



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Pesachim, Daf 11 – Daf 20

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
v'l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf 11--56-----

MISHNA

- The people of Yericho did 6 things which the **Chachomim** were not happy about. The **Chachomim** protested 3 of them and did not protest the other 3. They did not protest their practice of grafting palm trees the entire 14th of Nisson, the practice of being “koreich” the shema, and the practice of cutting and piling the grain before the Omer was brought. The **Chachomim** did protest their practice of allowing the branches of hekdesh for personal use, the practice of eating from fruit that had fallen from the branches on Shabbos, and their giving of “pe’ah” from vegetables.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, Chizkiyahu Hamelech did 6 things – 3 of which the **Chachomim** were pleased with and 3 of which they were not pleased with. They were pleased with: the dishonoring of his father’s bones (his father was a rasha and this showed the people the punishment in store for the resha’im and afforded a kaparah for his father), the destroying of the copper snake from the times of Moshe Rabbeinu (people began using it as an idol), and the hiding of the sefer of refuahs (people stopped davening to Hashem and relied only on this book). They were not pleased with: his cutting off the doors of the heichel to send to the king of Ashur (to try and make peace), his stopping the flow of the Gichon (to prevent the invading army’s access to water), and for making a leap year in the month of Nisson which is not allowed (he actually made a leap year on the 30th day of Adar, which is possible to be the first day of Nisson, he didn’t know that was a problem).

MARKIVIN DEKALIM KOL HAYOM...

- **R’ Yehuda** said, their process would be to take a potion made of different branches, fruit and flour, and smear it onto the palm tree, to help it grow. **R’ Acha the son of Rava** said, they would actually graft the branch of a male palm onto a female tree.

V’KORCHIN ES SHEMA

- **R’ Yehuda** said, they would not separate between the word “Echad” and the word “v’ahavta” of the next paragraph. **Rava** said, they would not pause between “today” (“hayom”) and “on your heart” (“ahl livavecha”), which therefore gave the impression as if they were saying – today it need be on your heart, but not tomorrow. In a Braisa, **R’ Meir** says like **R’ Yehuda** explained, and **R’ Yehuda** (the Tanna) says that they paused in that place but would not say “baruch sheim...”
 - **Q:** Why do we say “baruch sheim...”? **A: Reish Lakish** explained, when Yaakov Avinu desired to tell his sons when Moshiach will come, the Shechinah left him to prevent him from disclosing this. Yaakov thought that maybe the Shechinah left because one of his sons was not a tzaddik. His sons told him, “Shema Yisrael...”, meaning, that we all believe in Hashem and are righteous. Upon hearing this, Yaakov said, “Baruch sheim k’vod malchuso l’olam va’ed”.
 - The **Rabanan** said, we have no right to add “baruch sheim...”, because Moshe Rabbeinu did not put it as part of Shema in the Torah. However, we should say it, because Yaakov Avinu said it. They decided that it should be said, but said quietly.
 - **R’ Avahu** said, when the heretics began saying that we are whispering things that agree with their way of thinking, the **Rabanan** instituted that “baruch sheim...” should be said aloud in places in which heretics are present.
- A Braisa says, **R’ Meir** said, the people of Yericho had 6 practices: 3 that the **Chachomim** approved of, and 3 that they didn’t approve. The **Chachomim** approved of their practice of grafting palm trees the entire 14th of Nisson, the practice of being “koreich” the shema, and the practice of cutting the grain before the Omer was brought. The **Chachomim** did not approve of their practice of piling the grain before the Omer was brought, the practice

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

of making openings in their fences to allow the feeding of the fallen fruit to poor people on Shabbos and Yom Tov, and the practice of allowing the branches of hekdesch for personal use. **R' Yehuda** said, if the **Chachomim** approved of the first 3, why didn't everyone else do these things as well. Rather, the **Chachomim** disapproved of all 6, but they only protested 3 of them. They did not protest their practice of grafting palm trees the entire 14th of Nisson, the practice of being "koreich" the shema, and the practice of cutting and piling the grain before the Omer was brought. They did protest their practice of allowing the branches of hekdesch for personal use, the practice of making openings in their fences to allow the feeding of the fallen fruit to poor people on Shabbos and Yom Tov, and the practice of giving pe'ah from vegetables.

- **Q:** A Mishna says that the **Chachomim** approved of the practice of cutting the grain before the Omer was brought, but not of piling the grain, although they didn't protest the piling. This must follow **R' Yehuda**, because he is the one who discussed the concept of protest, and yet the Mishna says that the **Chachomim** approved the practice of cutting!? **A:** **R' Yehuda** said in the Braisa that there are "3" things that they did not protest, but then goes on to list 4. One must be taken out. The practice of cutting before the Omer should be removed, to make it consistent with the Mishna.
- They would allow the personal use of the branches of hekdesch, because they held that since the branches grew after the time that the tree was made hekdesch, there is no me'ilah issue on the branches and they may be used. The **Chachomim** agreed that there is no me'ilah issue, but said that it is still assur.

