

1 Adar 5781
Feb. 13, 2021



Pesachim Daf 84

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

MISHNAH: Everything which can be eaten of a full-grown ox may be eaten of a tender goat,¹ and also the tops of the shoulder blades and the cartilages.² (84a1)

GEMARA: Rabbah pointed out a contradiction. We learned: Everything which can be eaten of a full-grown ox may be eaten of a tender goat; hence that which cannot be eaten [of the former] may not [be eaten of the latter]. Then consider the sequel: [and also] the tops of the shoulder blades and the cartilages: yet surely these cannot be eaten in the case of a full-grown ox? — Rather it is [dependent on] Tannaim, and it is taught thus: Everything which can be eaten of a full-grown ox may be eaten of a tender goat, while that which cannot be eaten [of the former] may not be eaten [of the latter]: but some maintain, also the tops of the shoulder blades and the cartilages. Rava said: This [the second] is a defining clause, and it teaches thus: Everything which can be eaten of a full-grown ox after [much] boning may be eaten of a tender goat when roasted, and what is it? the tops of the shoulder blades and the cartilages.

It was taught in accordance with Rava: Everything which can be eaten of a full-grown ox after [much] boning may be eaten of a tender goat when roasted, and what is it?

¹ But not those portions of a full-grown ox which are too hard to be eaten (the reference, of course, is to the pesach-offering), though in the case of a young goat these are soft and edible.

² E.g., the cartilage of the ears, the gristly portion of the breast, and the small ribs at the end of the spine.

³ The sinews of the neck of a young goat fit for a pesach-offering are soft, but when it grows older they harden and are unfit for food.

The tops of the shoulder blades and the cartilages, and the soft sinews are treated as meat. (84a1 – 84a2)

It was stated: [With regard to] sinews which would ultimately harden,³ — Rabbi Yochanan said: One may register for them in the pesach-offering; Rish Lakish maintained: One may not register for them in the pesach-offering. Rabbi Yochanan said, One may register for them in the pesach-offering, [because] we decide by the present. Rish Lakish maintained. One may not register for them in the pesach-offering, [because] we decide by its ultimate [condition].⁴ Rish Lakish raised an objection against Rabbi Yochanan: Everything which can be eaten of a full-grown ox may be eaten of a tender goat, and what is it? The tops of the shoulder blades and the cartilages; [thus] only these,⁵ but not sinews which would ultimately harden! — Said he to him: He teaches those, and the same applies to these. [Thus] why are those [permitted]? Because they can be eaten in the case of a full-grown ox after [much] boning; [so] these too call be eaten of a full-grown ox after [much] boning. (84a2)

Rabbi Yirmiyah said to Rabbi Avin: When you go before Rabbi Avahu, point out a contradiction to him. Did then Rabbi Yochanan say, '[With regard to] sinews which would

⁴ Thus Rabbi Yochanan interprets the 'soft sinews' of the foregoing Baraisa as meaning those which are soft now, even if they ultimately harden; while in the view of Rish Lakish it means only those which remain permanently soft.

⁵ Which even in the case of a full-grown ox can be eaten after protracted boiling.

ultimately harden, one may register for them in the pesach-offering', which shows that we decide by the present? Surely Rish Lakish asked Rabbi Yochanan: 'Can the skin of the head of a tender [sucking] goat be defiled'?⁶ And he answered him: 'It cannot be defiled', which proves that we decide by the future? — Said he to him: he who pointed out this contradiction to you was not particular about his flour.⁷ Surely Rabbi Yochanan retracted in favor of Rish Lakish's view, and he said to him: Do not provoke me, for I learn it as the opinion of an individual.⁸ (84a2 – 84a3)

MISHNAH: He who breaks a bone of a tahir pesach-offering receives forty [lashes]. But he who leaves over [meat] of a tahir [offering] or breaks [a bone] of an tamei [one] does not incur forty [lashes]. (84a3)

GEMARA: As for leaving over [meat] of a tahir [offering], it is well. For it was taught: And you shall let nothing of it remain until the morning; and that which remains of it until the morning you shall burn with fire. Scripture desires to state an affirmative command after a negative command, thus teaching that one is not lashed for it; this is Rabbi Yehudah's view.⁹ Rabbi Yaakov said: This is not the real reason, but because it is a negative injunction involving no action,¹⁰ for which one is not lashed. But how do we know [that] he who breaks [a bone] of a tamei

⁶ At present it is edible, but not when the goat grows older. Can it be defiled as food, since it can now be eaten, or not, since it will ultimately harden.

