



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Pesachim Daf Samach Gimmel

- A Braisa says, **Others** (argue on our Mishna and) say, if during the shechita he intended for those with a bris and those without, it is kosher. However, if he intended for those without a bris and then for those with a bris, it is passul.
 - **Q:** In both cases at least some of the people had a bris, so why should the halacha be different in the two cases!?
 - **A:** Maybe we can say that the **Others** (which is **R' Meir**) hold that the very end of the shechita act is the only part considered significant, and they hold like **Rava** explained, that it is only the first stated intent that takes effect. Therefore, when he intends for "people with a bris and people without a bris", only the intent for "people with a bris" takes effect and it is a kosher Pesach. However, when he intends for "people without a bris and people with a bris", it will be passul.
 - **A: Rabbah** said, it could be that the **Others (R' Meir)** say the entire act of the shechita is considered significant. The reason why they differentiate as to the order of who the Pesach was intended for is because we are discussing the case where he intended for both sets of people, but only had time to verbalize the first group during the shechita. **R' Meir** says we only follow what was verbalized, even if there was more that was intended. The **Rabanan** say we follow what was intended as well, and since in each case there was intent for people with a bris, the Pesach is valid.
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Meir** says we don't just follow what was said verbally, rather we take into account other intentions as well. We find this in a Mishna which says that if one intended to separate Terumah and mistakenly said it was being separated as ma'aser, or visa-versa, or if one promises not to enter into a particular house or benefit a particular person and mistakenly names the wrong house or person, the Mishna (**R' Meir**) says that the statement does not take effect!?
 - **A: Abaye** said, the case of the Braisa is where he intended for people with a bris when cutting the first pipe (of the 2 pipes needed to be cut during shechita) and intended to also include people without a bris when cutting the second pipe. In that case, both pipes were cut with intention for those with a bris and the Pesach is valid. The second case of the Braisa is when the reverse took place. In that case, since the first pipe was cut while intending solely for people without a bris, the Pesach is passul. The **Rabanan** hold that an intent cannot take effect unless it is had during the cutting of both pipes. Therefore, it will not be passul.

MISHNA

- One who shechts the Pesach "over" chametz has violated a lav.
 - **R' Yehuda** says the same applies to the shechting of the afternoon Tamid on Erev Pesach.
 - **R' Shimon** says, if one shechts a Pesach for its own sake over chametz on Erev Pesach, he would be chayuv, but if it is shechted not for its own sake, he would be patur. With regard to the shechting of all other korbanos on Erev Pesach, whether shechted for their own sake or not, he would be patur. With regard to shechting a Pesach on the Yom Tov of Pesach itself, if it is done for its own sake, he is patur. If it is done not for its own sake, he is chayuv. All other korbanos, if shechted over chametz on Pesach, whether for their

own sake or not, he would be chayuv, except for a chatas which is shechted not for its own sake, in which case he would be patur.

GEMARA

- **Reish Lakish** said, one would not be chayuv unless there is chametz owned either by the one who slaughters, the one who does the zerika, or by one of the people of the ownership group of this Pesach, *and* the chametz must be present in the Azarah. **R' Yochanan** says the chametz need not be present in the Azarah.
 - **Q:** What is the base of the machlokes? We can't say that they argue whether the use of the word "ahl" in the pasuk teaches that the chametz must be nearby, because they already argue elsewhere regarding whether the word "ahl" means nearby. We find that **Reish Lakish** says that if the breads of a Korbon Todah are outside the Azarah wall during the shechita of the animal, the breads do not become kodesh, because the pasuk says that the breads must be "ahl" the korbon, and **R' Yochanan** says it becomes kadosh unless the breads are outside the walls of Yerushalayim during the shechita!? **A:** The machlokes is whether a questionable warning (the witnesses who are warning do not see the chametz at the time of the shechita unless it is present in the Azarah) can make a person chayuv. **Reish Lakish** says it cannot and **R' Yochanan** says that it can.
 - **Q:** They argue about this in another place as well!? We find that they argue regarding a case where one promised to eat a loaf of bread, and didn't. **R' Yochanan** says he is not chayuv, because there is no action that was done, although the warning would be effective even though it was a questionable warning (when he is warned that he will be chayuv if he doesn't eat it that day, since there is time left in the day, he may not be chayuv). **Reish Lakish** says one can be chayuv even though no action was done, but he is patur, because the warning is a questionable warning. **A:** The argument is based on how to interpret the word "ahl", and we would not be able to learn the case of chametz from the case of the Todah. Chametz is assur wherever it is, and therefore maybe it is only in that case that **R' Yochanan** doesn't require it to be close by, but regarding the Todah, maybe he would require it close by. If we would just give the case of Todah, we would think that it is only there that **Reish Lakish** says it need be close by, but chametz, which is assur wherever it is, does not need to be close by to make him chayuv for shechting "over" chametz.
- **Q: R' Oshaya** asked **R' Ami**, if the shochet doesn't have chametz, but one of the members of the ownership group does, what is the halacha? **A:** He answered, the pasuk says it may not be shechted "ahl chametz", which could be anyone's chametz, not just the shochet. **Q:** He asked, if so, he should be chayuv if anyone in the world has chametz!? **A:** He answered, the pasuk compares the lav of shechting with chametz to the lav of leaving over the meat until the morning. Whoever is chayuv for that (the owners and Kohanim doing the korbon) would be chayuv if they have chametz during the shechita.
 - **R' Pappa** said, based on this, the Kohen who offers the fats "over" chametz will also be chayuv, since he would be chayuv for leaving it over until the morning.
 - One Braisa says like **R' Pappa**. Another Braisa argues and says that we don't compare offering to shechita.

R' YEHUDA OMER AHF HATAMID...

- **R' Yehuda** says that the pasuk says "zivchi" ("My korbon") may not be shechted "over" chametz. The Tamid is the korbon that is referred to when Hashem says "My korbon".