

25 Shevat 5781
Feb. 7, 2021



Pesachim Daf 78

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

Shall we say that our Mishnah does not agree with Rabbi Yosi? For it was taught, Rabbi Eliezer said: The *tzitz* effects acceptance for [the tumah of] eatables; Rabbi Yosi said: The *tzitz* does not effect acceptance for [the tumah of] eatables. Now it was assumed: since Rabbi Yosi rules, The *tzitz* does not effect acceptance for [the tumah of] eatables, he agrees with Rabbi Yehoshua who maintains: We require both.¹ Shall we now say [that] our Mishnah does not agree with Rabbi Yosi? — No: Rabbi Yosi agrees with Rabbi Eliezer, who maintained: The blood [is fit] even if there is no meat. If so, in respect of what law [does he rule]: the *tzitz* does not effect acceptance for [the tumah of] eatables?² — Then on your reasoning, when Rabbi Eliezer rules: The *tzitz* does effect acceptance [for the tumah of eatables], — since he maintains [that] the blood [is fit] even if there is no meat, in respect of what law [does the *tzitz* effect acceptance]? — Rather they differ in respect of establishing it with [the unfitness of] piggul and excluding it from [the law of] me'ilah.³ Rabbi Eliezer holds: The *tzitz* effects acceptance for it [the tumah of the meat] and renders it as tahor, and so establishes it as piggul⁴ and excludes it from [the law of] me'ilah; while Rabbi Yosi holds: The *tzitz* does not effect acceptance for it and does

not render it as tahor; hence it cannot be established as piggul, nor does it exclude it from [the law of] me'ilah.

To this Rav Mari demurred: Even granted that Rabbi Yosi agrees with Rabbi Eliezer: as for sacrifices,⁵ it is well, [since] there is blood; as for the omer, there is the kometz [the handful]; [in the case of] the lechem hapanim [the showbread] too there are the spoons [of levonah (frankincense)].⁶ But [in the case of] the shetei halachem [the two loaves], what can be said?⁷ And should you answer, it is in respect of what is offered together with them,⁸ then it is tantamount to the public shelamim-offerings, [and] if so there are [only] four, whereas we learned five? — Rather, Rabbi Yosi holds: tumah was permitted in the case of a community.⁹ But surely it was taught: Both [in the case of] the one and the other,¹⁰ we sprinkle on them the whole seven [days]¹¹ with [the ashes of] all the purification offerings which were there;¹² these are the words of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yosi said: We sprinkle on them on the third day and on the seventh day alone. Now if you should think that Rabbi Yosi holds: Tumah was permitted in the case of a community, why do I need sprinkling at all?¹³ Hence it is clear that our Mishnah does not agree with Rabbi Yosi.

¹ The blood and the meat.

² Since you now say that the blood can be sprinkled in any case.

³ For piggul; mere intention renders it piggul, and it may then not be eaten even within the permitted precincts or within the permitted time. But a sacrifice cannot become piggul unless it is otherwise fit. Again, if one benefits from sacrifices of the higher sanctity before their blood is sprinkled, he is liable to a me'ilah-offering; if after, he is exempt, for by then the meat is permitted to Kohanim.

⁴ For now there is no other disqualification.

⁵ Mentioned in our Mishnah that they may be offered in tumah.

⁶ All these ascend the altar, and therefore the *tzitz* makes them acceptable.

⁷ For these consist entirely of eatables, for whose tumah Rabbi Yosi holds that the *tzitz* does not effect acceptance. How then can they be offered in tumah?

⁸ The slaughtering of these sacrifices sanctifies the loaves, and the sprinkling of their blood permits them for eating; thus the Mishnah teaches that the *tzitz* effects acceptance for the tumah of the showbread in so far as the sacrifices can now be brought.

⁹ So that acceptance is not required at all.

¹⁰ Sc. the Kohen who burnt the red heifer and the Kohen Gadol.

¹¹ The former prior to his burning the red heifer; the latter, before Yom Kippur, when he officiated in the Beis HaMikdash.