⁷ Whether he milled sound wheat or the refuse! I.e., he was careless about his data.

⁸ This refers to the Mishnah in Chulin 122a which states that the skin of the head of a tender goat is as its meat, i.e., can be defiled as an eatable, which proves that we decide by the present and thus contradicts Rabbi Yochanan's answer to Rish Lakish. He, however, countered by stating that he regarded it as an individual's ruling only. Hence when he rules in the present discussion that we decide by the present, it must be on the assumption that that Mishnah represents the opinion of the

[offering is not lashed]? — Because Scripture states, Neither shall you break a bone of it: 'of it' [implies] of a fit sacrifice but not of an unfit one. (84a3)

Our Rabbis taught: 'Neither shall you break a bone of it': 'of it' implies of a fit sacrifice but not of an unfit one. Rebbe said: In one house shall it be eaten . . . neither shall you break a bone of it: [this intimates,] whatever is fit for eating is subject to the [prohibition of] breaking a bone, while whatever is not fit for eating is not subject to the [prohibition of] breaking a bone. Wherein do they differ? Said Rabbi Yirmiyah: They differ in respect of a pesach-offering which came in a state of tumah: on the view that [the verse refers to] a fit [sacrifice], this however is unfit;¹¹ but on the view that whatever is fit for eating [is subject to this law], [surely] this too is fit for eating.¹² Rav Yosef said: In such a case all agree that it is not subject to the [prohibition of] breaking a bone, for Rebbe comes to be [more] lenient and this is surely unfit. But they differ where it enjoyed a period of fitness and then became unfit:¹³ on the view that [the verse refers to] a fit [sacrifice], this [indeed] was fit; but on the view that [only what is] fit for eating [is meant], surely it is not fit for eating now.

Abaye said: In such a case all hold that it is not subject to the [prohibition of] breaking a bone. What is the reason?

majority, an assumption, however, which he evidently abandoned.

⁹ This is a general principle, for when an affirmative precept follows a negative one, it is implied that if the latter is violated, the remedy lies in the former.

¹⁰ It is violated by remaining passive, not by committing a positive act.

¹¹ Normally such is unfit, for tumah is merely overridden in favor of a community, but not permitted; hence it is not subject to the prohibition of breaking a bone.

¹² Since a pesach-sacrifice offered in tumah may be eaten in tumah.

¹³ E.g., the pesach-sacrifice became tamei after the sprinkling of the blood.

[Because] at all events it is unfit now. But they differ in respect of breaking a bone during the daytime.¹⁴ On the view that [the verse refers to] a fit [sacrifice], this [indeed] is fit; but on the view, that [only what is] fit for eating [is subject to this law], at present it is not fit for eating.

An objection is raised: 'Rebbe said: One may register for the marrow in the head, but one may not register for the marrow in the thigh-bone'. Why [may one register for] the marrow in the head? Because one is able to scrape it and extract it. Now if you think that the breaking of the bone by daylight is permitted, then the thigh-bone too, let us break it during the day, extract the marrow, and register for it? — Abaye can answer you: Yet even according to your view, let us still take a glowing coal after nightfall, place it upon it, burn it and extract the marrow and register for it? For surely it was taught: But he who burns the bones or cuts the sinew does not violate [the prohibition of] breaking a bone? Then what can you say?¹⁵ Abaye said: Because it may split.¹⁶ Rava said: [This is impossible] on account of the loss of sacred food, which he may destroy with [his own] hands, as the fire may destroy some of the marrow. [Hence] during the daytime too [it may not be broken] as a preventive measure on account of after nightfall.¹⁷