UPORTZIN PERATZOS

- **Ulla in the name of Reish Lakish** said, the machlokes was regarding dates that fell off the tree and were stuck in the upper branches. The **Rabanan** held that we don't allow one to climb the tree to get those dates, because we are concerned that he may mistakenly pull off a date still attached to the tree, and the people of Yericho felt there is no need for such concern. However, they both agreed that if the dates were stuck in the lower branches, it would be mutar to take them (at that height there are no dates still attached to the tree).
 - **Q: Rabbah** asked, the dates that fell are muktzeh and should be assur to take on Shabbos!? We can't say that since it is "prepared" for the ravens it is considered prepared for people, because a Mishna says that meat which is fit for human consumption is not considered to be "prepared" for a dog on Shabbos, so if something is considered to be prepared for birds that would certainly not give it the status of being prepared for humans!? **A:** Something fit for humans is not considered "prepared" for animals, because a person has no intention to give something of that quality to an animal. However, something "prepared" for ravens, if fit for human consumption, will be considered "prepared" for humans as well, because a person intends to use anything that is fit for him.
 - **Ravin said in the name of Reish Lakish**, the machlokes was regarding dates stuck in the lower branches. The **Rabanan** held that the fact that it is "prepared" for ravens does not make it "prepared" for humans, and it is assur as muktzeh. The people of Yericho held that it is considered "prepared". However, all would agree that dates in the upper branches would be assur, because of the concern that he would rip off a date still attached to the tree.

V'NOSNIN PE'AH L'YEREK

- **Q:** A Mishna clearly says that there is no pe'ah given from vegetables, because they are perishables!? **A:** **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, the machlokes was specifically about turnip leaves. They are preserved along with the actual turnips, but not on their own. The people of Yericho held that makes them chayuv in pe'ah, and the **Rabanan** held that it does not.

-----Daf ת]---57-----

- A Braisa says, originally the people of Yericho would give pe'ah from the leaves of turnips and cabbage. **R' Yose** says, also from leeks. Another Braisa says they would give pe'ah from the leaves of turnips and leeks. **R' Shimon** says, also from cabbage.
 - The Gemara says that **R' Yose** and **R' Shimon** are each replacing the second species listed by their respective **T"K**, not simply adding a third species. Therefore, the **T"K** of **R' Yose** actually agrees with **R' Shimon**, and visa-versa.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, the son of Bohayan gave pe'ah from vegetables to the poor people. When Bohayan saw this happen, he asked the poor people to give back the vegetables (no ma'aser was given from them under the pretense that they were pe'ah, but because they were not truly pe'ah, ma'aser had to be given) and promised to give them double the amount of produce that did have ma'aser taken from it.
- A Braisa says, initially the Kohanim (who are entitled to receive the hides of a Korbon Olah) would pile the hides together in the Beis Haparva, and would divide them among the kohanim of the "beis av" (the kohanim who did the avodah on that day) in the evening. Eventually, some tougher kohanim would forcibly take more than their share. To prevent that from happening, they began to divide the hides on a weekly basis (when the entire week's kohanim were there). Even then, the high ranking kohanim would forcibly take more than their share. After that, the owners began to give the hides to hekdesh.
 - This influx of donations brought in enough funds to allow the entire Heichal to be covered with flawless, gold plates.
- **Abba Shaul** said in a Braisa, there were Sycamore tree trunks in Yericho that were being stolen. Rather than allowing them to be stolen, the owners gave them all to hekdesh. The Braisa continues and says that there was much corruption by the families of the Kohanim Gedolim in the times of the Beis Hamikdash.
 - A Braisa says, the Azarah cried out 4 cries: 1) "Let the sons of Eli leave" (referring to Chafni and Pinchas, for not treating the korbonos of certain women properly); 2) "Let Yissachar of Barkai leave" because he would wrap his hands in silk before doing the Avodah so that his hands wouldn't get dirty with blood; 3) "Open the gates to allow Yishmael ben Pi'achi to come in and serve as the Kohen Gadol"; 4) "Open the gates to allow Yochanan ben Narbai to come in and fill his stomach with the meat of kodashim".
 - They said of Yochanan ben Narbai, that he would eat 300 calves (he would invite many people to his meals), and drink 300 barrels of wine for his meal, and would then eat 40 se'ah of small birds for dessert. They said that in all his days there was never "nossar" in the Beis Hamikdash.
 - **Q:** How was Yissachar of Barkai punished? **A:** The king and queen had an argument – the king said that goat meat is the best and the queen said that sheep meat is better. They decided to ask Yissachar of Barkai, who, as the Kohen Gadol, would eat a lot of meat of the various korbanos. He came and waved (derogatorily) towards the king and said, if goat meat was better, it would be the preferred choice for the Korban Tamid! The king said, for waving dismissively at me, your right hand should be cut off. Yissachar of Barkai bribed the one who was to carry out the punishment, and had his left hand cut off instead. When the king heard of this, he had the right hand cut off as well. Upon hearing this story, **R' Yosef** praised Hashem for punishing Yissachar of Barkai on this world, rather than on the next world.
 - **R' Ashi** said, Yissachar of Barkai didn't even know Mishnayos, because **R' Shimon** clearly says in a Mishna that goats and sheep are equally as good for korbanos.
 - **Ravina** said, Yissachar of Barkai didn't even learn pesukim, because a pasuk teaches that they are equally as preferable to be brought for korbanos.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK MAKOM SHENAHAGU!!!