¹² Some ashes were kept of every red heifer killed since Moshe.

¹³ Seeing that the sacrifices of Yom Kippur were public offerings.

Rav Pappa said to Abaye: And does Rabbi Yosi grant the [Court's] document to two!¹⁴ For it was taught, Rabbi Yosi said: I agree with the words of Rabbi Eliezer in respect to minchah-offerings and [animal] sacrifices, and with the words of Rabbi Yehoshua in respect to sacrifices and minchah-offering. 'The words of Rabbi Eliezer in respect to sacrifices,' for he used to say: The blood [is fit] even if there is no meat; 'the words of Rabbi Yehoshua in respect to sacrifices,' for he used to say: If there is no blood there is no meat, if there is no meat there is no blood. 'The words of Rabbi Eliezer in respect to minchah-offerings, for he used to say: the handful [is fit] even if there is no remainder [fit for consumption]; 'and the words of Rabbi Yehoshua in respect to minchah-offerings,' for he used to say: if there is no remainder there is no handful, [and] if there is no handful there is no remainder!

Said he [Abaye] to him: He states what appears logical [to him]. [Thus:] when he was studying [the subject of] sacrifices he said: It is logical [that] just as they differ in respect to sacrifices, so do they differ in respect to minchah-offerings too. [And] when he was studying [the subject of] minchah-offerings he said: It is logical [that] just as they differ in respect to minchah-offerings, so do they differ in respect to sacrifices too.

Said he [Rav Pappa] to him: It is correct [that] when he was studying [the subject of] sacrifices he said: It is logical [that] just as they differ in respect to sacrifices, so do they differ in respect to minchah-offerings too, because the verses [on this matter] are written fundamentally in connection with sacrifices. But when he is studying [the subject of] minchah-offerings and he says: It is logical [that] just as they differ in respect to minchah-offerings, so do they differ in respect to sacrifices too, — but surely, the verses are fundamentally written in connection with sacrifices! — Rather [explain it thus], there is no difficulty:

¹⁴ In a lawsuit the court granted a document containing the verdict to the winner. Here Rabbi Yosi grants this document to both sides — i.e., he agrees with both Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua.

I agree with the words of Rabbi Eliezer, where it [the meat] was tamei, and with the words of Rabbi Yehoshua, where it was lost or burnt. Where it was tamei, what is the reason [that he agrees with Rabbi Eliezer]? Because the *tzitz* effects acceptance! Surely you know Rabbi Yosi to maintain [that] the *tzitz* does not effect acceptance for [the tumah of] eatables! — Rather [explain it thus], there is no difficulty: I agree with the words of Rabbi Eliezer in the case of the community; I agree with the words of Rabbi Yehoshua in the case of an individual. In the case of the community, what is the reason [that he agrees with Rabbi Eliezer]? Because tumah is permitted in the case of a community? But one [objection] is that you know Rabbi Yosi to maintain [that] tumah is overridden in the case of a community. Again, if it refers to a community, [does only] Rabbi Eliezer declare it fit, but not Rabbi Yehoshua? Surely you have said, even Rabbi Yehoshua agrees in the case of a community! Rather [explain it thus:] I agree with the words of Rabbi Eliezer where it was done [offered], and with the words of Rabbi Yehoshua [where it is] at the very outset. [But] if it was done, even Rabbi Yehoshua agrees, for it is taught: Rabbi Yehoshua agrees that if he sprinkled [the blood] it is made acceptable? One refers to tumah; the other to [the case where it] is lost or burnt. [Thus:] when does he teach, Rabbi Yehoshua agrees that if he sprinkled [the blood] it is made acceptable, where [the meat] was tamei, but not if it was lost or burnt; [and] when does Rabbi Yosi say, I agree with the words of Rabbi Eliezer if it was done, where [the meat] was lost or burnt. (78a1 – 78b1)

MISHNAH: If the meat was tamei while the fat¹⁵ has remained [tahor], he must not sprinkle the blood;¹⁶ if the fat was tamei while the meat has remained [tahor], he must sprinkle the blood. But in the case of [other] dedicated sacrifices it is not so, for even if the meat was

¹⁵ The portions burnt on the altar.

