eating this oil, because it is assur to sell ma’aser sheini in Yerushalayim.

### GEMARA

- If a hot item falls into a hot item (where one is assur, or the combination is assur), all agree it becomes assur (the heat causes absorption). If a cold item falls into a cold item, all agree it remains mutar. If hot falls into cold or visa-versa, there is a machlokes: **Rav** says the upper one is stronger (if the upper one is hot and the lower one is cold they become assur because the upper one causes absorption), and **Shmuel** says the bottom one is stronger (it’s only assur if the bottom one is hot).
  - **Q:** Our Mishna said, if the juice of the roasting Pesach falls onto the oven wall and then goes back onto the Korbon, the area of the Korbon must be removed. Presumably this is because the hot juice makes the oven wall hot (because the upper is stronger), and when the juice goes back onto the meat, the meat is being cooked with the heat of the oven wall instead of the heat of the fire. This is a proof to **Rav** and problematic for **Shmuel**!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing a case where the oven wall was itself hot as well.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna said, if the juices drip onto flour, a handful of the flour must be removed. According to **Rav** the flour becomes assur because the juice heats up the flour, which in turn heats the juice, thus making the juice roasted by something other than fire. However, according to **Shmuel**, since only the juice is hot but the flour is not, it should not make the flour assur!? **A: R’ Yirmiya in the name of Shmuel** said, the Mishna is discussing where the flour itself was hot.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna said, if the Pesach is smeared with oil of terumah and the owners are non-Kohanim, if the Pesach was already roasted, the outer layer must be peeled off. According to **Rav**, since the oil was not hot, it does not get absorbed and therefore a “peeling” is sufficient. However, according to **Shmuel** who

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

says the bottom is stronger, the oil should get fully absorbed and a “peeling” should not be enough!? **A:** So little oil is used when smearing that it cannot permeate the entire animal and a “peeling” is sufficient.

- There are 2 Braisos that support **Shmuel’s** view. The Braisos say, if hot falls into hot, or if cold falls into hot, it is assur. If hot falls into cold, or cold falls into cold, it just needs to be rinsed off.
  - **Q:** When hot falls into cold, in the time that it takes the cold item to cool off the hot item, the hot item does absorb enough that a rinsing shouldn’t be sufficient!? **A:** The Braisos should say, if hot falls into cold it needs to be “peeled”. If cold falls into cold, it only needs to be rinsed.
- **R’ Huna** said, we only say that cold which fell into cold is sufficient with a rinsing if the prohibited item has not been salted. If it has been, it makes the other item assur even though they are cold. This is based on **Shmuel** who says that something which is salted is like something which is hot, and something which is pickled/preserved is like it is cooked (and if permitted and prohibited items are pickled together it is as if they have been cooked together).
  - **Rava** said, this is only if it has been salted so much that it can’t be eaten because it is so salty.
    - **R’ Chininah the son of Rava from Pashrunya** permitted a bird that fell into “kutach” (a dairy, salty dip). **Rava** explained, he permitted it because the salt content wasn’t to the point of preventing one from eating it.
      - If the bird would have been roasted, it would have needed to be peeled. If the meat would have had cracks, even peeling would not have been sufficient, and it would be assur. Also, if the meat would have been spiced, it would be assur as well.
- **Rav** said, if fatty kosher meat and lean non-kosher meat are roasted in the same oven, the kosher meat becomes assur. Although lean meat doesn’t give off aroma, the fatty meat makes the lean meat fatty and the lean meat then gives off the aroma which is absorbed by the kosher meat, and makes it assur. **Levi** said, even if the kosher meat is lean and the non-kosher meat is fatty, the kosher meat does not become assur, because it is merely aroma, which is not considered significant enough to make something assur. In fact, **Levi** paskened this way for the Reish Galusa when a goat and a pig were roasted together in an oven (he permitted the goat).
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that 2 Pesachim may not be roasted together because they may get mixed, which would make them assur (a Pesach may only be eaten by its ownership group). Presumably this is referring to the mixing of taste (aroma), which makes this Braisa problematic according to **Levi**!? **A:** The concern of the Braisa is the mixing up of the korbanos (the owners of one korbon will mistakenly take the other korbon), not the mixing of taste. This must be what the Braisa means, because the Braisa says, the korbanos may not be roasted together “*even if one is a sheep and the other is a goat*”. If the concern is taste, why should we think there is a difference if they are different types of animals? It must be that we are concerned with mixing up the actual animals.
    - **Q:** Based on this, the Braisa is problematic according to **Rav**!? **A:** **R’ Yirmiya** said, the Braisa is discussing a case where the animals are roasted in separate pots, and therefore there is no concern for mixing tastes.
      - **Q:** The Pesach can’t be roasted in a pot!? **A:** They split the oven with coals, which prevents taste from being mixed. Therefore, the only concern is with regard to actually mixing up the animals.
  - **R’ Mari** said, we can say this is the same machlokes as we find among Tanna’im in a Mishna. The Mishna says, if one removes hot bread from the oven and places it on top of a barrel of terumah wine: **R’ Meir** says the bread may only be eaten by Kohanim (it has absorbed the flavor of the wine), **R’ Yehuda** says it may be eaten by a non-kohen, and **R’ Yose** says if it is wheat bread, it may be eaten by anybody, but if it is barley bread it may only be eaten by a kohen. Apparently, **R’ Meir** holds like **Rav** and **R’ Yehuda** holds like **Levi**.
    - **Levi** is forced to agree to the above understanding. **Rav** can say that all agree that aroma is considered significant, and the machlokes is only whether the taste is absorbed in this case. This can be seen from the way **Reish Lakish** explains the Mishna. He says, all agree that hot bread on an open barrel may only be eaten by Kohanim, and cold bread on a closed barrel may be eaten

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

by anybody. The machlokes is regarding hot bread on a closed barrel or cold bread on an open barrel, whether or not the taste is absorbed in these cases. However, we see that all agree if it were to be absorbed, it would make it assur, like **Rav** said.

- **R' Kahana the son of R' Chininah Saba** taught, bread baked in an oven with roasting meat may not be eaten with kutach.
  - A fish was once roasted with meat and **Rava of Parzikya** prohibited eating it with kutach. **Mar bar R' Ashi** said, eating this fish even alone is prohibited because eating fish with meat causes bad breath and tzara'as.