Rav Pappa said: In such a case all hold that it is subject to the [prohibition of] breaking a bone. What is the reason? [Because] in the evening it is fit for eating. But they differ in respect of a limb part of which went out:¹⁸ On the view that [the verse refers to] a fit [sacrifice], this [indeed] is

fit;¹⁹ while on the view that [only what is] fit for eating [is subject to this law], this, however, is not fit for eating, as was taught: Rabbi Yisshmael the son of Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah said: A lamb part of which went outside, and which he broke, is not subject to the [prohibition of] breaking a bone.

Rav Sheishes the son of Rav Idi said: In such a case all agree that it is not subject to the [prohibition of] breaking a bone, for this limb is surely unfit. But they differ in respect of breaking a bone of a half-roast [offering]. On the view that [the verse refers to] a fit [sacrifice], this is fit;²⁰ while on the view that [only what is] fit for eating [is subject to this law], now [however] it is not fit for eating.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: In such a case all agree that it is subject to the [prohibition of] breaking a bone. What is the reason? Because it is surely fit for eating, as he can roast it [completely] and eat it. But they differ in respect of [the breaking of the bone of] the fat tail. On the view that [the verse refers to] a fit [sacrifice], this is indeed fit, but on the view that [only what is] fit for eating [is subject to this law], this [however] is not fit for eating, for the fat tail is offered to the Most High.²¹

Rav Ashi said: In such a case it is certainly not subject to the [prohibition of] breaking a bone, for it is certainly unfit for eating at all. But they differ in respect of [breaking the bone of] a limb upon which there is less than an olive of meat. On the view that [the verse refers to] a fit [sacrifice], this indeed is fit; but on the view that [only what is] fit for

¹⁴ Of the fourteenth, before the Festival commences on the evening of the fifteenth.

¹⁵ Why one may not register for the marrow.

¹⁶ The fire may not burn it through but cause it to crack and split and this is the same as breaking it.

¹⁷ The point of the 'too' ('during the daytime too') is this: just as it must not be burnt at night by Rabbinical law only, lest something else happen, so he must not break it during the day by Rabbinical law only, also because he may do something else instead, viz., break it at night.

¹⁸ Beyond the walls of Jerusalem. The offering had to be eaten in Jerusalem; whatever went outside became unfit. Here as only part of a limb had gone out, this part should be cut out', but this entails cutting across the bone in the limb.

¹⁹ Sc. the part which remained inside, and when he breaks the bone he naturally touches on that part. Consequently it is forbidden.

²⁰ The sacrifice itself is fit, though it may not be eaten because it was not properly prepared.

²¹ I.e., it is burnt on the altar together with the eimurim.

eating [is subject to this law], we require the standard of eating, which is absent.

Ravina said: In such a case it is not subject to the [prohibition of] breaking a bone, because we require the standard of eating. But they differ in respect of a limb upon which there is less than an olive of meat at this point, but which contains as much as an olive of meat elsewhere. On the view that [the verse refers to] a fit [sacrifice], this indeed is fit. But on the view that [only what is] fit for eating [is subject to this law], we require the standard of eating at the point where it is broken, which is absent.

It was taught as four of these. For it was taught, Rebbe said: 'In one house shall it be eaten . . . neither shall you break a bone of it': he is culpable on account of that which is fit, but he is not culpable on account of that which is not fit. [Thus:] If it had a period of fitness but became unfit by the time of eating, it is not subject to the [prohibition of] breaking a bone. If it contains the standard of eating,²² it is subject to the [prohibition of] breaking a bone; if it does not contain the standard of eating, it is not subject to the [prohibition of] breaking a bone. That which is intended for the altar is not subject to the [prohibition of] breaking a bone. [Only] at the time of eating is it subject to the [prohibition of] breaking a bone; when not at the time of eating it is not subject to the [prohibition of] breaking a bone. (84a3 – 84b4)

