

26 Shevat 5781  
Feb. 8, 2021



Pesachim Daf 79

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

### ***What is sufficient for applying blood?***

The Mishna said that other sacrifices are different than Pesach. If a Pesach’s meat became impure, its blood may not be applied, but with other sacrifices, as long as the fats are pure, the blood may be applied. The Gemora says that this Mishna follows Rabbi Yehoshua.

The Gemora cites a braisa in which he says that for all sacrifices, if a kazayis of meat or of fats remains, one may apply the blood, but half a kazayis of each does not combine. If the sacrifice is an olah, they do combine, as both are offered on the altar. However, this is not true with a *mincha – flour* offering, even if it all still remains.

Rav Pappa explains that this is referring to all of the mincha which accompanies a sacrifice. The braisa is teaching us that if just the mincha remains, even all of it, this is not enough to apply the blood. We may have thought that it is considered part of the sacrifice, since it is brought because of it, so the braisa teaches that it is not enough.

The Gemora asks how we know that one may apply the blood if only the fats remain. Rabbi Yochanan says in the name of Rabbi Yishmael (or Rabbi Yehoshua ben Chanania) that after the verse says that the kohen will apply the blood, it verse says that he will offer the fats as a pleasant smelling offering to Hashem, teaching that he may apply the blood even on account of only the fats.

The Gemora asks how we know that one may apply it if only the innards offered on the altar (kidneys and liver lobe) remain?

The Gemora explains that the braisa implies that they are sufficient, since it only lists the mincha as insufficient.

Rabbi Yochanan himself answers that the verse cited above, which refers to the pleasant smelling offering, implies that *anything* which is offered on the altar, including the innards, is sufficient.

The Gemora explains that both parts of the phrase (“fats” and “pleasant smelling offering”) are necessary. The second one teaches that any innards that remain is sufficient, and not just fats, while the first one teaches that only things which are permitted after applying the blood, like fats, are sufficient, excluding the mincha. (78b – 79a)

### ***Pesach in impurity***

The Mishna says that if the whole nation or most of it became impure, or if only the kohanim became impure, the Pesach is offered in impurity. If a minority became impure, it is offered in purity - the majority on the first Pesach, and the remainder on the second Pesach. (79a)

### ***What impurity?***

The Gemora cites a braisa which says that if either the nation was impure, or if the kohanim and the vessels were



impure, or even if just the vessels were impure, the Pesach was offered in impurity by all, as it is brought in unison.

Rav Chisda says that impure vessels cause it to be brought in impurity only if they are impure due to contact with a corpse, making them a source of impurity which will make those who handle them impure. However, if they became impure by touching a dead rodent, making them a first level impurity, they will only make the meat impure, but not the kohanim. Since eating impure meat is only a standard prohibition, that impurity does not allow impure people to be involved, since that is a more severe kares prohibition which can be avoided.

The Gemora explains that Rav Chisda says that impurity is only suspended in a communal sacrifice, and therefore we only allow whatever impurity is necessary.

Rav Yitzchak also says that it is only suspended.

Rava says that even if the knife is a first level impurity, making the meat impure, impure people can be involved in offering it. Since the verse which prohibits one from eating an impure sacrifice concludes by saying that anyone impure may eat a sacrifice, this teaches that the requirement that one who eats the meat be pure is only when the meat itself is pure. Once the meat is impure, there is no restriction on someone impure eating it. (79a)

### ***Half and half***

The Gemora cites a dispute about the status of half a nation which is impure. Rav says that half is like a majority, while Rav Kahana says it is not. Rav says that they are like a majority, and therefore, all offer the first Pesach. The two halves offer separately, to avoid the pure half doing it impurely. Rav Kahana says that that they are not like a majority, and therefore the pure half offers it on the first Pesach, and the impure half on the second Pesach. Some say that Rav Kahana says that the impure half don't offer

either Pesach. They can't offer the first, since they're not a majority, and they can't offer the second, since they are not a minority either.

The Gemora challenges Rav from our Mishna, which says that if a majority of the nation was impure, they offer the Pesach in impurity, implying that half of the nation wouldn't offer it in impurity.

Rav deflects this by saying that the Mishna means that *everyone's* Pesach is done in impurity only when a majority is impure, but if half is impure, they offer it in impurity, but the other half offer it in purity.

The Gemora supports this reading from the continuation of the Mishna which says that if a minority is impure, the pure majority offers the first Pesach in purity, and the rest offer it on the second Pesach. This implies that if half are impure, they do not offer it on the second Pesach, supporting Rav, who says that they offer it on the first.

