

Pesachim 89

הממנה עמו אחר בחלקו רשאים בני חבורה ליתן לו את שלו והוא אוכל משלו והן אוכלין משלהן:איבעיא להו בני חבורה שהיו ידיו של אחד מהן יפות מהו שיאמרו לו טול חלקך וצא מי אמרינן מצי אמר להו הא קבילתון או דילמא מצו למימר ליה כי קבלינן לתיקוני זביחה אדעתא דאכלת טפי מינן לא קבלינך

The Gemara discusses the concept of a chabura or a group in regards to a Pesach offering. This was an essential component of the Pesach as it could not have been brought as an individual. The specific example that is debated over here is when one individual eats a lot more than others in the group. Can the other people in the group tell him that he should take his allotted portion and just leave? Or can he claim that they accepted him as he is and is entitled to eat as much as he likes? The Chasam Sofer quotes the Haflah and interprets the above passage in a completely different but homiletically way. There is a Yissacher-Zevulon arrangement in which one person undertakes to study Torah diligently as Yissachar did and the other person to support him financially as Zevulon

did. This was the original arrangement between the two brothers, Yissachar and Zevulon. Yissachar was the scholar, and Zevulon was the businessman. They made an arrangement in which Zevulon would financially support Yissachar to receive the reward for study the Torah. The Haflah says that this idea is embedded in our Gemara in the words that people of the chabura telling the individual to take your portion and participate elsewhere. One can participate elsewhere and still receive the same portion. It can be the person that is eating the Pesach offering elsewhere. Or it can be a Zevulon working to help to support a Yissachar and receiving the same portion. As the saying goes in our times, we're all in this together!!

Weekly Quiz

1. Why can't the Pesach be burned on the sixteenth of Nissan? Please cite the three reasons in the Gemara.
2. What is the dispute between Rabbi Yochanan and Rish Lakish about the sinews that will eventually harden? What are the reasons for their arguments?
3. What is the dispute between Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Yaakov as to why one does NOT receive lashes if he lets the Pesach become nosar?
4. Why would contacting piggul and nosar cause the hands of the Kohanim to become tamei?
5. What is the dispute between Rav Yehuda and Rav Yehoshua Ben Levi regarding counting people for a minyan?
6. What are the five things that Rav Huna taught us regarding proper etiquette for a meal?
7. How does the Gemara attempt to prove the concept of ברירה in the first mishna of the eighth perek?
8. What was the complaint of Hoshea against the Jews? What was the response of G-d to him?
9. What are two reasons cited that the Jews were exiled specifically to Bavel?
10. What is the dispute between Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel regarding a half eved and half ben chorin?

Pesachim 83 - 89
פסחים פ"ג - פ"ט

Friday, February 19, 2021
ז' אדר תשפ"א



Daf Yomi Jax

From the Desk of Rabbi Yaakov Fisch

It was another exciting week of learning. I would especially like to thank Avi Smith for teaching the class a couple of mornings this week while I was away.

There are so many layers of Talmudical debate in our studies. Beyond the halachic and aggadaic teachings, we occasionally are treated to these interesting philosophical and ethical debates. This week we discussed the very contemporary debate about how much risk one should expose oneself to benefit someone else. The application of this was with a half eved and half ben chorin in which the Mishna said that Beis Shamai convinced Beis Hillel that the owner should be compelled to emancipate the half eved so he can marry and build a family. The controversy here was how someone can put himself at a spiritual disadvantage (granting the eved emancipation is a prohibition) for the advantage of someone else!! That debate has raged on for centuries in one form or another, and we studied it in its constitutional law form.

Have a Peaceful Shabbos,

Rabbi Yaakov Fisch

Pesachim 83

ואמאי נייתי עשה וידחי לא תעשה אמר חזקיה וכן תני דבי חזקיה אמר קרא (שמות יב) לא תותירו ממנו עד בוקר והנותר ממנו עד בוקר באש תשרפו שאין ת"ל עד בקר מה ת"ל עד בקר ליתן לו בקר שני לשריפתו אביי אמר קרא (במדבר כח) עולת שבת בשבתו ולא עולת חול בשבת ולא עולת חול ביום טוב רבא אמר קרא (שמות יב) הוא לבדו יעשה לכם הוא ולא מכשיריו לבדו

The Mishna had stated that if there is sacrificial meat from the Pesach left over, it should be burned on the sixteenth of Nissan. If the sixteenth of Nissan coincides with Shabbos, one must wait until the seventeenth of Nissan and not burn the sacrificial meat on Shabbos. The Gemara challenges this by asking shouldn't say that the positive mitzvah of burning sacrificial meat outweighs the prohibition of burning the meat on Yom Tov! This is known in the Talmud as עשה דוחה לא

