

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) MISHNAH (cont.)

2) Drawing inferences from the Mishnah

R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua draws three inferences from the Mishnah.

3) If someone designates a Korban Pesach and dies

A Baraisa is cited that discusses the procedure to follow when someone designates a Korban Pesach and dies.

The Gemara questions the ruling of the Baraisa.

Five different resolutions are presented to explain the Baraisa.

4) MISHNAH: The Mishnah discusses the consequence of the Korban Pesach becoming mixed-up with other korbanos.

5) Clarifying R' Shmion's position

After challenging R' Shimon's ruling the Gemara explains that R' Shimon maintains that one may bring a korban to a circumstance of invalidation.

The position of the Rabanan who disagree with R' Shimon, regarding a Korban Pesach mixed with a bechor, is explained.

6) MISHNAH: The Mishnah discusses what should be done if a group loses their Korban Pesach and one of the members of the group is sent to find the lost animal. The second half of the Mishnah discusses what should be done when the korban of different groups become mixed together.

7) A lost Korban Pesach

A Baraisa is cited that clarifies the laws of a lost Korban Pesach. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What three principles did R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua derive from the Mishnah?
2. What does the Gemara find difficult with the Baraisa that discusses the person who designated an animal as a Korban Pesach and then dies?
3. Explain: אין מביאין קדשים לבית הפסול.
4. What is the proper procedure to follow if one group mixed-up its Korban Pesach with the korban of another group?

Distinctive INSIGHT

An inherited Korban Pesach

ת"ר המפריש פסחו ומת אם בנו ממונה עמו יביאנו לשום פסח, אין בנו ממונה עמו יביאנו לשום שלמים

We learned in a Baraisa: If someone sets aside a Korban Pesach, and he dies, if the son is reserved with him, the son can bring it as a Pesach. If the son is not reserved with him, it should be brought as a Shelamim.

The commentators each deal with the obvious question of why the son, who inherits the assets of his father, cannot continue and fill the role of the father in this Korban Pesach even in the case in which he is not reserved.

Tosafos Ri"d explains that the rule is that although the son inherits the property of his father, he does not automatically become as his father in terms of the title and name associated with the korban. This Korban Pesach was reserved for Mr. Ploni, and his son who now owns it does not have the power to take his place and be "Mr. Ploni." This is also why a son who inherits a korban Chattas or Asham from his father cannot continue and bring these offerings, but the rule is that an animal for a Chattas whose owner died is put to death, and an animal designated for an Asham is left to graze until it develops a blemish.

If a son inherits an animal of his father which was designated for a Shelamim or Olah, it may even be offered. As stated above, these animals remain as the korban of the father. There is a classic מחלוקת found in Temura 2a, where Rabbi Yehuda holds that when the son brings these offerings of the father, he does not do סמיכה—leaning of the hands upon the animal's head with all one's weight. The offering is his father's, and Rabbi Yehuda holds that סמיכה is only done by the owner of the offering himself. Rabbanan argue, and based upon verses, they hold that סמיכה may be done, even by the son.

In our case, Rambam (Hilchos Korban Pesach 4:4) rules that the son should sell the portion in the Korban Pesach which his father owned, and with the cash he can go and buy a portion for himself in another Korban Pesach. This opinion is consistent with Rambam's general view that בעלי חיים אינם נדחים—live animals are not rejected. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

If a Mitzvah gets pushed off, will its performance ever be required?

שמע מינה דיחוי מעיקרא הוי דיחוי .

We learn from here that initial rejection is considered rejection.

Based on a Gemara in Sukah, Tosafos¹ points out an apparent contradiction. The Gemara there says that initial rejection is not considered a rejection. Tosafos answers that in regards to offering up the animal (our Gemara) it is considered rejection, whereas in regards to mitzvos it is not. Another answer² they offer is that in the case of Sukah, it is within the realm of possibility to fix, and therefore is not considered a "rejection." See below for more details.

