



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

Pesachim Daf Samach Aleph

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.

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 passul 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 as 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.
 - **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).