

6 Adar 5781
Feb. 18, 2021



Pesachim Daf 89

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

The Master said: ‘And [their owners] are exempt from observing the Second Pesach.’ But one has [definitely] not discharged [his duty]?¹ — [The reason is] because it is impossible [to do otherwise]. What should be done? Should each bring a [second] pesach-offering, — then they bring chullin to the Temple Court, since four of them have [already] sacrificed.² If all of them bring one pesach-offering, the result is that the pesach-offering is eaten by those who have not registered for it.³ How so? Let each of them bring his pesach-offering and stipulate and declare: ‘If mine was blemished, let this one which I am bringing now be a pesach-offering; while if mine was unblemished, let this one which I am bringing now be a shelamim-offering?’ — That is impossible, because there is the breast and the shoulder [of the shelamim-offering], which is eaten by Kohanim [only].⁴ Then let each one register a Kohen with him? — What is the position of this Kohen? If he has [already] sacrificed a pesach-offering, then perhaps this [too] is a pesach-offering, with the result that the pesach-offering is eaten by those who have not registered for it. While if he has not observed the pesach-offering⁵ perhaps this is a shelamim-offering, and so he will not made a pesach-offering at all? Then let all the five

[jointly] bring one Kohen who had not made a pesach-offering and register him for these five pesach-offering, for in any event, there is one [sacrifice] with which he will discharge [his duty]! — Rather [the reason is] because he reduces [the time allowed for] the eating of the shelamim-offering, for the pesach-offering [is eaten] a day and a night,⁶ whereas a shelamim-offering [is eaten] two days and one night.⁷ Then let them bring a pesach-‘remainder’ and declare, ‘If mine was blemished, let this which I bring now be a pesach-offering; while if mine was unblemished, let this which I bring now be a shelamim-offering,’ for a pesach-‘remainder’ is eaten one day and one night [only]?⁸ — May we then set aside [animals] in the first instance to be remainders?⁹ Then let us take the trouble to bring a pesach-remainder?¹⁰ Rather [the reason is] because of the semichah — the laying [of hands]; for whereas the pesach-offering does not require semichah, a remainder requires semichah. That is well of a mens’ sacrifice, [but] what can be said of a women’s sacrifice?¹¹ — Rather it is on account of the [blood] applications: for whereas the pesach-offering [requires] one application, the shelamim-offering [requires] two, which are

¹ Sc. the one whose offering was blemished.

² A pesach-offering can only be brought when there is an actual obligation. and if a man not under this obligation consecrates an animal as such, the consecration is invalid and the animal remains chullin, which may not be brought into the Temple Court for slaughtering. Here four have actually discharged their duty already, though we do not know who they are, so that four of the animals must remain unconsecrated.

³ Because the registration of those whose duty has been done is of no account.

⁴ And since it may be a pesach-sacrifice and no Kohanim are registered for this, they cannot eat it.

⁵ Having been tamei or on a distant journey at the First Pesach.

⁶ And what is left over after that must be burnt as nossar.

⁷ Since each sacrifice may be a pesach-offering, we can only permit the shorter period, whereas actually it may be a shelamim-offering.

⁸ If an animal is consecrated as a pesach-offering but not sacrificed as such, it is a pesach-‘remainder’, which is then brought as a shelamim-offering but eaten only during the shorter period. Hence here, let each consecrate the animal for a pesach-offering. If his animal was blemished, he discharges his duty with this one. But if his animal was unblemished, this is automatically a pesach-‘remainder’, since it cannot be sacrificed for its own purpose.

⁹ Certainly not!

¹⁰ I.e., let us find an animal which was actually left over from the first Pesach.

¹¹ Which does not require semichah.



four.¹² [But] what does that matter? Surely we learned: All [blood] which is sprinkled on the outer altar,¹³ if he [the Kohen] applied them with one sprinkling, he has made atonement?¹⁴ — Rather [the reason is] because whereas [the blood of] the pesach-offering must be poured out [gently],¹⁵ [that of] the shelamim-offerings requires dashing [against the altar].¹⁶ But what does that matter? Surely it was taught: All [blood] which is applied by dashing [against the altar], if he [the Kohen] applied [it] by pouring it out, he has discharged [his duty]?¹⁷ — Granted that we say [thus] where he has done so; [do we say thus] as the very outset too?¹⁸ (88b3 – 89a2)

MISHNAH: If a man says to his children, ‘Behold, I slaughter the pesach-offering on behalf of whichever of you goes up first to Jerusalem,’ as soon as the first has inserted his head and the greater part of his body [in Jerusalem] he has acquired his portion, and he acquires it on behalf of his brethren with him. (89a3)