עשה. What's the reason for this rule of עשה דוחה לא תעשה? How can a prohibition from the Torah just be cast aside because there is a mitzvah at hand? There seem to be two different approaches in the Rishonim on this issue. One approach is the Ramban in Chumash in Parshas Yisro. He writes that when one fulfills a positive Mitzvah in the Torah it is an expression of love to G-d or אהבה. When one abstains from a sin that is not an expression of love to G-d or אהבה but rather one of fear of G-d or יראה. The Ramban writes that just as אהבה is greater than יראה, or love is a

greater expression of service to G-d than fear of G-d. So too, a positive mitzvah outweighs a negative prohibition as it is an expression of love to Hashem and a negative prohibition is an expression of fear to Hashem. The Rabbeinu Nissim takes a different approach and simply says that there is no prohibition applied in the case of the mitzvah. For example, in the case of shatnez (a mixture of wool and linen), the prohibition was not applied in the case of tzitzis.



Pesachim 88

תנן מי שחציו עבד וחציו בן חורין עובד את רבו יום אחד ואת עצמו יום אחד דברי הלל בית שמאי אומרים תקנתם את רבו ואת עצמו לא תקנתם לישא שפחה אינו יכול שכבר חציו בן חורין לישא בת חורין אינו יכול שעדיין חציו עבד יבטל והלא לא נברא העולם אלא לפריה ורביה שנאמר (ישעיהו מה) לא תוהו בראה אלא לשבת יצרה אלא מפני תיקון העולם כופין את רבו ועושה אותו בן חורין וכותב שטר על חצי דמיו וחזרו בית הלל להורות בבית שמאי

If someone was half an eved and half a ben chorin (emancipated), Beis Hillel initially advocated that he worked for himself for one day and his owner one day. Beis Shamai responded that this was a solution only for his owner but not for himself as he could neither marry a maidservant nor marry a Jewish woman. Instead, the only solution was to compel the owner to emancipate the eved and enable him to marry a Jewish woman. Tosfos objects to this on philosophical and halachic grounds. Tosfos says

that one cannot violate a prohibition to benefit someone else. This is referred to as אין אומרים לו לאדם חטא כדי שיזכה חברך. In this case, there is a prohibition against granting emancipation to the eved, and if it was only done so the eved can marry a Jewish woman -- in essence, we are enabling him to violate a prohibition, so someone else can benefit!!! Tosfos responds that it was for a very

big mitzvah of getting married and building a family in this case. Tosfos brings proof from Rabbi Eliezer's story that entered a shul and found nine men for a minyan. To complete the minyan, Rabbi Eliezer emancipated an eved. A similar question is asked how he can violate the prohibition of emancipating

an eved for others to have a minyan. Tosfos responds by saying that a community praying is a great mitzvah, which would justify Rabbi Eliezer breaking the prohibition. There's another question asked and that

is what was the justification of Rabbi Eliezer emancipation of the eved. If the purpose was for davening with a minyan that is just a rabbinic mitzvah and how can a Biblical Law be overridden for that!! One of the Acharonim answers was Shabbos Zachor, a Biblical Mitzvah to hear the reading that week, and that is why Rabbi Eliezer was justified in his actions.



Pesachim 87

אמר לו הקדוש ברוך הוא להושע בניך חטאו והיה לו לומר בניך הם בני חנוכיך הם בני אברהם יצחק ויעקב גלגל רחמיך עליהן לא דיו שלא אמר כך אלא אמר לפניו רבש"ע כל העולם שלך הוא העבירם באומה אחרת אמר הקב"ה מה אעשה לזקן זה אומר לו לך וקח אשה זונה והוליד לך בנים זנונים ואחר כך אומר לו שלחה מעל פניך אם הוא יכול לשלוח אף אני אשלח את ישראל שנא' (הושע א) ויאמר ה' אל הושע לך קח לך אשת זנונים וילדי זנונים וכתיב וילך ויקח את גומר בת דבלים גמר

The Gemara elaborates on a most disturbing passage from the scriptures. G-d tells Hoshea, a prophet no less, that he should take a woman who is a prostitute and live with her and have her bear children with him. The backdrop to the story is that the Jewish people have become astray and are beyond redemption, and are unworthy of being redeemed. God says that He cannot give up on the Jewish people as these are His children. To give Hoshea a taste of what it means to have unsavory children, so he tells him to father two kids with the harlot. He then tells him to send the harlot and her children away. When he resists the directive, God reminds him of how much more difficult it is to give up on the eternal Jewish People. The context doesn't make it that much easier to understand how can God can ask anyone, especially a prophet, to live with a prostitute!! According to Ibn Ezra and the Radak, this story never actually occurred. This was merely a prophetic vision that Hoshea received. Since Hoshea complained about the Jewish People and suggested that G-d swap them out with another



