

10 Adar 5781
Feb. 22, 2021



Pesachim Daf 93

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

Who offers the second Pesach?

The Gemora cites a braisa which says that *Pesach Sheini* – the second Pesach is offered by those who didn’t bring the first one due to the following reasons:

1. Bodily impurity (zivah, niddah, having relations with a niddah, delivering a baby)
2. Negligence
3. Unavoidable circumstances that prevented it
4. Intentionally not bringing it
5. Being impure
6. Being on a far journey

The braisa asks why the verse then singles out one who is impure. The Gemora challenges this version of the question, as the verse had to teach us that one who is impure *may not* offer the first one, and therefore amends the question to be why it singles out who is on a journey. The braisa answers that the verse teaches that such a person is exempt from kares. The Gemora explains that this braisa, which assumes that a person on a journey could have brought the first Pesach, follows Rav Nachman, who says that if such a person brought it, it is valid. (93a1)

The Gemora asks why the braisa lists cases of women (niddah, delivering a baby), implying that a woman is obligated in Pesach Sheini. The Gemora challenges this from a braisa which states: You might think that only a person tamei through a corpse and one who was in ‘a journey afar off’ offer the second [pesach], – from where

¹ This braisa omits all the cases of women, since the verse refers to *ish* – a man.

do we know [that] zavin and metzorain and those who had intercourse with niddos [must keep it]? From the verse, If any man [etc.]?¹ The Gemora answers this by saying that the first braisa follows Rabbi Yosi,² while the second one follows Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Shimon.³ (93a1 – 93a2)

When is one liable kares for missing Pesach?

The Gemora cites a braisa about the rules of kares for missing each Pesach sacrifices. Rebbe says that one is liable for each, Rabbi Nassan says one is liable only for the first one, and Rabbi Chanania ben Akavia says that one is liable only if he missed both. The Gemora says that Rebbe and Rabbi Nassan’s positions in this braisa are consistent with their positions in another braisa about a non-Jew who converted or a child who became an adult in between the two Pesach sacrifices. Rebbe says that they are obligated in the second Pesach, while Rabbi Nassan says only one who was obligated in the first offers the second. The Gemora explains that Rebbe considers each Pesach a separate obligation, Rabbi Nassan considers the second one a makeup for first, and therefore one is liable for intentionally missing the first, and Rabbi Chanania ben Akavia considers the second one a way of fixing the missing of the first, and therefore one is only liable if he missed both.

The Gemora explains that they all explained the same verse, but in different ways. The verse says that a man

² Who says that one may offer a Pesach Sheini even if it is only for a woman.

³ Who say that a woman isn’t obligated in Pesach Sheini.

who was pure, and not on the road, and missed offering the Pesach, receives kares, *ki* – because he didn't offer the sacrifice to Hashem in its time, *cheto yisa - he will carry his sin*. Rebbe reads the word *ki* as *or*, indicating that he is liable for missing either one. Rebbe also says that the phrase "carry his sin" implies kares, since he says that megadef, which receives kares, means one who blasphemes. The verse uses the same phrase "carry his sin" in reference to one who blasphemes, teaching that it means kares. Rabbi Nassan reads the word *ki* as *because*, and the sacrifice referred to is the first Pesach, indicating that he is liable kares only for missing that one. Rabbi Nassan says that megadef is not one who blasphemes, and therefore we learn that a blasphemer is liable kares from the phrase "carry his sin" used about the first Pesach. Rabbi Chanania ben Akavia reads the word *ki* as *if*, and the sacrifice referred to is the second Pesach, indicating that he is only liable if he misses both. He also says that the phrase "carry his sin" teaches that one who blasphemes is liable kares.

The Gemora enumerates what each one's position is in each of these cases:

First missed	Second missed	Ruling		
		Rebbe	Rabbi Nassan	Rabbi Chanania
Intentionally	Intentionally	Liable		
Unintentionally	Unintentionally	Exempt		
Intentionally	Unintentionally	Liable		Exempt
Unintentionally	Intentionally	Liable	Exempt	

(93a2 – 93b1)

How far is far?

