

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

**Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o"h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

## POINT BY POINT OUTLINE OF THE DAF

prepared by Rabbi Pesach Feldman of Kollel Iyun  
Hadaf, Yerushalayim

[daf@dafyomi.co.il](mailto:daf@dafyomi.co.il), [www.dafyomi.co.il](http://www.dafyomi.co.il)

Rosh Kollel: Rabbi Mordecai Kornfeld

### 1) IS OUR MISHNAH LIKE R. YOSI?

(a) **Suggestion:** Our Mishnah is unlike R. Yosi:

1. (**Beraisa - R. Eliezer**): The Tzitz is Meratzeh for Achilos;
2. R. Yosi says, it is not.
3. We are thinking that since R. Yosi says that it is not Meratzeh for Achilos, he holds like R. Yehoshua who requires blood and meat.

(b) **Rejection #1:** No, it is even like R. Yosi. He holds like R. Eliezer, who permits Zerikah even if the meat is not intact.

(c) **Question:** If so, why would we need the Tzitz to be Meratzeh for Achilos?

1. **Counter-question:** R. Eliezer does not require meat to be Zorek, yet he says that the Tzitz is Meratzeh for Achilos!
2. **Answer:** We must say that the meat is considered Tahor to enable it to become Pigul, and to uproot Me'ilah;
3. R. Eliezer holds that the Tzitz is Meratzeh for Achilos. Me'ilah does not apply [after Zerikah], and the meat can become Pigul

[if there was intent Chutz li'Zmano] as if it was Tahor;

(d) **Answer:** R. Yosi holds that it is not Meratzeh for Achilos. The meat is considered Tamei, Me'ilah applies, and it cannot become Pigul.

(e) **Objection (Rav Mari):** Even if R. Yosi holds like R. Eliezer [who does not require meat to be Zorek], this does not explain everything!

1. Granted, we may offer blood of Zevachim (the Tzitz is Meratzeh), a Kometz from the Omer, and the Levonah [to permit Lechem ha'Panim]. However, Shte'i ha'Lechem should be totally eaten [and this is forbidden. It what sense can they be offered?!]

2. **Suggestion:** Perhaps the Mishnah permits bringing b'Tum'ah the Korbanos brought with Shte'i ha'Lechem!

3. **Rejection:** If so, there would be only four, for Zivchei Shalmei Tzibur are brought with Shte'i ha'Lechem, and these were counted as *another* one of the five!

(f) **Rejection #2 (of Suggestion (a)):** [The Mishnah is R. Yosi.] He holds that Tum'ah is Hutrah b'Tzibur.

(g) **Objection (Beraisa - R. Meir):** For seven days beforehand, we sprinkle on both [the Kohen who will burn Parah Adumah, and the Kohen Gadol who will serve on Yom Kipur] with Mei Chatas from every Parah Adumah burned previously;

1. R. Yosi says, we sprinkle only on days three and seven.

2. If Tum'ah is Hutrah b'Tzibur, we need not sprinkle at all (Tosfos Yoma 8a - since we do not know that he is Tamei)!
- (h) Conclusion:** Our Mishnah is unlike R. Yosi.
- (i) Question (Rav Papa):** R. Yosi contradicts himself!
1. **(Beraisa - R. Yosi):** Nir'eh (I hold like) R. Eliezer regarding Zevachim and Menachos, and like R. Yehoshua regarding Zevachim and Menachos:
2. Regarding Zevachim I hold like R. Eliezer, who permits [offering] blood even without meat, and like R. Yehoshua, who says that each is Me'akev the other;
3. Regarding Menachos I hold like R. Eliezer, who permits [offering] the Kometz even if the Shirayim are not intact, and like R. Yehoshua, who says that each is Me'akev the other.
- (j) Answer #1 (Abaye):** (R. Yosi does not say that he agrees with each of them in both places.) Rather, he says that presumably they argue about both:
1. He saw that they argue regarding Zevachim, and said that presumably, they argue similarly about Menachos. He saw that they argue about Menachos, and said that presumably, they argue similarly about Zevachim. (Tosfos Rid - when he saw that they argue about Menachos, he considered this proper, since they argue similarly about Zevachim. The Tana of the Beraisa put R. Yosi's two statements together and equated them.)
- (k) Objection (Rav Papa):** I understand the first part. However, why did he say that *presumably* they argue about Zevachim like about Menachos? (Surely they do!) The verses they argue about (77a, "v'Dam Zevachecha Yishpoch" and "v'Asisa Olosecha ha'Basar v'ha'Dam") refer to Zevachim!
- (l) Answer #2:** Rather, R. Yosi holds like R. Eliezer regarding Tum'ah [of meat or Menachos], and like R. Yehoshua regarding when they are burned or lost.
- (m) Objection:** Presumably, he holds like R. Eliezer regarding Tum'ah because the Tzitz is Meratzeh. However, R. Yosi holds that the Tzitz is not Meratzeh for Achilos!
- (n) Answer #3:** Rather, R. Yosi holds like R. Eliezer regarding a Tzibur, and like R. Yehoshua regarding an individual.
1. **Question:** What is the reason?
2. **Answer:** Tum'ah is Hutrah for the Tzibur.
- (o) Objection #1:** We showed that R. Yosi holds that Tum'ah is Nidcheh [and not Hutrah] for the Tzibur!
- (p) Objection #2:** We said that also R. Yehoshua is Machshir for the Tzibur!

## 78b

- (q) Answer #4:** Rather, R. Yosi holds like R. Eliezer b'Di'eved, and like R. Yehoshua l'Chatchilah.
- (r) Objection:** In the Mishnah [cited on 77b] R. Yehoshua agrees that if Zerikah was done, it was Meratzeh!
- (s) Answer:** That is only for Tum'ah, but not if they are burned or lost;
1. R. Yosi holds like R. Eliezer b'Di'eved regarding when they are burned or lost.