-----Daf 71-----58-----

PEREK TAMID NISHCHAT -- PEREK CHAMISHI

MISHNA

- Typically, the Korbon Tamid is slaughtered 8 ½ hours into the day (2 ½ hours after chatzos) and is offered on the Mizbe'ach 9 ½ hours into the day. On Erev Pesach (the Korbon Pesach must be brought after the Tamid, and a lot of time is needed for the Pesach) the Tamid is slaughtered 7 ½ hours into the day and offered on the Mizbe'ach 8 ½ hours into the day. This is true whether Erev Pesach falls on a weekday or on a Shabbos. However, when Erev Pesach falls on a Friday, the Tamid is slaughtered at 6 ½ hours into the day and offered at 7

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

½ hours into the day (additional time is needed to roast the Korbon Pesach after bringing it on the Mizbe'ach, because that roasting must be done before Shabbos begins).

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that the Tamid is typically slaughtered at 8 ½ hours into the day and offered at 9 ½ hours? **A:** **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, the pasuk says that the afternoon Tamid must be brought “bein ha'arbayim”, which teaches that the Tamid must be brought in the middle of the afternoon. Therefore, the Tamid, which takes an hour from slaughter to offering, is brought with 2 ½ hours of the afternoon before it begins and 2 ½ hours left after it is completed.
 - **Q:** **Rava** asked, our Mishna says that there are times when the Tamid is brought earlier. If we learn out the time from a pasuk, how can we ever bring it earlier!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, the pasuk teaches that the Tamid may be brought beginning from the time that the shadow starts casting to the east (1/2 hour after chatzos, which is 6 ½ hours into the day). However, because no korbon (besides a Pesach) may be brought after the Korbon Tamid, on a typical day we delay the Tamid until 8 ½ hours to allow for the bringing of personal korbanos. On a typical Erev Pesach, since the Pesach must be brought after the Tamid, we bring the Tamid an hour earlier, to give more time for all the Pesachim to be brought. When Erev Pesach is Friday, and we need time to roast the Pesach in addition to offering it, we bring the Tamid an additional hour earlier.
- A Braisa says: **R' Yishmael** says, the Tamid is brought on Shabbos as it is during the week. **R' Akiva** says, like it is brought on Erev Pesach.
 - **Abaye** explains, **R' Yishmael** is saying, the Tamid is brought on Erev Pesach that falls on Shabbos at the same time that it is brought when Erev Pesach falls on a weekday (i.e. at 7 ½ hours into the day). **R' Akiva** says that the Tamid is brought on Erev Pesach that falls on Shabbos at the same time that it is brought when Erev Pesach falls on a Friday (i.e. at 6 ½ hours into the day). According to this explanation, our Mishna follows **R' Yishmael**.
 - The machlokes between **R' Yishmael** and **R' Akiva** is as follows. Every Shabbos, the 2 spoons of “levonah” would be removed from the Shulchan and offered on the Mizbe'ach, after which the Lechem Hapanim of the previous week would be distributed to the Kohanim. **R' Yishmael** says that the levonah was offered after the Korbon Mussaf. Since the Mussaf had to be offered during the hour before chatzos, the levonah could not be offered until chatzos. The Tamid could therefore not be brought until an hour and a half after chatzos (or 7 ½ hours into the day). **R' Akiva** says that the levonah was brought before the Mussaf. Therefore, the Tamid could be brought at 6 ½ hours into the day.
 - **Q:** **Rava** asked, in the Braisa **R' Akiva** says it is brought “like it is brought on Erev Pesach”. He doesn't say anything about it being an Erev Pesach which is also Erev Shabbos!? **A:** **Rava** therefore explained the Braisa as follows. **R' Yishmael** says, when Erev Pesach falls on Shabbos, the Tamid is brought as it is on all other days of the year (at 8 ½ hours). **R' Akiva** says, when Erev Pesach falls on Shabbos, the Tamid is brought as it is on all other Erev Pesach (at 7 ½ hours). According to this explanation, our Mishna follows **R' Akiva**.
 - The machlokes between **R' Yishmael** and **R' Akiva** can be explained as follows. **R' Yishmael** is concerned, that since the meat cannot be roasted until after Shabbos, if we slaughter it at 7 ½ hours into the day, the meat may spoil. **R' Akiva** is not concerned for spoilage.
 - **Q:** If **R' Akiva** is not concerned for spoilage, why not bring the Tamid at 6 ½ hours and begin the Pesach after that!? **A:** He holds that the levonah is brought after the Mussaf, and the Tamid therefore cannot be brought before 7 ½ hours.
 - **Q:** **Rabbah bar Ullah** asked, in the Braisa **R' Yishmael** seems to be discussing a regular Shabbos. He doesn't say anything about Shabbos that is Erev Pesach!? **A:** **Rabbah bar Ullah** therefore said, the machlokes in the Braisa is regarding the Tamid brought on a regular Shabbos. **R' Yishmael** says it is brought as on a typical weekday, at 8 ½ hours. **R' Akiva** says it is brought as