The Gemora tries to challenge Rav Kahana from this support, but deflects. According to the second version of Rav Kahana, the Gemora deflects it by saying that the second statement of the Mishna is teaching that if half are impure, they do not offer it at all, not on the first or the second. According to the first version of Rav Kahana, the Gemora deflects it by saying that the second statement only used the case of a majority pure to continue the format of the first statement, but it applies equally if half were impure. (79a – 79b)

### ***Supporting braisos***

The Gemora cites a braisa to support Rav, and one to support each of the versions of Rav Kahana:

1. The braisa supporting Rav says that if half were impure and half pure, they all offer the first Pesach, each group separately.

2. The braisa supporting the first version of Rav Kahana says if half were impure and half pure, the pure half offers the first Pesach, while the impure half offers the second.
3. The braisa supporting the second version of Rav Kahana says that if half were impure and half pure, the impure half does not offer either Pesach. (79b)

***Explaining the other braisos***

The Gemora tries to explain each braisa according to the other positions: Rav and the second version of Rav Kahana can explain the second braisa by saying that it's a case where the impure half includes women. This braisa says that women are not obligated in the first Pesach, but can optionally offer it. Therefore, this half is not a true majority of those obligated, and therefore are deferred to the second Pesach.

Rav can explain the third braisa by saying that it's a case where the pure half is in addition to women who are also pure. This braisa says that women are obligated in the first Pesach, but not in the second Pesach, which they can optionally offer. Therefore, for the first, we count the women, yielding an overall minority which is impure, and they offer cannot offer it in impurity. For the second, we don't count the women, yielding half which is impure, which cannot offer a second Pesach.

The first version of Rav Kahana can explain the third braisa by saying that it's a case where the pure half includes women, which are obligated in the first Pesach but not the second. Therefore, for the first, we count the women, yielding half pure, which do not offer the first Pesach in impurity. For the second, we don't count the women, yielding a majority which is impure, which do not offer the second Pesach.

Rav Kahana cannot explain the first braisa according to his position, and he therefore says that the status of half the nation is a dispute of Tannaim.

The chart below summarizes how each position explains each braisa:

Braisa	Rav	Rav Kahana (1)	Rav Kahana (2)
Impure half offers:			
Separately on first	Supports	Inconsistent – dispute of Tannaim	
On the second	Impure half includes women, who aren't obligated in first	Supports	Impure half includes women, who aren't obligated in first
Doesn't offer	There are also pure women, who are obligated in first, but not second	Pure half includes women, who are obligated in first, but not second	Supports

(79b)

***How much of a majority?***

The Gemora returns to quote the full text of the first braisa. The braisa continues to say that if there was even one more impure than pure, they are a majority, and therefore all offer it in impurity. Rabbi Elazar ben Masia says that one individual cannot tilt the nation to offer it in impurity, as the verse says that you may not offer the Pesach in *achad she'arecha* – *one of your gates*. The word

achad can be read as *yachid* – *one individual*, teaching that one person cannot determine how the Pesach is offered. Rabbi Shimon says that even if one tribe was impure, they offer their own Pesach in impurity, and the rest offer it in purity. The Gemora explains that he says that a tribe is considered a *kahal* – *community*, which cannot be deferred to the second Pesach. Rabbi Yehuda says that if one tribe is impure, everyone offers the Pesach in impurity, since a communal sacrifice cannot be offered in separate groups. The Gemora explains that Rabbi Yehuda agrees that a tribe itself is considered a *kahal*, but he also says that a communal sacrifice must be offered uniformly. (79b – 80a)

#### **DAILY MASHAL**

##### **On the Wings of Eagles**

On the possuk, “I carried you on the wings of eagles and brought you to Me” (Shemos 19:4), the Targum Yonasan explains that when Bnei Yisrael offered the Korban Pesach in Egypt, Hashem carried them to Yerushalayim to slaughter their korbanos there, and then brought them back to Egypt. Their miraculous voyage represents the great spiritual levels that they had reached instantaneously. Hashem brought them from the lowest depths of impurity in Egypt to the greatest heights of holiness in Yerushalayim, in just one instant. Why did Hashem then return them to Egypt? Hashem saw that such a sudden and drastic change was not for their benefit. They needed to grow slowly and steadily, step by step. For this reason he returned them to Egypt, and then led them back to Eretz Yisrael, after the forty-two stages of their journey through the Desert. They then regained the holiness they had experienced on the night of Yetzias Mitzraim (R’ Avraham Yehoshua Heshel of Apta, Ohev Yisrael parshas Masai).