Pesachim 84

איתמר גידין שסופן להקשות רבי יוחנן אמר נמנין עליהן בפסח ר' יוחנן אמר נמנין עליהן בתר השתא אזלינן ריש לקיש אמר אין נמנין עליהן בתר בסוף אזלינן

Every member of the chabura (group) had to the beginning of Yom Tov but will undoubtedly be accounted to eat a component of the Pesach. Obviously, only the edible parts of the animal could be part of this category. The Gemara introduces the example of the sinews that are soft and edible at the moment but will eventually harden and be no longer edible over time. Rav Yochanan



says that we determine its eligibility based on its present status. Rish Lakish disagrees and says that we assess its eligibility based on its future status, and since the sinews will harden and not edible, it cannot be counted for the Pesach at present. The larger issue of the sugya is that if you have something evolving into something else -- how do you evaluate and assess its status? Based on its current status or its eventual status? The issue is discussed regarding an esrog that meets the minimum requirement for size at

Pesachim 85

אבר שיצא מקצתו חותך עד שמגיע לעצם וקולף עד שמגיע לפרק וחותר ובמוקדשין קוצץ בקופיץ שאין בו משום שבירת העצם מן האגף ולפנים כלפנים מן האגף ולחוץ כלחוץ החלונות ועובי החומה כלפנים: אמר רב יהודה אמר רב וכן לתפלה ופליגא דריב"ל דא"ר יהושע בן לוי אפילו מחיצה של ברזל אינה מפסקת בין ישראל לאביהם שבשמים

The Mishna stated that if sacrificial meat was taken out of Jerusalem's boundaries, it became invalidated. Once it left the threshold of the gate and outward, it was invalid. From the threshold on inward, it was valid. In the name of Rav, Rav Yehuda responded that the same would apply to Tefila/ prayer. Rav Yehoshua ben Levi disagreed and said that even an iron wall could not separate Israel and their Father in Heaven. What is the comparison of Rav and Rabbi Yehoshua Ben Levi's dispute about prayer into the context of our Daf? Rashi comments that the issue is about combining different individuals for a minyan of 10. Suppose you have nine people on one side of the door or threshold and one person on the other side, than you cannot combine them for a minyan, according to Rav. Rabbi Yehoshua Ben Levi disagrees and says that even an iron wall can not separate Israel and their Father in Heaven, which means to say that these groups would be able to combine for a minyan. Tosfos disagrees and says that even Rabbi Yehoshua Ben Levi would admit that they would not be able to connect for a

minyan. Tosfos argues that the Gemara is referring to that an individual passing by a shul that is saying kaddish or kedusha would be able to respond according to Rabbi Yehoshua Ben Levi even though he is not in the same room that the kaddish is being recited. The Shulchan Aruch in Ch. 55:13 of the Orach Chaim rules in accordance with Tosfos view of the Gemara that everyone would agree that one cannot combine two groups of people in two different areas for a minyan. These are his words: צריך שיהיו כל העשרה במקום אחד ושליח צבור עמם, והעומד בתוך הפתח מן האגף ולחוץ, דהינו קשסוגר הדלת במקום [שפה] פנימית של עבי הדלת, ולחוץ כלחוץ



Pesachim 86

רב הונא בריה דרב נתן איקלע לבי רב נחמן בר יצחק אמרו ליה מה שמך אמר להו רב הונא אמרו ניתב מר אפוריא יתיב יהבו ליה כסא קבליה בחד זימנא ושתייה בתרי זימני ולא אהדר אפיה אמרו ליה מ"ט קרית לך רב הונא אמר להו בעל השם אני מ"ט כי אמרו לך ניתב אפוריא יתבת אמר להו כל מה שיאמר לך בעל הבית עשה חוץ מצא מאי טעמא כי יהבי לך כסא קבלת בחד זימנא אמר להו מסרבין לקטן ואין מסרבין לגדול מ"ט אשתיתיה בתרי זימני אמר להו דתניא השותה כוסו בבת אחת הרי זה גרגרן שנים דרך ארץ שלשה מגסי הרוח מאי טעמא לא אהדרת אפך אמר להו כלה הופכת פניה תנן

Rav Huna was once visiting Rav Nachman and was asked his name and he responded as Rav Huna. He was then questioned why are you identifying yourself as Rav Huna. He responded in a cryptic manner, that I am the השם. What does that even mean? There appear to be two interpretations. Rashi says, that he meant to say that people called me that even in my youth. According to Rabbeinu Chananel, he meant to

say that he received semicha and that he was self-identifying as Rav Huna. The Rema justifies that the title official title of a rabbi may be referred to as a Rav based upon this Gemara. There was some criticism on the Baal Shem Tov for assuming that title as the critics felt it reflected arrogance. His students defended his title based on his worthiness and also bases on this Gemara.

