



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

Pesachim Daf Ayin Beis

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna said, if one shechts a Pesach on Shabbos, not for its own sake, he is chayuv a chatas. If the case is discussing where he mistakenly brought it not for its own sake (he thought the animal was designated as another korban), that would mean that our Mishna holds that changing an animal's designation by mistake is effective in changing its status (which is a machlokes elsewhere)!? We must therefore say that the Mishna is discussing where he purposefully brought the Pesach not for its own sake. However, that doesn't fit with the next part of the Mishna, because **R' Yehoshua** would not say that he is patur if he purposefully brought the Pesach for the sake of another korban!? This part of the Mishna must be discussing where he mistakenly brought it not for its own sake!? **A: R' Avin** said, the first case of the Mishna discusses where he did it purposefully and the later part of the Mishna discusses where he did it mistakenly.
 - **Q:** In the Mishna, **R' Eliezer** poses a question to **R' Yehoshua** by comparing the case of a Pesach brought not for its sake to a case of other korbanos brought not for their sake. However, based on **Ravin's** answer, the cases can't be compared, because one was discussing when it was done intentionally and one where it was done mistakenly!? **A: R' Eliezer** says, whether brought not for its sake intentionally or mistakenly, it (the shechita) is considered to be a mistake that was done in an attempt to do a mitzvah. Therefore, he can ask by comparing the 2 cases to each other.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Yehoshua**, who says there is a difference between intentionally and mistakenly bringing it not for its sake (only mistakenly doing so is considered to be making a mistake while attempting to do a mitzvah), he should answer **R' Eliezer** by saying that the cases can't be compared for this reason!? **A: R' Yehoshua** is saying, according to me, the cases can't be compared at all (for the reason just stated). However, according to you (**R' Eliezer**) who says that they can be, they shouldn't be compared for another reason, because the Pesach was brought for the sake of something that may not be brought on Shabbos, and the other korbanos are being brought for the sake of something that may be brought on Shabbos!
- In the Mishna, **R' Eliezer** asks, one may bring korbanos tzibbur on Shabbos, and yet if one brings other korbanos for the sake of the korbanos tzibbur, he is chayuv! **R' Yehoshua** responded, that is because there are a limited number of korbanos tzibbur that may be brought on any Shabbos. However, the number of Pesachim that may be brought on a Shabbos is unlimited, and therefore another korban brought for its sake will be patur.
 - **Q:** It seems that **R' Yehoshua** says when there are a limited number to be brought (so he should not have made the mistake) he will be chayuv. However, we find that **R' Yehoshua** says, if a mohel made a mistake and gave a bris on Shabbos to a baby who was born on Friday, instead of giving it to another baby who was born on Shabbos, he is patur. That is a case of a limited number, and yet **R' Yehoshua** says he is patur!? **A: R' Ami** said, the case with the baby is where he gave a bris to the Friday baby, and the Shabbos baby was still around, needing a bris. In that case, we say that when he gave the bris to the Friday baby, he is still preoccupied with having to give a bris to the Shabbos baby, and therefore he is patur. In our Mishna, the case is where he first shechted the korbanos tzibbur and only afterwards brought other korbanos for the sake of a korban tzibbur. In that case, he was no longer preoccupied with the mitzvah (because the mitzvah had already been done). Therefore he is chayuv.

- **Q:** This would mean that **R' Meir** argues and says that he is patur even when he brings the other korbanos *after* the korbanos tzibbur have already been brought. However, in a Braisa **R' Chiya of Avel Aruv said in the name of R' Meir** that all would agree that where the mohel gave a bris to the Shabbos baby first and then to the Friday baby, that he is chayuv, because the true mitzvah was already done. They only argue when he gave a bris to a Sunday baby before the Shabbos baby!? **A:** The **Yeshiva of R' Yannai** said, the first case of the Braisa is where he gave a bris to the Shabbos baby on Friday and gave a bris to the Friday baby on Shabbos. In that case, Shabbos had no right to be overridden (because the Shabbos baby already had a bris before Shabbos). In our Mishna, Shabbos was allowed to be overridden by the korbanos tzibbur, and therefore, he is patur when bringing the other korbanos.
 - **Q: R' Ashi** asked, in the case of the bris Shabbos also stands to be overridden for any other baby in the world whose 8th day fell out on that Shabbos!? **A: R' Kahana** answered, Shabbos was not allowed to be overridden by this particular mohel, and that's why he is chayuv.

U'SHAR KOL HAZVACHIM SHESHACHTAN LESHUM PESACH...