GEMARA: This proves that there is bereirah – retroactive determination.¹⁹ — Said Rabbi Yochanan: He [their father] said this in order to encourage them in [the performance of] mitzvos.²⁰ This may be proved too, for he [the Tanna] teaches: And he acquires it on behalf of his brethren with him; now it is well if you say that he had registered them beforehand, then it is correct. But if you say that he had not registered them beforehand, can they be registered after he

has slaughtered it? Surely we learned: They may register and withdraw their hands from it until it is slaughtered!²¹ This proves it. It was taught likewise: It once happened that²² the daughters preceded the sons, and so it was seen that the daughters were zealous while the sons were lazy. (89a3)

MISHNAH: One may always register for it as long as there is as much as an olive in it for each one [registered]. They may register and withdraw their hands from it until it is slaughtered; Rabbi Shimon said: until the blood is sprinkled. (89a3)

GEMARA: What does he inform us? — He informs us this, viz., though this company had registered for it, it can retract [entirely] and a different company register for it.²³ (89a4)

They may register and withdraw their hands from it until it is slaughtered etc. Abaye said: The controversy is in respect of withdrawing, for the Rabbis hold: [And if the household be too little] for being [me-heyos] for a lamb [implies] in the lifetime [mi-chayus] of the lamb;²⁴ while Rabbi Shimon holds [that it implies] during the circumstances [mi-havayus] of the lamb.²⁵ But in respect of registering all agree [that this can be done only] until it is slaughtered, because the Torah said, according to the number of [bemiksas] the souls, and then, you shall make your count [tachosu].²⁶ It was taught likewise: They may register and withdraw their hands from it until it is

¹² The blood was applied to the north-east and the south-west corners of the altar, thus making it appear that the four corners were sprinkled upon.

¹³ This includes the blood of the shelamim-offering.

¹⁴ I.e., the sacrifice is valid, though in the first place two applications are required.

¹⁵ From the basin on to the wall of the altar near the base.

¹⁶ Vigorously, from a distance.

¹⁷ The sacrifice is valid.

¹⁸ Surely we may not arrange at the very outset that the blood should be gently poured out where it really requires to be dashed against the altar. Hence there is no possibility of observing the Second Pesach.

¹⁹ Bereirah is a technical term denoting that a choice or selection made now has retroactive validity in a legal sense. Actually there is a controversy in this matter. It is now assumed that only one was registered.

²⁰ But actually he had registered all of them beforehand.

²¹ But not after!

²² Where the father had made such a declaration.

²³ This disagrees with Rabbi Yehudah, who maintains that one member at least of the original company must remain.

²⁴ The verse is understood to refer to withdrawal, it being translated: And if the household has become too little etc., because some of its members have withdrawn. The present interpretation of mi-heyos teaches that this withdrawal is possible only while the animal is still alive.

²⁵ I.e., as long as it still exists for its sacrifice service to be performed, which is until the blood is sprinkled.

²⁶ ‘Be-michsas’ and ‘tachosu’ are connected with a root meaning to slaughter, while at the same time retaining their connotation of numbering, i.e., registering. Hence registration is permitted only until it is slaughtered

slaughtered. Rabbi Shimon said: They may register until it is slaughtered and withdraw until the blood is sprinkled. (89a4)

MISHNAH: If a man registers another with him [to share] in his portion,²⁷ the members of the company²⁸ are at liberty to give him his [portion],²⁹ and he eats his and they eat theirs.³⁰ (89b1)

GEMARA: The scholars asked: Can the members of a company, one of whom has “refined hands”,³¹ say to him, ‘Take your portion and go!’ Do we rule that he can say to them, ‘Surely you have accepted [me]’; or perhaps they can answer him, ‘We accepted you for the purpose of the sacrifice,³² but we did not accept you with the view that you should eat more than we?’ — Come and hear: If a man registers another with him, the members of the company are at liberty to give him his [portion], and he eats his and they eat theirs. What is the reason? Is it not because it is as though one of them were quick-handed:³³ and if you should think that one who is quick-handed can say to them, ‘You have accepted me,’³⁴ then let this one be as though he is quick-handed? — I will tell you: That is not so, [for] characters differ, for even if both of them together eat [only] as much as one member of the company, they can say to him that they are not willing to have a stranger with them.

Come and hear: If the attendant ate as much as an olive at the side of the oven, if he is wise he eats his fill of it; but if the members of the company wish to do him a favor, they come and sit at his side and eat: this is Rabbi Yehudah’s opinion. Thus, only if they wish, but not if they do not wish. Yet why so? Let him say to them, ‘Surely you have accepted [me.]’³⁵ — There it is different, because they can say to him,

‘We accepted you with the intention of troubling you to attend on us; [but] we did not accept you that we should take the trouble of attending to you.’

Come and hear: Members of a company, one of whom is quick-handed, are at liberty to say [to him], ‘Take your portion and go.’ And not only that, but even when five arrange for a meal in common,³⁶ they are at liberty to say to him, ‘Take your portion and go.’ This proves it. What does ‘and not only that’ mean?³⁷ — It is stated in the format of “not only this” [but also this as well]. In the case of pesach-offering it goes without saying, for they can say to him, ‘We accepted you for the purpose of the sacrifice.’ But even in the case of a meal in common, which is mere companionship, they are at liberty to say to him, ‘Take your portion and go.’