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

on a typical Erev Pesach, at 7 ½ hours (since personal korbanos can't be brought on Shabbos there is no reason to delay the Tamid). Our Mishna, which discusses Shabbos which is also Erev Pesach, can follow both views.

- The machlokes between **R' Yishmael** and **R' Akiva** can be explained as follows. **R' Yishmael** says that we keep the Tamid at 8 ½ hours on Shabbos even though the reason to delay the bringing of the Tamid to that time does not apply (personal korbanos may not be brought), so as not to confuse the time the Tamid is brought every day. **R' Akiva** is not concerned for confusion, and therefore says that on Shabbos, when the delay is not needed, it should be brought at 7 ½ hours.
 - **Q:** If so, why is it not brought at 6 ½ hours!? **A:** He holds that the levonah is brought after the Mussaf, and the Tamid therefore cannot be brought before 7 ½ hours.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says: the Tamid is typically brought at 8 ½ hours. On Erev Pesach it is brought at 7 ½ hours. When Erev Pesach is Shabbos, **R' Yishmael** says it is brought as on a Monday. Presumably this means that it is brought as on another Erev Pesach, at 7 ½ hours. This is correct according to **Abaye's** explanation, but not according to **Rava!**? **A:** **Rava** will say, **R' Yishmael** means that the Tamid on Erev Pesach that falls on a Shabbos is brought as a *regular* Monday – at 8 ½ hours into the day.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, when Erev Pesach falls on a Shabbos, **R' Yishmael** says the Tamid is brought as it is during the rest of the year (at 8 ½ hours). This doesn't fit according to **Abaye's** explanation!? **A:** **Abaye** will say, the Braisa means, it is brought as it is on *Erev Pesach of the rest of the years* – at 7 ½ hours.
- A Braisa explains, a pasuk teaches that no korbon may be brought before the morning Tamid. The pasuk says "V'arach alehah Ha'olah", "the" first olah (the morning Tamid) should be the first thing placed on the wood of the Mizbe'ach. Also, nothing may be brought after the afternoon Tamid. The pasuk says "v'hiktir alehah chelvei hashlamim" (the shelamim should be brought on top of the morning Tamid). **Abaye** says, this teaches that on the *morning* Tamid the shelamim can be offered, but not on the afternoon Tamid. **Rava** says, that may mean that only a shelamim can't be brought later. The pasuk therefore says "Hashlamim" which we darshen to mean "hashleim" – complete – the afternoon Tamid completes all korbanos of the day.