## 2) IS EATING KORBAN PESACH ME'AKEV?

(a) **(Mishnah):** If the meat [of Pesach] became Tamei and the Chelev is intact, we are not Zorek;

1. If the Chelev became Tamei and the meat is intact, we are Zorek;

(b) Other Zevachim are different. Even if the meat became Tamei and the Chelev is intact, we are Zorek.

(c) **(Gemara - Rav):** If Zerikah was done [in the Reisha], it was Meratzeh.

(d) **Question:** Pesach must be eaten!

(e) **Answer:** Eating is not Me'akev.

(f) **Question:** It says "Ish l'Fi Achlo"!

(g) **Answer:** That is only l'Chatchilah.

(h) **Question:** It is Me'akev!

1. **(Beraisa):** "B'Michsas" teaches that Pesach is slaughtered only for Menuyav (people who have a right to eat from it, i.e. they own part);

2. **Suggestion:** If it was slaughtered Lo li'Mnuayav, perhaps this is like one who transgressed a Mitzvah, but it is Kosher!

3. **Rejection:** The repetition "Ish l'Fi Achlo Tachosu" teaches that it is Me'akev.

4. **Summation of question:** The verse equates Ochlav (those who will eat from it) with Minuy! (Tachosu connotes being counted on it. Just like Shechitah li'Mnuayav is Me'akev, also l'Ochlav.)

(i) **Answer #1:** Rav holds like R. Noson, who says that eating Pesach is not Me'akev. (We will give another answer on the coming Daf.)

(j) **Question:** Where do we find that R. Noson says this?

(k) **Answer #1 (Beraisa - R. Noson) Question:** What is the source that all of Yisrael can be Yotzei with one Korban Pesach [even though there will not be a k'Zayis for everyone]?

1. **Answer - Question:** "V'Shachatu Oso Kol Kehal Adas Yisrael" - are all of Yisrael Shochet [one Pesach]?!

i. **Answer:** Rather, [it is as if everyone slaughtered]. This teaches that everyone can be Yotzei with one Pesach.

(l) **Rejection:** There is different, for each person has potential to get and eat a k'Zayis if others would withdraw.

(m) **Answer #2 (Beraisa):** If a Chaburah was Nimneh on a Pesach (everyone acquired a k'Zayis), and then a second Chaburah was Nimneh on it (each of them acquired less than k'Zayis), the first Chaburah is Yotzei, for everyone gets a k'Zayis. The second Chaburah must bring Pesach Sheni, for everyone does not get a k'Zayis. (They were not Yotzei);

1. R. Noson says, neither needs to bring Pesach Sheni, for Zerikah was done for both of them.

(n) **Question:** Here also, the second Chaburah could get and eat a k'Zayis if the first Chaburah would withdraw!

(o) **Answer:** If that is the reason, R. Noson would have said so;

1. Rather, he said that it is because Zerikah was done for them. This shows that it depends only on the blood.

(p) **Question:** What forced Rav to establish our Mishnah to discuss l'Chatchilah, like R. Noson? He should have said that it disqualifies even b'Di'eved, like Chachamim!

(q) **Answer:** He found the Mishnah difficult:

**1. Question:** Why does it say that we are not Zorek? It should say that it is Pasul!

**2. Answer:** L'Chatchilah we are not Zorek, but b'Di'eved it is Kosher.

**(r) Question:** How does R. Noson expound "Ish l'Fi Achlo"?

**(s) Answer:** It teaches that the person must be able to eat.

### 3) WHEN DO CHACHAMIM AND R. NOSON AGREE?

**(a) Question:** Who is the Tana of the following Beraisa?

**1. (Beraisa):** If Pesach was slaughtered Lo l'Ochlav and Zerikah was done Lo l'Ochlav, it is Kosher and one is Yotzei with it.

**2. Suggestion:** It is like R. Noson, and unlike Chachamim.

**(b) Answer:** No, it is even like Chachamim. Intent for who will eat it does not affect Zerikah. ("Ish l'Fi Ochlo" discusses Shechitah.)

**(c) Question:** Who is the Tana of the following Beraisa?

**1. (Beraisa):** If someone was sick at the time of Shechitah and healthy at the time of Zerikah or vice-versa, we do not do Shechitah and Zerikah for him unless he is healthy from Shechitah through Zerikah.

**2. Suggestion:** It is like Chachamim, and unlike R. Noson.

**(d) Answer:** No, it is even like R. Noson. [He does not require that the Pesach be edible, but] he requires that the person be able to eat. (He expounded so above, 2:r.)

**(e) Question:** Who is the Tana of the following Beraisa?

**1. (Beraisa):** If it was slaughtered b'Taharah and then the owners became Tamei, we are Zorek b'Taharah. The owners may not eat it b'Tum'ah.

**(f) Answer #1 (R. Elazar):** It is only like R. Noson.

**(g) Answer #2 (R. Yochanan):** It is even like Chachamim. The case is, most of the Tzibur became Tamei. They bring Pesach b'Tum'ah.

**(h) Question:** If so, they may eat the meat b'Tum'ah!

**(i) Answer:** This is a decree, lest the owners (Rashi's text - Tzibur) become Tamei next year after Zerikah, and they will think that they may eat, just like they ate the previous year even though they became Tamei;

**1.** They will not realize that they were permitted only because they were Tamei at the time of Zerikah, but one who (Rashi - a Tzibur that) was Tahor at the time of Zerikah may not eat b'Tum'ah.