Others state: That is no problem to us,³⁸ but this is our question: Are the members of a company permitted to divide,³⁹ or are they not permitted to divide?⁴⁰ — Come and hear: Members of a company, one of whom was quick-handed, are at liberty to say to him, ‘Take your portion and go.’ Thus, only if he is quick-handed, but not if he is not quick-handed. This proves it.⁴¹ (89b1 – 89b2)

Rav Pappa and Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua joined together in eating bread. But by the time Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua ate one [piece], Rav Pappa ate four. Said he to him, ‘Divide with me.’ ‘You have accepted [me as a partner],’ he retorted. [Thereupon] he raised all these objections⁴² to him, and he answered him as we have answered them. He then refuted him by [the teaching regarding] ‘the members of a company [etc.]’. Said he to him, There the reason is because they can say to him, ‘We

²⁷ Without the knowledge of the other members of the company.

²⁸ Who disapprove of the new companion.

²⁹ Bidding him to go and eat it elsewhere with the new companion of his choice.

³⁰ This Tanna holds that one pesach lamb may be eaten by two separate companies.

³¹ To seize food — i.e., he is a glutton and eats more than his due share.

³² We calculated that so many are required for this lamb.

³³ Presumably the two will eat more than the ordinary share of one.

³⁴ Enabling me to eat as much as I like.

³⁵ As one of your company, and since I cannot go to you, you must come to me.

³⁶ Each contributing an equal share.

³⁷ In which way is the second ruling more noteworthy than the first?

³⁸ That the quick-handed companion may be told to take his portion and go.

³⁹ Each to take his share.

⁴⁰ But must all eat together.

⁴¹ They must eat together.

⁴² From the teaching cited above.



accepted you for the purpose of the sacrifice.' He refuted him by [the teaching regarding] 'a meal in common [etc.]', so he divided with him. Then he went and joined bread with Ravina. By the time Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua ate one [piece], Ravina ate eight. Said he: A hundred Pappas rather than one Ravina! (89b2 – 89b3)

Our Rabbis taught: If a man registers others with him for his pesach-offering and his chagigah,⁴³ the money he holds⁴⁴ is chullin. And he who sells his olah-offering and his shelamim-offering⁴⁵ has effected nothing,⁴⁶ and the money, however much it is,⁴⁷ is utilized for a freewill-offering. But since he has not effected anything, why should it be utilized for a freewill-offering?⁴⁸ Said Rava: As a penalty.⁴⁹ And what does 'however much it is' mean? — Even if they [the animals] were only worth four [zuz] and he paid five, the Rabbis penalized him even in respect of that additional [zuz]. (89b3)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

The Gemora discusses the rights of a group of people who are sharing food, whether it be the korban pesach or any food they bought together, to dismiss one of the people in the group with his portion (or whatever is left of it). This is because they are scared that he will eat much more than his portion. At first glance, this seems to be a fair rule in order to ensure that each person receives his portion.

However, what if everyone in the group is a fast eater besides one person, or if one person is simply a slow eater? Can he dismiss them with their portions?

The Sfas Emes answers that he cannot. This rule is not based on protecting everyone's portions, he says, but rather protecting the majority from being eaten under the table. One person has no right to force everyone else to take their portion.

⁴³ Here the shelamim-offering which was brought on the fourteenth likewise and eaten before the pesach-offering. This was eaten by the same who had registered for the pesach-offering.

⁴⁴ Which he received from those whom he registered.

⁴⁵ I.e., animals which he consecrated for that purpose.

DAILY MASHAL

Pesach Sheini

The Sefas Emes writes that Pesach Sheini represents the opportunity of people who had sullied themselves with aveiros to become pure and draw close to Hashem (Likutim, Kodem Shavuos).

The mitzva of Pesach Sheini was granted as a result of people who were *tamei* and unable to offer the Korban Pesach in its proper time. They came to Moshe Rabbeinu to protest that they too wanted to bring the korban. "Wait and I will hear what Hashem has commanded for you," Moshe said (Bamidbar 9:8).

R' Tzadok HaKohen explains that this mitzva was drawn down from *Shomayim* as a result of the heartfelt yearning of the Jewish people to perform the mitzvos. In truth, there was no fault in these *tamei* people. They were not to be punished or scorned for failing to bring the Korban Pesach; they were simply exempt. Yet they did not suffice with this excuse. They wanted so badly to do this mitzva, that Hashem granted it to the entire Jewish people in their merit (Pri Tzadik, Pesach Sheini).

⁴⁶ The sacrifice must be offered on behalf of the first owner.

⁴⁷ Even if it exceeds the animal's worth.

⁴⁸ His action being null, the money remains chullin.

⁴⁹ He should not have bought another man's sacrifice.