-----Daf 59-----

- A Braisa says, the Tamid is brought before the Korbon Pesach, the Pesach is brought before the Ketores, and the Ketores is brought before the lighting of the Menorah. The Tamid is brought before the Pesach, because regarding the Pesach the pasuk says "b'erev" and "bein ha'arbayim", and regarding the Tamid the pasuk only says "bein ha'arbayim".
 - **Q:** For this reason, the Ketores should be brought and the Menorah should be lit before the Pesach as well!? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk says that the Kohen should arrange "it" (the Menorah) from evening until morning, which teaches that nothing else can be done after the Menorah in the evening. Through a hekesh to Ketores, we are taught that the same halacha applies regarding Ketores. Therefore, the Pesach must precede the Ketores and the lighting of the Menorah.
 - There is a Braisa that says that the Pesach is brought after the Ketores and the lighting of the Menorah because regarding the Pesach the pasuk says "b'erev" and "bein ha'arbayim", and regarding the Menorah and Ketores the pasuk only says "bein ha'arbayim".
- A Braisa says, the morning Ketores is brought before the morning Tamid, because regarding the morning Ketores the pasuk says "baboker, baboker", and regarding the morning Tamid the pasuk only says "baboker" once. Also, nothing is brought after the afternoon Tamid except the Ketores, the lighting of the Menorah, the Korbon Pesach, and the korbon of one who must bring a korbon to allow him to eat kodashim (a "mechusar kipurim") which falls on Erev Pesach. **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yochanan ben Broka** says, a michusar kipurim may bring his korbon after the Tamid any day of the year.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** According to the T”K, it makes sense that the korbbon of the michusar kipurim may be brought after the Tamid on Erev Pesach, because bringing a korbbon after the Tamid violates a simple positive commandment, but it allows him to eat the Pesach, which is a positive commandment that carries the kares penalty. However, according to **R’ Yishmael the son of R’ Yochanan ben Broka**, why should he be allowed to violate the “asei” just to allow him to eat regular kodashim which is also only a simple “asei”!? **A: Ravina in the name of R’ Chisda** said, we are discussing the bringing of a bird chatas, of which only the blood (not the intestines or the meat) goes on the Mizbe’ach, which is not considered problematic to be brought after the Tamid. **A2: R’ Pappa** said, we may even be talking about bringing an animal, but he leaves it on top of the Mizbe’ach and burns it the next morning. In that way it does not become passul (because it is on top of the Mizbe’ach), and it is not problematic with regard to the afternoon Tamid (because it is not being burned until the morning).
 - **Q:** A metzora who is a michusar kipurim must bring an asham as well. According to **R’ Pappa**, he can do the same thing as he does to the chatas (leave it overnight on the Mizbe’ach). However, since the asham is not a bird, how would **R’ Chisda** deal with it!? **A:** The Braisa is discussing where the asham was brought before the afternoon Tamid was brought.
 - **Q:** What about the olah that must be brought as well? It can’t be that the olah was brought before the Tamid, because a Braisa says that the olah cannot be brought before the chatas!? **A: Rava** said, the olah of a metzora is an exception to this general rule and may be brought before the chatas, in which case the Braisa is discussing a case where the olah was brought before the Tamid.
 - **Q: R’ Shamen bar Abba** asked **R’ Pappa**, how can we leave the korbbon on top of the Mizbe’ach overnight? The Kohanim will think it belongs to a korbbon that was offered that day and will burn it that night!? **A:** Kohanim are careful and will be sure to avoid that mistake.
 - **Q:** If the korbbon is not offered until the morning, the Kohanim cannot eat the chatas until then, and we have learned that the one bringing the korbbon gets his atonement when the Kohanim eat the korbbon (which won’t be until the morning, so what has been gained by bringing the chatas to the top of the Mizbe’ach)!? **A:** Since it is not possible to offer the chatas at this time, we treat it as if it is a korbbon whose intestines were lost or became tamei, in which case the Kohanim may eat the korbbon although it has not been offered. Here too, the Kohanim will be allowed to eat the korbbon.
- **R’ Kahana** asked, one pasuk says that fats of a korbbon may be burned throughout the night. Another pasuk says the fats must be burned before the afternoon Tamid!? He answered, as long as the blood of the korbbon was offered on the Mizbe’ach before the afternoon Tamid, the remaining fats may be burned on the Mizbe’ach even at night.
- **R’ Safra** asked, one pasuk says that the Korbbon Pesach may be burned on the Mizbe’ach all night. However, another pasuk says that a weekday korbbon may not be burned on Yom Tov, so how can the Pesach, which is brought on Erev Pesach, be burned at night, which is already Yom Tov!? **A: Rava** answered, the pasuk refers to Erev Pesach that was on Shabbos. In that case it may be burned all night, because a korbbon of Shabbos may be burned on Yom Tov.

-----Daf 60-----

MISHNA

- If a Korbbon Pesach was slaughtered not for its own sake (e.g. it was slaughtered with intent for a Shelamim), or the remaining avodos (catching the blood, walking the blood to the Mizbe’ach, or throwing the blood onto the Mizbe’ach) were not done for the sake of a Pesach; or, if he began with intent for a Pesach but then changed his intent to be not for the sake of a Pesach; or, if he began with intent not for the sake of a Pesach and then changed his intent to be for the sake of a Pesach; in all these cases the Pesach is passul.
 - The case of “intending for the sake of the Pesach and then changing the intent to be not for the sake of a Pesach” would be if he began with intent for a Pesach and then had intent for a Shelamim. The case of

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

“intending not for the sake of the Pesach and then changing the intent to be for the sake of a Pesach” would be if he began with intent for a Shelamim and then had intent for the Pesach.

