



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

Pesachim Daf Ayin Gimmel

SHACHTO SHELO L'OCHLAV

- **Q:** It is obvious that this would be a passul Korbon Pesach, and he would therefore be chayuv for bringing it on Shabbos!? **A:** Since the next part of the Mishna says, if he brought it for people who can and people who cannot eat the Pesach he is patur, we say this obvious halacha in the beginning of the Mishna as well.
 - **Q:** The next part of the Mishna is also obvious! Since it is a valid Pesach, he will not be chayuv for bringing it on Shabbos!? **A:** Since the Mishna first gives the case of a Pesach shechted not for its sake, it also gives the case of shechting it for people who can't eat it (although this case is obvious).
 - **Q:** Why does the Mishna need to say the case of the Pesach brought not for its sake? **A:** To teach the machlokes between **R' Eliezer** and **R' Yehoshua**.
- **Q: R' Huna bar Chininah** said to his son, when you go to **R' Zerika**, ask him, according to the shita who holds that one who acts destructively by making a wound (e.g. not for a kosher shechita, or not for its blood) is patur, why is one who shechts the Pesach for people who can't eat it chayuv? The Pesach is passul and the wound he made has not accomplished anything and should therefore not make him chayuv!? **A:** The shechita accomplished that if the pieces of the korbon are brought onto the Mizbe'ach (although they should not be so brought), they will not be taken down (and will be burned on the Mizbe'ach). Therefore he has accomplished something and is chayuv.
 - **Q:** Why is he chayuv if he shechts the animal and then finds it to have a mum? His shechita has not accomplished anything!? **A:** He has accomplished that a mum of cataracts (according to **R' Akiva**) will not be taken off the Mizbe'ach if it is brought up.
 - **Q:** The Mishna says if he shechts it and finds it to be a treifah in a hidden way, he is patur. It is mashma that if it is an external treifah he would be chayuv. Why is he chayuv? He has not accomplished anything!? **A:** The shechita accomplishes that the animal is not a neveilah.
 - **Q: Ravina** asked, a Braisa says, one who shechts a chatas, outside the Azarah, on Shabbos, for avodah zarah is chayuv 3 chataos. What has he accomplished? **A: R' Avira** said, he has accomplished removing the animal from the status of "eiver min hachai".

SHACHTO V'NODA...

- **R' Huna said in the name of Rav**, if an Asham had been resigned to grazing until it gets a mum (which is what happens when, for example, its owners brought another Asham in its place, or the owners died), and a person takes the animal and shechts it without a specific intention, it is valid as an Olah.
 - **Q:** It must be that **Rav** holds that a korbon's designation can be changed without a specific intent to uproot it (because he shechted it without a specific intent). If so, why does **Rav** say his din only once the asham has been resigned to grazing? As soon as the asham is not needed (e.g. because its owners died) it should be valid if brought for an olah right then!? **A:** It is a gezeirah to wait until then so that people don't take an asham that will be used as an asham and bring it for an olah. We see this to be true from a Mishna that says that the asham whose owners have died or used another asham should be let to graze, and when it gets a mum it should be sold and the proceeds are to be used for an olah. The Mishna is mashma that the animal itself should not be used as an olah, only the money from its sale. We see that a gezeirah was instituted so that

people would not bring the animal for an olah when it still may be used as an asham by the owners (e.g. when they didn't die or use another animal for their asham).

- **Q: R' Chisda** asked, the Mishna said, if one shechted the Pesach and then found out that the owners had given up their ownership in the animal (making it ownerless) he is patur. A Braisa says, if this were to happen on a weekday, the animal must be immediately burned (which is what must be done to a korbon with an internal invalidity). If we say that a korbon's designation can only be changed by specifically uprooting it, that is why this korbon, even after there are no longer any owners, is considered to be a Pesach, and a Pesach brought without owners is internally passul. However, if we say like **Rav**, that a korbon's designation changes on its own when circumstances change, when the owners removed themselves from the animal it automatically becomes a Shelamim, (which does not become passul when it has no owners) which would be passul only because it was brought after the Tamid. Since it is passul because of an external factor, it would not be immediately burned, but would rather be left overnight and burned in the morning!? **A: Rav** must have said that if the Asham was specifically shechted with intent that it be an Olah, it is a valid Olah. Specific intent *is needed* to uproot the designation.
 - **Q:** We have said earlier that **R' Chiya bar Gamda** said, that a specific uprooting is only needed in a case when the animal was going to be used as a Korbon Pesach for Pesach Sheini. However, in general no specific uprooting is necessary. How will he explain the above Braisa that says uprooting is necessary!? **A: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** said, the reason the Braisa said the korbon must be immediately burned was not because it was considered an ownerless Pesach. It is because the case was where it was designated before chatzos, and became ownerless after chatzos. It was therefore considered to be fit as a Pesach and then unfit, in which case it can no longer become fit again.
 - **Q: Rav** says that a live animal that was fit and then became unfit *can* become fit again!? **A: R' Pappa** said, the Braisa follows **R' Eliezer** who says that another korbon brought for the sake of a Pesach is passul. Therefore, although the ownerless Pesach automatically becomes a Shelamim, since it is brought as a Pesach, it becomes passul (and is considered to have an internal psul) and must be immediately burned.
 - **Q: R' Eliezer** would say one should be chayuv a chatas for bringing this on Shabbos (he holds that one who mistakenly does a melacha on Shabbos in the course of attempting to do a mitzvah is chayuv), but our Mishna says he is patur. So how can we say that the Braisa which is explaining our Mishna follows **R' Eliezer**!? **A: R' Yosef the son of R' Sala Chasida** said, the Braisa follows **R' Yosef ben Chonai**, who says that another korbon brought for the sake of a Pesach is passul (and would be immediately burned), but he could hold like **R' Yehoshua** that one who does so on Shabbos would be patur.
 - **R' Ashi** said, **Rav** follows the view of **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yochanan ben Broka**, who says that if there was time for the shochet to find out that the owners removed themselves from this animal or became tamei, the shochet is chayuv and the animal is left overnight and burned in the morning. Presumably it must be left for the morning because he holds that it automatically became a Shelamim and is therefore only an external invalidity!
 - **Q:** It could be that **R' Yishmael** says that even internal invalidities are left overnight. He must hold that way because he says that even if the owners become tamei it must be left overnight. In that case we have said that he certainly needs to

specifically uproot the designation! It must be that he holds that even internal invalidities are left overnight and there is no proof that he would agree with **Rav's** view!? **A:** We must say like we said above, that the Braisa follows the view of **R' Yosef ben Chonai**.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK EILU DEVARIM!!!