The Mishna cites two opinions about the definition of a far road. Rabbi Akiva says it means that he was at the distance of Modi'in from the courtyard of the Bais Hamikdash, in any direction. Rabbi Eliezer says that as long as he was outside the courtyard, it is considered a far road. Rabbi

Yosi says that the dot on top of the heh (last letter) of *rechoka* – far teaches that it is not only if he was literally on a far road, but as long as he was outside the courtyard. (93b2)

Ulla says that the distance from Modi'in to Yerushalayim is 15 mil. The Gemora says that this follows Rabbah bar bar Chanah in the name of Rabbi Yochanan, who said that one normally walks 10 parsa (40 mil) in a day, with 5 of those mil from dawn to sunrise and 5 from sunset to nightfall. This leaves 30 mil during the sunlight hours, and 15 mil from midday until sunset, which is the time for offering the Pesach. Ulla's statement is therefore consistent with his position that one must be on the road during the time of offering the Pesach to be exempt. (93b2)

The Gemora returns to Rabbi Yochanan's statement on the distance one walks in various parts of the day. The Gemora supports the distance of 5 mil from dawn to sunrise from the verses about Lot. One verse says that at dawn the angels hurried Lot to leave Sedom, while a later verse says that Lot arrived at Tzo'ar when the sun was rising, and Rabbi Chanina says that he saw both places, and they were 5 mil apart. (93b2 – 93b3)

The Gemora returns to discuss when one must be on the far road. Ulla says it is during the time of offering the Pesach, while Rav Yehuda says it is also during the time of eating it. Rabba told Ulla that there is a difficulty with both positions. Ulla, who says that one is exempt if he wasn't available during the time of offering, seems inconsistent with his other statement that one may offer a Pesach for someone who is impure (e.g., due to touching a rodent), but will be pure at night, when it must be eaten, implying that the important time is the eating time. Rav Yehuda, who says that one must be on the road during eating time, seems inconsistent with his statement that one may not offer a Pesach for someone who is impure now, but will be pure at night. Ulla said that neither of them is inconsistent.

Ulla says that the exemption of a far road only applies to one who is pure, and the verse refers to being on the road, and therefore being unable to *do* the Pesach, implying the offering. However, if one was impure, his exemption is unrelated to the rules of a far road, and therefore he is obligated as long as he can eat it. Rav Yehuda is consistent, as the verse explicitly invalidates anyone who is impure, including even one whose seventh day of impurity to a corpse is on Erev Pesach, even though he can eat it at night. This is different than one who was on the road, who is only exempt due to his location. Therefore, if he is in the right place at the time of eating, he is obligated. (93b3 – 94a1)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

The Rambam (Hilchos Korban Pesach 5:2) rules that if someone missed bringing a korban pesach due to forced circumstances, he is chayev kares if he purposely does not bring a pesach sheini. Later in the same law, the Rambam states that if he was impure or “far away” on pesach and therefore did not bring a korban pesach, he is not chayev kares even if he purposely does not bring a pesach sheini.

The Ra’avad (ibid.) asks that these two rulings of the Rambam are seemingly contradictory.

The Kesef Mishnah (ibid.) answers that these rulings are based on the Rambam’s understanding of our Mishna. After the Mishna states that in all of these cases one should bring a pesach sheini, it asks, “Why did the Torah single out one who is impure or far away?” It answers, “Because these are obligated in Kares and these are not.”

The Rambam understands that the Mishna means that someone who does not bring the korban pesach due to his being impure or “far away” is pushed off to pesach sheini. When one does not bring a pesach sheini he is not chayev kares. However, when the Torah says that if someone is not impure or far away he is chayev kares, it means that

even if he does not bring the korban due to forced circumstances he may be punished with kares if he does not bring a pesach sheini.

DAILY MASHAL

Pesach Sheini

The Gerrer Rebbe writes that Pesach Sheini is a tikkun, a means of repair, for those who are perceived as beyond the pale – “B’derech Rechokah” – in his words. They are outside the scope of assistance. To them, to those who could not develop the closeness and Dveikus to Hashem that was emblematic of Pesach is this second chance.

The Torah tells us: There were men who were impure of the dead, therefore could not offer the korban pesach on that day. They approached Moshe and Aharon on that day. Those men said to him, “We are impure [because of contact] with a dead person; [but] why should we be excluded so as not to bring the offering of Hashem in its appointed time, with all the children of Israel? Moshe said to them, “Imdu – Wait, and I will hear what Hashem instructs concerning you.” The Chidushei HaRim writes that Imdu does not mean wait – but rather it means imdu in Teshuvah and Tefillah. It is not too late, just stand and pursue these two services and Hashem will help you along the way.