

6 Tishrei 5774
Sept. 10, 2013



Pesachim Daf 82

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

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

1. There is an argument as to why we do not allow people who are burning an impure korban pesach in front of the Beis Hamikdash to use their own wood.

Rav Yosef says that the reason is in order not to embarrass someone who does not have his own wood. Rava says that the reason is because people who see that they are taking back leftover wood to their houses suspect the people doing so of taking wood from the Beis Hamikdash for their own use. The practical difference between the two opinions would be in a case where people wanted to bring wood that is not used in the fires of the Beis Hamikdash. According to Rav Yosef they would not be allowed to do so, but according to Rava this should be permitted.

2. There is a similar argument as to why kohanim who were impure on the day their family served in the Beis Hamikdash were made to stand at the eastern gate.

Rav Yosef says that this was done in order to embarrass them that they allowed themselves to become impure and miss their day of service in the Beis Hamikdash. Rava says that this was in order that people should not think that they prefer to do their own work rather than the service of the Beis

Hamikdash. People should therefore see that they are not serving in the Beis Hamikdash due to their impurity. The difference between the two opinions would be in a case where the kohanim in question have no other work, or do not have more profitable work. According to Rav Yosef the reason is still applicable, while according to Rava it is not.

3. If the korban became impure or went out of the area where it was permitted to be eaten, it should be burned immediately (on Erev Pesach).

The Gemora quotes the source for the law regarding the meat becoming impure from the verse, “And the meat that will touch anything impure should not be eaten, it should be burned with fire.” While the Gemora originally thinks the source for the law regarding meat that left the permitted area is from the Chatas that Aharon burned on the day of the inauguration of the Mishkan, it concludes that the source is a Halachah l’Moshe mi’Sinai (this law also somewhat covers a case where the meat becomes impure, see Gemora at length).



4. There is an argument in the Mishna regarding what to do in a case where the owners of the korban pesach became impure or died.

The Tanna Kamma says that in such a case we should wait until the meat becomes nosar, and it is then burned on the sixteenth of Nisan. [We do not burn kodshim on Yom Tov.] Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah says that the meat is burned right away (on the fourteenth) as it has no one to eat it.

5. There is an argument in the Gemora whether the above argument applies only when the owners died or became impure before the sprinkling of the blood (not afterwards).

Rav Yosef states that if the owners died after the sprinkling of the blood, everyone agrees that the meat can only be burned on the sixteenth, as the meat was able to be eaten at one point. However, Rabbi Yochanan understands that Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah holds that even if the owners died after the sprinkling of the blood the meat should be burned right away.

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Our Gemora quotes the Mishna in Tamid which states that kohanim who were impure on the day their family served in the Beis Hamikdash were made to stand at the eastern gate. Rav Yosef says that this was

done in order to embarrass them, while Rava argues that this was done in order that people should not think that they prefer to do their own work. The difference between the two opinions, the Gemora says, would be in a case where the kohanim are either finicky or are rope weavers. Rashi explains this to mean that they either have no other work, or do not have more profitable work. According to Rav Yosef the reason is still applicable, while according to Rava it is not.

The Lechem Mishna (Hilchos Temidin u'Musafin 6:5) notes that while the Rambam rules like Rava, he does not mention that in cases where they have no work etc. that this was inapplicable. Why does he omit the Gemora's exceptions according to Rava?

The Lechem Mishna therefore understands that the Rambam understood the Gemora differently than Rashi. He understands that finicky means that while they do other work, they do work on their own terms. They only work when they want to work, and are not embarrassed about having become impure while doing something they wanted to do. Similarly, the rope weaver refers to someone who does odd jobs, and is not easily embarrassed. Accordingly, the Rambam understands that according to Rava there is reason to suspect that they are working, and according to Rav Yosef there is no reason to make them stand there, as they are not easily embarrassed. This is why the Rambam, who rules like Rava, did not mention that there is any difference in these cases.