GEMARA

- **Q: R' Pappa** asked, is the Mishna discussing where one had proper and improper intent during one avodah, in which case the Mishna would have to follow **R' Yose** who says that when a person says 2 opposing ideas in one statement for one action (like here where has 2 intents for the one avodah), both ideas are given weight and effect, and therefore, even though he intended for the Pesach, since he also intended for a Shelamim, the Pesach is passul (however, according to **R' Meir** we only follow the first idea, or intent, and therefore the Pesach in this case should be kosher), or is the Mishna discussing where these 2 intents were each had at a separate avodah, in which case even **R' Meir** would agree that the Pesach is passul? [The Gemara says that the question is regarding the case where he first intends for a Pesach and then intends for a Shelamim, because in the reverse case, **R' Meir** and **R' Yose** would agree that the Pesach is passul].
 - **A:** Our Mishna began by saying, if all of the avodos are done not for the sake of a Pesach, it is passul. There seems to be no reason for this case, because we said that if any one of the avodos are done with this intent, it is passul. Rather, the Mishna must be understood as saying if any of the avodos are done not for the sake of a Pesach, even if the first 3 avodos were done for its sake and the last avodah was done for the sake of a Shelamim, it is passul. We see from here that this part of the Mishna is clearly discussing the intent of 2 separate avodos. If so, the next part of the Mishna, which discusses beginning with one intent and switching to another intent must be discussing where it was done regarding one avodah (and it follows **R' Yose**), because if done regarding 2 avodos, this part of the Mishna would be the exact same as the beginning of the Mishna!
 - It could be that this second part of the Mishna discusses the intent of 2 separate avodos as well. However, the beginning of the Mishna discusses where he intends regarding the avodah that he is in the midst of performing. The end of the Mishna is discussing where he intends regarding a later avodah while he is performing an earlier avodah, and the Mishna teaches that such intent makes the Pesach passul as well. This would answer the question of **R' Pappa** in Mesechta Zevachim, where he asks whether an invalid intention had during one avodah regarding another avodah makes the korban passul.
 - **A:** The end of the Mishna says, if there is intent not for the sake of the Pesach, and then there is intent for the sake of the Pesach, it is passul. If this is referring to intents at 2 separate avodos, the Mishna already said it is passul even if the first avodah has intent for a Pesach and the second avodah has intent not for the Pesach, so surely when the first avodah had intent not for the Pesach it will be passul!? Rather, we must say that this part of the Mishna is talking about the 2 intents during one avodah. If so, the entire Mishna must be talking about multiple intents during one avodah, and the Mishna is following **R' Yose**.
 - It could be that the Mishna is discussing where the intents took place during separate avodos. The reason why the Mishna states the seemingly unnecessary second case is just for the sake of completeness.
 - **A:** The next Mishna says, an intent to shecht the Pesach for people who can't eat a kezayis of it, or are not able to join this Pesach for any other reason, makes the Pesach passul. This is clearly discussing the intent during one avodah. If so, our Mishna must also be discussing intent during one avodah.
 - It could be that our Mishna is discussing two avodos and the next Mishna is discussing one. There is no reason to assume that they must be discussing the same case.
 - **A:** The next Mishna says, if he has in mind during the shechita for people who could eat a kezayis and for people who cannot, it is valid. This is clearly discussing whether both intents were during one avodah (i.e. the shechita) or whether it was during 2 separate avodos. Therefore, our Mishna must also be discussing even a case where the intents were had during one avodah.
 - It could be that our Mishna is discussing two avodos and the next Mishna is discussing one. There is no reason to assume that they must be discussing the same case.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** If an animal is designated as a Korbon Pesach during the rest of the year, and then shechted with intent for a Shelamim, it is kosher as a Shelamim. If it is shechted with intent for a Pesach, it is passul. What would be the halacha if it was shechted with intent for a Pesach and then with intent for a Shelamim? Would **R' Yose** say that we follow the second intent and deem it kosher? **A: R' Dimi** said, just like on Erev Pesach, if he had in mind for a Shelamim and then for a Pesach it would be passul as a Pesach, similarly, during the rest of the year, if he has in mind for a Pesach and then a Shelamim, it is passul as a Shelamim.
 - **R' Yirmiya** said to **R' Dimi**, it could be that intent for a Pesach during the rest of the year is a weaker invalidation, because the same intent on this same animal on Erev Pesach will make the Pesach kosher!
 - **Rava** said, if the animal designated as a Pesach is shechted during the rest of the year with intent for a Pesach and then with intent for a Shelamim, it will be kosher, for the following reason. If there was only intent for Shelamim it would clearly be kosher even though the designation was for a Pesach. We see that the Shelamim intent removes the invalidation of the designation. If so, the Shelamim intent can also remove the Pesach intent.
 - **Q: R' Ada bar Ahava** asked **Rava**, maybe a stated intent is different than a presumed intent based on a designation, and therefore the Shelamim intent can remove the presumed intent of the designation, but not the stated intent of the Pesach during the shechita!? We see this concept that although a Pesach is presumably intended for people who can eat it, a stated intention to the contrary makes it passul. Yet, if there is a stated intent to bring it for some who can eat it and some who cannot it is kosher. We see that a stated intent is stronger than a presumed one!? **A: Rava** said, presumption of the intent as a Pesach based on its designation is very strong, because without a specific intent to the contrary, it will remain as a Pesach. Yet, an intent for a Shelamim breaks that intent, which is why the intent as a Shelamim may be able to break a stated intent as well. The presumption to shecht for those who can eat it is not that strong, because it is common for people to leave the group and join the group of a Korbon Pesach at any time up to the shechita. Therefore, any presumption as to who it is being shechted for is a weak one.
- **Q:** If an animal designated as a Pesach is shechted at any other time during the year, with the intention to shecht it for someone who is not the owner of the animal, does this make it a kosher korbon just like the intent for a Shelamim made it a kosher korbon? **A: R' Pappa** said, I told **Rava** that just like intent for another korbon makes it passul on Erev Pesach, but makes it kosher the rest of the year, so too an intent for the wrong owners, which would make it passul on Erev Pesach, will make it kosher the rest of the year. **Rava** said to **R' Pappa**, it could be that only intent for a different korbon is strong enough to do that because: it is an invalidation in the animal itself, it applies during all 4 avodos, it applies even after the death of the owners, and applies to communal korbonos as well. However, intent for the wrong owners, which doesn't apply in these 4 instances, may not be strong enough of an intent to make the korbon kosher during the rest of the year. Therefore, **Rava** said, that intent for the wrong owners makes the Pesach passul even during the rest of the year.