¹⁶ Even according to Rabbi Eliezer, because the main purpose of the pesach-offering is that it should be eaten.

tamei while the fat has remained tahor, he must sprinkle the blood.¹⁷

GEMARA: Rav Giddal said in Rav's name: If he sprinkled [the blood], it [the pesach-offering] is made acceptable.¹⁸ But we require eating?¹⁹ — The eating is not indispensable. But surely it is written, according to every man's eating [you shall make your count for the lamb]? — That is for preference.²⁰ And is [this] not [to intimate that] it is indispensable? Surely it was taught: According to the number of [bemichsas] the souls: this teaches that the pesach-offering is killed for none save those who registered for it. You might think that if he slaughtered it for those who are not registered for it, he should be regarded as violating the mitzvah, yet it is fit. Therefore it is stated, 'according to every man's eating ... you shall make your count [tachosu]': The Torah reiterated it, to teach that it is indispensable; and eaters are compared to registered persons.²¹ — Rather, Rav ruled as Rabbi Nassan, who said: The eating of the pesach-offerings is not indispensable. Which [statement of] Rabbi Nassan [is alluded to]?²² Shall we say, the following [dictum] of Rabbi Nassan? For it was taught, Rabbi Nassan said: How do we know that all Israel can discharge [their obligation] with one pesach-offering? Because it is said, and the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall slaughter it at dusk: does then the whole assembly slaughter? Surely only one slaughters! But it teaches that all Israel can discharge [their obligation] with one pesach-offering.²³ Perhaps it is different there, because if some withdraw it is fit for the others, and if the others withdraw it is fit for these?²⁴ — Rather it is this [dictum of] Rabbi Nassan. For it was taught: If one company registered for it, and then

another company registered for it, the former, for whom there is as much as an olive [per person], eat it and are exempt from sacrificing a second pesach-offering; the latter, for whom there is not as much as an olive [per person], cannot eat, and they are bound to sacrifice a second pesach-offering. Rabbi Nassan said: Both are exempt from sacrificing a second pesach-offering, because the blood has already been sprinkled.²⁵ Yet still perhaps it is different there, because if these withdraw it is fit for them [the others]? — If so, let him teach, because it is possible for them to withdraw? Why [state] 'because the blood has already been sprinkled?' That proves' that the matter depends [entirely] on [the sprinkling of] the blood, but the eating is not indispensable. Now, what compels Rav to establish our Mishnah as meaning in the first place [only] and [in accordance with] Rabbi Nassan: let us establish it as [agreeing with] the Rabbis, and even if it was done,²⁶ it is not [fit]? — To Rav our Mishnah presents a difficulty: why does it state: he must not sprinkle the blood; let it teach, 'it is unfit'? Hence this proves that he must not sprinkle in the first place [only], but if done it is indeed well. But on Rabbi Nassan's view, what is the purpose of 'according to every man's eating?' — [To teach] that we require men who are fit to eat [to register for it]. (78b1 – 78b3)

Who is the author of the following which our Rabbis taught: If he slaughtered it for those who can eat of it, but sprinkled its blood for those who cannot eat of it, the pesach-offering itself is fit,²⁷ and a man discharges his obligation with it? With whom [does this agree]? Shall we say [that] it is [according to] Rabbi Nassan, but not the Rabbis? — You may even say [that it agrees with] the

¹⁷ Even according to Rabbi Yehoshua, since the fat is tahor.

¹⁸ And the owner does not bring another.

¹⁹ Which is impossible, since the meat is tamei.

²⁰ I.e. 'in the first place the lamb must certainly be brought for this purpose; nevertheless, even when it cannot be eaten the sacrifice is valid.

²¹ Just as registration is indispensable, so are eaters, and consequently eating, indispensable.

²² For he does not rule thus explicitly, and it must be inferred from some other statement.