It was stated: If a limb does not contain as much as an olive of meat at this point, but does contain as much as an olive of meat elsewhere, — Rabbi Yochanan maintained: It is subject to the [prohibition of] breaking a bone; Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: It is not subject to the [prohibition of] breaking a bone. Rabbi Yochanan raised an objection against Rish Lakish: 'Neither shall you break a bone of it':

²² Either at the point where it is broken, as required by Ravina, or on the limb itself', as required by Rav Ashi.

both a bone upon which there is as much as an olive of meat and a bone upon which there is not as much as an olive of meat. Now what does 'there is not as much as an olive of meat upon it' mean? Shall we say that there is not as much as an olive of meat upon it at all, then why is it subject to the [prohibition of] breaking a bone?²³ Hence surely this is what it means: Both a bone upon which there is as much as an olive of meat at this [very] point and a bone upon which there is not as much as an olive of meat at this point, but there is as much as an olive of meat upon it elsewhere? — Said he to him, No: it means this: Both a bone which has as much as an olive of meat on the outside and a bone which has not as much as an olive of meat on it on the outside, but contains as much as an olive of meat [marrow] inside, [yet still] at the point of breaking. And it was taught [even so]: 'Neither shall you break a bone of it': [this refers to] both a bone which contains marrow and a bone which does not contain marrow, while to what do I apply, and they shall eat the meat in that night? To the meat on the bone. Yet perhaps it is not so, but [it applies] to the meat [marrow] inside the bone [too], while to what do I apply, 'neither shall you break a bone of it'? To a bone which does not contain marrow; but in the case of a bone which contains marrow he breaks [it] and eats [the marrow]; and do not wonder about this, for the affirmative command comes and overrides the negative command! When, [however,] 'they shall not break a bone of it is stated in connection with the Pesach Sheini, which need not have been taught, seeing that it has already been said, according to all the statute of the Pesach they shall keep it, deduce from this [that it means] both a bone which, contains marrow and a bone which does not contain marrow.

An objection is raised: [With regard to] a limb part of which went outside, he cuts [the meat] as far as the bone,

²³ For Rabbi Yochanan and Rish Lakish both, agree that it must contain as much as an olive of meat before it is subject to the prohibition.



and pares it until he reaches the joint and then cuts it off. Now if you say [that] a limb upon which there is not as much as an olive at this point but there is as much as an olive on it elsewhere is not subject to the [prohibition of] breaking a bone, why does he pare it until he reaches the joint and [then] cut it off? Let us scrape a little away and break it? — Abaye said: [This cannot be done] because of a [possible] split. Ravina said: This refers to the thigh bone. (84b4 – 85a1)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

While Rabbi Yirmiyah above (4.) stated that the Tanna Kamma and Rebbi argue about whether or not there is a prohibition against breaking a bone of the korban pesach when everyone is bringing it while they are impure, Rav Yosef says that everyone agrees that there is no prohibition in such a case. The Rambam (Hilchos Korban Pesach 10:1) indeed codifies the ruling of Rav Yosef.

The Or Sameach (ibid.) adds an interesting insight to this law. He says that this could be why the law against breaking a bone is not clearly stated as applying for all future generations who will bring a korban pesach. This is because in a year when the korban pesach will be brought when everyone is impure, it will in fact be a mitzva to break the bones of the korban pesach. Being that there is edible marrow in the bones and there is no prohibition that year against breaking them, one should make sure to do so in order that the marrow will not be nosar.

DAILY MASHAL

The Torah forbids breaking a bone of the pesach-offering. The Sefer Hachinuch explains: A person's religiosity is determined by his actions, not merely by his intentions. What a person does impacts him. Accordingly, Hashem wanted the Jewish People to regard themselves as free men on pesach, and therefore they should behave like that. An actor practices his part over and over until it

becomes second nature by him. Therefore, the commandment was that they should not suck the meat out of the bones, for that is not an attribute of royalty. Kings recline when they dine and every Jew should sit like a king on the night of Pesach.