-----Daf נ"ו-----61-----

MISHNA

- If one shechted a Pesach intending for people who can't eat it (e.g. old or sick), for people who were not part of the group, for people who did not have a bris, or for people who were tamei, the Pesach is passul. If he shechted it intending for people who can eat it *and* for people who can't, for people part of the group *and* for people not part of the group, for people with a bris *and* for people without a bris, for tamei people *and* for people who are tahor, it is valid.
- If a Pesach is shechted before chatzos it is passul, because the pasuk says "bein ha'arbayim". If a Pesach was shechted before the Korbon Tamid, the Pesach is valid, but the blood should not be placed on the Mizbe'ach until after the blood of the Tamid. If the Pesach blood was placed on the Mizbe'ach before the Tamid blood, the Pesach is nonetheless valid.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

GEMARA

- A Braisa explains, the pasuk says that the Pesach must be shechted “b’michsas nefashos” (according to the number of people). From here we are taught that a Pesach must be shechted for people who have been included in the group bringing it. The pasuk repeats and says “tachosu”, which teaches that shechting it for people not in the group bringing the Pesach actually makes the Pesach passul.
 - **Q:** How do we know that shechting for people who can’t eat a kezayis will make the Pesach passul? **A:** The pasuk says “ish l’fi achlo tachosu”, which makes a hekesh from the “eaters” to the ones who are part of the group, and teaches that they have the same halacha.
- If one shechts a Pesach to be eaten by people who have a bris, but has in mind that the “zrika” should also be for people who don’t have a bris: **R’ Chisda** says it is pasul (because there is an intent for the zrika to include people without a bris) and **Rabbah** says it is valid (as long as the shechita is for people with a bris, any intent during the zrika will not have an effect).
 - **Rabbah** brings a proof from a Braisa. The Braisa says, just like if one person of the group is tamei, he will not make the Pesach passul for the rest of the group, so too if there is partial intent to include one who doesn’t have a bris, it will not make the Pesach pasul for the rest of the group. Or, maybe we should say that just like having in mind to eat even a kezayis of a korbon beyond its proper time will make the entire korbon passul, maybe intending for even one person without a bris should likewise make the korbon passul!? The Braisa says, we will learn the din of intending for one without a bris from the din of including one who is tamei, since they only apply to Pesach (for all other korbanos a tamei person or one without a bris can make a shaliach to bring the korbon for him), and we will not learn it out from intending for beyond its proper time, which applies to all other korbanos as well. However, one may say that we should learn it out from intending for beyond its time, and should not learn it out from tumah, because tumah is different in that a Pesach is sometimes permitted to be brought by tamei people (when most of the Yidden are tamei)!? Therefore, the pasuk says the words “v’chol areil”, which teaches that the psul of not having a bris only makes the korbon passul when *all* the members of the group don’t have a bris. Now, we may say that the same psul should apply for the zrika was well. To prevent us from saying that, the pasuk says “zos”, which teaches that as long as the shechita was performed for people who have bris, the Pesach is kosher even if the zrika was intended only for people who don’t have a bris. The reason why zrika is treated leniently is because we find that the zrika does not have to be done with the intent for those who can eat the Pesach.
 - **R’ Chisda** said, the Braisa should be understood to be saying that a partial intent for those who don’t have a bris is only not problematic during the shechita. However, during the zrika, even a *partial* intent for those who don’t have a bris will be problematic. The word “zos” teaches that a partial intent like this is only not problematic for shechita, but for zrika it would be a problem. It seems right to be more machmir by zrika, because we find it is more stringent in that the din of “pigul” only applies for the zrika.
 - **Q: R’ Ashi** asked, this explanation of the machlokes is based on the assumption that “v’chol areil” teaches that it is only problematic if *all* the people don’t have a bris (“v’chol”). Maybe “v’chol” should be understood to mean “any”, and not “all”, in which case it would mean that if there is “anybody” without a bris it makes the Pesach pasul? To avoid this way of thinking, the pasuk says “zos”, which teaches that it is only problematic if *all* members of the group don’t have a bris. If the words of the pasuk are explained in this way, the psul would apply to shechita as well as zrika (there would be no words which would teach to differentiate between shechita and zrika)!? **A:** Rather, **R’ Ashi** said that **R’ Chisda** and **Rabbah** argue regarding the following pasuk. The pasuk says “v’nirtza lo l’chaper alav”. This teaches that the zrika of a korbon must be done for the person bringing the korbon. **Rabbah** says, it is only pasul if the person he has in mind for (in the place of the owner) is fit to have brought this korbon. Therefore, one without a bris, who cannot bring a korbon Pesach, will not make the Pesach passul if the zrika is intended for him. **R’ Chisda** says, “since” this person could bring a Pesach if he were to give himself a bris, if the zrika is done with him in mind, he makes the Pesach passul even now.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** We find that **Rabbah** does say the concept of “since” regarding cooking on Yom Tov (it is permitted even late in the day on Yom Tov “since” guests may come) and **R’ Chisda** does *not* say the concept of “since”!? **A:** **Rabbah** does not say “since” here, because there is an action that must be taken (he must give himself a bris). Regarding Yom Tov, no action need be taken and therefore he does say “since”. **R’ Chisda** says the concept of since only when it leads to a chumra (like over here), but not when it leads to a kula (like on Yom Tov).