In practice, there are those who say³ that in regards to mitzvos, initial rejection is not considered a rejection but something which began as an obligation and subsequently was rejected is questionable if it remains rejected. Based on this, the Pri Migadim⁴ is in doubt about the law of a chicken which is slaughtered with a pool of water beneath it (for example on a rainy day). In such a case, the blood immediately mixes with the water and no longer retains the appearance of blood. Therefore it does not have an obligation to be covered (for the mitzvah of covering the blood). If one were to subsequently slaughter more chickens in that same spot the water would eventually take on the appearance of blood and would require covering. The Pri Migadim is unsure if this case is considered an initial rejection, for when the blood originally fell it was immediately pushed off from

its obligation to be covered, and then when it later becomes blood one would cover it without a berachah. Or, is this perhaps considered an obligation from the outset and then something that was subsequently rejected. For when the blood originally falls from the neck of the animal it is really required to be covered and only when it subsequently mixes with the water is it then considered rejected. If this were so, it would be considered "obligated from the outset and subsequently rejected," requiring it to be covered (out of doubt) without a berachah. ■

1. כאן בתוד"ה שמע מינה

2. ומבואר מדבריהם, שלתירוצם הראשון אין נפ"מ בין אם בידו, ולתירוצם השני אין נ"מ בין מצוה להקרבה וברש"י (בד"ה שמע מינה) מבואר שפשיטא ליה שהדיחוי שבהקרבה שבסוגיין, דינו כדיחוי שבסוגיא בסוכה, ואע"פ ששם גם מצוה וגם בידו, ותירץ את קושית תוס', שהגמ' כאן רוצה להוכיח נגד המ"ד בסוכה שדיחוי מעיקרא אינו דיחוי. וב"י (באו"ח סוף תרמ"ו בד"ה וראיבי), כתב בדעת הרמב"ם ורא"ש, וז"ל דאע"ג דנראה ונדחה כל שבידו לא הוי דיחוי. עכ"ל. [וע"ע זבחים ל"ד ב' וכן עי"ש בפמ"ג במש"ז ס"ק ו' שסתם כן. ועוד כתב שם הפמ"ג וז"ל ודבר שבדיעבד כשר ולכתחלה פסול כשחזור להכשירו לכ"ע ל"ש נראה ונדחה וכשר הוא. עכ"ל אמנם עי"ש בדע"ת למהרשם בדעות בזה. ודע עוד שנחלקו הראשונים בדין דיחוי דקדשים לדינא. והט"ו באו"ח תרמ"ו ס"ק ו', ועה"ש שם סי"ג, כתבו דדיחוי מעיקרא גם בקדשים לא מקרי דיחוי. ובנראה ונדחה בקדשים הוי דיחוי

3. בפמ"ג ביור"ד סימן כ"ח במש"ז ס"ק ט' ובשם הפר"ת. ובעה"ש הנ"ל דעתו כט"ז שאין דיחוי אצל מצוות אפילו בנראה ונדחה. אמנם הגרע"א ופת"ש ביור"ד שם בסעיף י"א, ס"ל דהוא ספק. וכן עי"ש בד"ת וכה"ח. ועי' במ"א תקפ"ו סק"ו וע"ש במ"ב ובשעה"צ ס"ק ל"ג. וע"ע בפת"ש הנ"ל שהביא שיש חולקים על המ"א ואכמ"ל

4. יו"ד כ"ח, במ"ז ס"ק ט'. ועי"ש בכה"ח ודרכ"ת שלא יברך אא"כ היה דם שנפל בבת אחת כשיעור דמראת דם, ועע"ש ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Becoming one

חבורה שאבד פסחה ואמרו לאחד צא ובקש ושחוט עלינו...

The Mishnah discusses a chaburah that lost its Pesach; it asks someone to go and seek another and slaughter it for them. The Sifsei Tzaddik of Piltz, zt"l, explains that, in exile, we are all considered a "chaburah that has lost its Pesach," in need of the אחד, the One, Who will go and seek, or pray, on our behalf. For Hashem does "pray"—as we

find in the Gemara in Berachos 7a. The term "chaburah" alludes to our need to join together as one, or התחברות. By loving one another unconditionally and becoming a true chaburah, we will be worthy of bringing the Korban Pesach once again.

The Chassidim pushed and crowded around the tisch of their Rebbe, Rav Yitzchak of Vorki, zt"l, and many were crushed in the confusion.

The Rebbe spoke up: "Every single Yid is like a holy sefer! How can you push each other like this? You have to treat one another with respect, like you would treat a holy book! You should

not lean on your friend or push him!"

One of the Chassidim spoke up boldly: "But, Rebbe, doesn't the halachah permit stacking one sefer on top of another as long as it isn't Tanach?"

The Rebbe smiled and answered, "True. But each of you shouldn't see himself as a holy sefer at all—just his friend! If your fellow is like a sefer kodesh and you are nothing of the sort, how could you possibly push him and climb on top of him?"

How can we come to true love and unity? By seeing the holiness of other Jews, and not focusing on ourselves! ■