²³ Now in that case there is certainly not as much as an olive of meat for each, which is the minimum to constitute eating.

²⁴ So that virtually it is fit for all, but in the present case it is not fit for any.

²⁵ Which proves that in Rabbi Nassan's view the eating is not indispensable.

²⁶ I.e., even if the blood was sprinkled.

²⁷ This is assumed to mean that it is fit for the sprinkling of its blood and the burning of the fat, but not for eating.

Rabbis: There is no intention of eaters at the sprinkling. (78b3 – 78b4)

Who is the author of the following which our Rabbis taught: If he was ill at the time of the slaughtering but well at the time of sprinkling, [or] well at the time of slaughtering but ill at the time of sprinkling, one may not slaughter and sprinkle on his behalf, unless he is well from the time of the slaughtering until the time of the sprinkling? With whom [does this agree]? Shall we say [that] it is [according to] the Rabbis but not Rabbi Nassan? — You may even say [that it agrees with] Rabbi Nassan: we require a man who is capable of eating [to be registered for it]. (78b4)

Who is the author of the following which our Rabbis taught: If he slaughtered it in taharah and then its owners became tamei, he must sprinkle the blood in taharah,²⁸ but the meat must not be eaten in tumah? With whom [does this agree]? — Said Rabbi Elozar: This was taught as a controversy, and it is [the view of] Rabbi Nassan.²⁹ But Rabbi Yochanan said: You may even say [that] it is [the view of] the Rabbis: we treat here of the community,³⁰ who may even sacrifice in [a state of] tumah. If it refers to the community, why may the meat not be eaten in tumah? — As a preventive measure, lest the owners become tamei [in a subsequent year] after the sprinkling and they argue: Were we not tamei last year, and yet we ate; then now too we will eat! But they will not know that in the previous year the owners were tamei when the blood was sprinkled,³¹ whereas this year the owners were tahor [when the blood was sprinkled].³² Alternatively I may answer, Rav ruled as Rabbi Yehoshua.³³ For it was taught, Rabbi Yehoshua said: [In the case of] all the sacrifices of the Torah, whether the meat was tamei while

the fat has remained [tahor] or the fat was tamei while the meat has remained [tahor], he must sprinkle the blood. [In the case of] a nazir and one who sacrifices the pesach-offering, if the fat was tamei and the meat has remained [tahor], he must sprinkle the blood; if the meat was tamei while the fat has remained [tahor], he must not sprinkle the blood. Yet if he sprinkled it, it is acceptable. If the owners became tamei through a corpse, he must not sprinkle [the blood], and if he does sprinkle the blood it is not acceptable. (78b4 – 79a1)

DAILY MASHAL

Communal Korbanos

In the Hafotra read on Parshas Para, the Torah compares Bnei Yisrael to the sheep offered for Korban Pesach, “I will multiply the people like sheep... Like the sheep of Yerushalayim on its festivals” (Yechezkel 36:37-38, Rashi). Even though each family brings its own Korban Pesach, the Torah still considers it a communal korban, which may be offered even if the community is impure.

The same is true of Bnei Yisrael. Each person maintains his individuality. Yet when we join together as a united community, we are beloved and accepted before Hashem even if we may be impure due to our aveiros. In this respect, the people of Bnei Yisrael are compared to the sheep of the Korban Pesach (Arvei Nachael, parshas Miketz).

²⁸ I.e., by ritually tahor Kohanim and with tahor service vessels.

²⁹ Who maintains that the eating is not indispensable. Rabbi Elozar holds that he does not require those registered for it even to be fit to eat. Consequently, he explains the previous Baraisa as the view of the Rabbis only.

³⁰ I.e., the whole or the majority of the community became tamei between the slaughtering and the sprinkling, e.g., if the Nasi died just then.

³¹ So that it was a pesach-offering sacrificed in tumah, which is eaten in tumah too.

³² Hence the sacrifice came in a state of taharah, and may therefore not be eaten now that the owners are tamei.

³³ Who does not consider the eating indispensable.