-----Daf 62-----

- **Q:** A Braisa quoted earlier said that we compare the having included one without a bris to having included one who is tamei. Just like the one tamei person doesn’t make the Pesach pasul for everyone else, so too the inclusion of one who doesn’t have a bris does not make the Pesach pasul for the others. If we are referring to the case where some of the people in the group were tamei, the way we know that it doesn’t make the Pesach pasul is from our Mishna. If so, the din that people without a bris in the group don’t make the Pesach pasul should also be learned from our Mishna, so why must it be learned from the case of tumah!? **A:** We are referring to tumah of the meat of the Pesach. If one limb becomes tamei it does not make the entire Pesach pasul. From there we learn out that if people without a bris are included, they too do not make the Pesach passul.
 - **Q:** The Braisa then said that we learn it out from tumah as opposed to learning from an intention “beyond its time”, because tumah only applies to Pesach and “beyond its time” applies to all korbanos. If we are referring to the tumah of the meat of the Pesach, such tumah applies to all korbanos as well!? **A:** The first part of the Braisa refers to tumah of the meat, but this next part of the Braisa refers to tumah of the people, and they are both considered one concept – the concept of tumah. **A2:** The din of tumah of the meat is different in how it is applied to Pesach than to all other korbanos. With regard to all other korbanos, if the meat and fats became tamei, but there is even just a kezayis of meat or fats that are still tahor, the korbon is kosher and the blood may be offered on the Mizbe’ach. Regarding Pesach, the blood may only be offered if there is a kezayis of meat that is still tahor. In this way, this halacha of tumah only applies to Pesach.
 - **Q:** How can the Braisa be said to be talking about tumah of the meat? The Braisa later said that we should not learn out from tumah, because there are times when the Pesach may be brought b’tumah. The only type of tumah that is overridden for the Pesach is when the people are tamei, not the meat!? **A:** The first part of the Braisa refers to tumah of the meat, but this next part of the Braisa refers to tumah of the people, and they are both considered one concept – the concept of tumah. **A2:** In a case when the Pesach is brought by tamei people, although they make the meat tamei by touching it, they are allowed to eat it (because a Pesach is only brought for the purpose of eating it). Therefore such tumah is at times overridden for the Pesach as well.
- **Q: R’ Huna the son of R’ Yehoshua** asked, a Braisa says, if an animal designated as a Pesach is now older than a year (which is pasul to be used for a Pesach, and therefore gets the din of a Shelamim), but is nonetheless shechted as a Pesach on Erev Pesach, or an animal designated as any other type of korbon which is shechted as a Pesach on Erev Pesach, **R’ Eliezer** says it is a pasul korbon and **R’ Yehoshua** says it is a kosher korbon (not as a Pesach, but as the other korbon). Now, **R’ Eliezer** says it is passul only because it is being offered on Erev Pesach, but if offered as a Pesach during any other time of the year, it would be kosher. According to **R’ Chisda**, who as we explained earlier says “since” when it leads to a chumra, he should say “since” it is passul if offered on Erev Pesach it should be passul at any other time as well!? **A: R’ Pappa** said, the pasuk says “zevach Pesach hu”, which teaches that on Erev Pesach such intent would make the korbon passul, but not during the rest of the year.
- **Q: R’ Simlai** asked **R’ Yochanan**, why is it that if one intends for the sake of the Korbon Pesach and then intends not for the sake of the Pesach, the Pesach is passul, yet if one has in mind for people who can eat the Pesach and for people who can’t eat the Pesach, the Pesach remains kosher? **A: R’ Yochanan** answered, not having in mind for the Pesach is: a psul in the animal; is a psul that does not have an identifiably pasul piece; applies

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

during all 4 avodos; and applies to communal as well as personal kobanos. In that way it is more stringent than the psul of intending for people who cannot eat the Pesach.