- The Mishna makes a difference between whether the animal is fit to be used as a Pesach or not. This follows **R' Shimon** in a Braisa. **R' Meir** argues with **R' Shimon** and says that in either case he is patur because he made a mistake while attempting to do a mitzvah.
 - **R' Bibi in the name of R' Elazar** said that **R' Meir** said he is patur even if he brought a calf (where it is very obvious that it can't be used as a Pesach) for the sake of a Pesach.
 - **Q: R' Zeira** asked, **R' Yochanan** said that **R' Meir** agrees that one who brings an animal with a "mum" as a Pesach on Shabbos will be chayuv. Why is that different than bringing a calf!? **A: R' Bibi** said, when he brings an animal with a "mum", he is not preoccupied with any mitzvah (because such an animal can never be brought as a korbon). When bringing a calf as a Pesach he is preoccupied, because the calf must be brought as a Shelamim.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, according to **R' Meir**, if he brings a chullin animal as a Pesach, will he be chayuv? **A: R' Nachman** said, he would be patur.
 - **Q:** Why is that different than bringing an animal with a "mum" in which case **R' Meir** agrees that he would be chayuv!? **A:** People can get confused between an animal of chullin and of kodesh, therefore he is patur (because he was trying to do a mitzvah). People don't get confused between an animal with a mum and one without a mum.
 - **Q:** The reason of **R' Meir** is because he is preoccupied with attempting to do a mitzvah, not because of confusion, like we see he says that one who brings a calf for a Pesach is patur even though there is no confusion in that case!? **A:** Confusion and preoccupation, each on its own, is enough of a reason for **R' Meir** to say he is patur. An animal with a mum, which has neither of these concepts, will make the one who brings it chayuv.
- **R' Zeira and R' Shmuel bar R' Yitzchak** said: **Reish Lakish** said, if one mistakenly eats nossar meat, thinking it was regular kodashim meat, he is chayuv. Although he was attempting to do a mitzvah (of eating kodashim), since there was no mitzvah actually done, he is chayuv. **R' Yochanan** said, if a person mistakenly lived with his wife while she was a niddah, he is chayuv, but one who mistakenly lives with his yevamah (the widow of his childless brother) while she is a niddah, is patur.
 - **Some explain** that **R' Yochanan** would agree with **Reish Lakish** in his case, because absolutely no mitzvah was done by eating nossar (whereas being with his wife is at least somewhat of a mitzvah). **Others explain** that **R' Yochanan** would say the person is patur in **Reish Lakish's** case. It is different than the case of the niddah, because in that case he should have asked his wife if she was a niddah. Since he didn't, he is chayuv. In the case of the meat, this concept doesn't apply.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Yochanan**, the reason he is patur in the case of the yevamah is because through living with her he performs the mitzvah of "yibum". Living with his wife

is also a mitzvah, and he should therefore be patur there as well!? **A:** The case being discussed is where his wife is pregnant, and therefore there is no mitzvah of “pru u’rvu”.

- **Q:** There is still the mitzvah of “onah” (the obligation for a person to live with his wife)!? **A:** The case discussed is where it is not one of the required times of “onah”.
- **Q:** **Rava** taught that being with one’s wife is a mitzvah even when not during the onah requirement!? **A:** It was at the time that the woman expected herself to become a niddah, at which time it is assur to live with her, and therefore is not a mitzvah at all.
 - **Q:** If so, why is he patur when it is his yevamah? **A:** He is embarrassed to ask her if she is a niddah, and is therefore patur. A man is not embarrassed to ask his wife, and therefore if he doesn’t, he is chayuv.
- **Q:** Who does **R’ Yochanan** follow when he says that the person is patur by the case of yevamah because he did a mitzvah?
 - It can’t be **R’ Yose** who says that one who carries a lulav into the reshus harabim on Shabbos on Succos is patur, because it could be that he is patur in that case because there is a time requirement with lulav (must be done by day) and that leads to nervousness, confusion and mistakes. With regard to a yevamah, that doesn’t have a time requirement, maybe he would not agree that he would be patur!?
 - It can’t be **R’ Yehoshua** of our Mishna who says one who brings another korban for the sake of a Pesach on Shabbos is patur, because there too there is a time requirement which makes errors understandable!?
 - It can’t be **R’ Yehoshua** where he says one who give a bris to the wrong baby on Shabbos is patur, because there too there is a time requirement which makes errors understandable!?
 - It can’t be **R’ Yehoshua** where he says that a Kohen who was eating Terumah and found out that he is passul to eat Terumah (his mother was a divorced woman who had married a Kohen) is patur from having to pay, because **R’ Bibi bar Abaye** said, that case discusses Terumah of chametz on Erev Pesach, which would mean that there too there is a time requirement which makes errors understandable!? Or, it could also be, the reason why he is patur there is because eating Terumah is referred to as “Avodah”, and **R’ Yehoshua** learns from a pasuk that a passul Kohen who mistakenly does the Avodah does not make that Avodah passul.
 - We find that **R’ Tarfon** referred to eating Terumah as “Avodah” based on a pasuk.