

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Piggul and nosar (cont.)

The Gemara explains that R' Huna and R' Chisda do not disagree. One is explaining the decree for piggul and the other is explaining the decree for nossar.

The reason one rules the minimum measure is the size of an olive and the other rules it is an egg is explained.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah records a dispute between R' Yishmael and R' Akiva concerning exempting oneself from the berachah on one korban with the berachah on another.

3) Explaining the dispute

The Gemara explains how the dispute between R' Yishmael and R' Akiva is related to their dispute regarding whether throwing the blood of a korban is the same as pouring the blood.

4) Shehecheyanu at a pidyon haben

R' Simlai was asked at a pidyon haben whether the father or the kohen makes the berachah of shehecheyanu.

R' Simlai inquired in the beis midrash and was told that the father recites the berachah.

The Gemara rules in accordance with this opinion. ■

הדרן עלך ערבי פסחים

וסליקא לה מסכת פסחים



REVIEW and Remember

1. According to the Gemara's conclusion, is there a dispute between R' Huna and R' Chisda?

2. Explain the dispute between R' Yishmael and R' Akiva in the Mishnah.

3. Explain the dispute between R' Yishmael and R' Akiva concerning blood applications.

4. Why would the kohen make shehecheyanu at a pidyon haben? Why would the father make the berachah?

Distinctive INSIGHT

The tum'ah of פיגול and the suspicious kohanim

מאן דתני אפיגול משום חשדי כהונה

Rashbam explains that the sages wanted to create a deterrent to prevent the kohanim from intentionally ruining an offering by intending to eat it beyond its proper time framework (פיגול). The kohen would then claim that he ruined the offering by accident. The sages instituted a penalty against a kohen who would do such a thing, and they declared such an animal to be tamei. The kohanim considered impurity to be a very serious condition, and this threat was enough to prevent them from intentionally causing an animal to be פיגול. If they ruined an offering, they would have to purify their hands before touching other offerings.

Rabeinu Chananel explains that the sages were not reacting to the possibility that a kohen would ruin someone's offering intentionally. Rather, if an animal which was already פיגול would be handled by a kohen, the other kohanim might suspect that the one moving it was planning to eat from it. This would place that kohen in a suspicious position among his fellow kohanim. Therefore, the sages imposed a penalty for touching an animal which was פיגול, and they declared that his hands would become tamei. In this way, no kohen would touch such an animal, and the kohen would thereby avoid all suspicion.

Ohr Sameach (שאר אבות הטומאה פ"ח ה"ג) explains that if a kohen would be involved in a case of פיגול, and he would want to conceal the mishap from the owner of the offering in order not to have to contend with the consequences, he might leave the offering unattended and have the situation deteriorate until the meat was left-over/נוטר which would then have to be destroyed anyway. The kohen would then explain to the owner that the meat had to be destroyed due to its being left beyond its time limit. Therefore, to prevent this misrepresentation, the sages declared that a פיגול animal causes tum'ah immediately. This would make it highly undesirable to have the meat stay around for an extended time until it became נוטר because the danger of spreading tum'ah was too risky. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
לעילוי נשמת גיטל רויזא בת ר' אברהם זאב הכהן
and
In honor of Shuie Greenspan - Mazal tov!!

HALACHAH Highlight

The money used in the redemption of the firstborn

The kohen should recite the blessing since benefit comes to his hand (the redemption money); or the father of the child should recite the blessing since he performs a mitzvah.... The halachah is that the father of the child recites two blessings.

It is clear from this Gemara that the blessing of shehecheyanu is recited because of the mitzvah performed and not because of any physical benefit gained. Nevertheless, in a situation where the father is grieving rather than rejoicing¹, the shehecheyanu is not recited. For example, if a child dies (God forbid) more than thirty days after birth, although the father is still obligated to perform the redemption with a blessing, he does not recite the blessing of shehecheyanu. The kohen also does not have to rejoice upon receiving the money, for the blessing is recited for the father and not for the benefit that the kohen receives². Based on this we can understand the opinion of the R' Yaakov Emden³ who writes that since kohanim nowadays cannot trace their lineage back to Aharon HaKohen, the kohen should return the money he receives, for fear that perhaps he is not really a kohen, in which case it may be thievery for him to take the money. Despite the fact that by returning it the kohen will not have joy, the father still fulfills his mitzvah, since the kohen's joy is not a necessary component of the mitz-

vah. Nonetheless, many poskim⁴ argue with R' Emden and hold that kohanim are assumed to be kosher even if they cannot trace their lineage back to Aharon. Furthermore, even if it turns out that he is not a kohen there is no question of theft concerning the money which the father gives him⁵ since the father willingly gives the money with the hope that he is a kohen. Therefore⁶, a kohen should not return the money for this will encourage people to redeem their sons with him rather than another kohen thus causing a loss to other kohanim. However, it is permitted for a kohen to return the money to a poor person. ■

1. רמ"א ביו"ד סי' ש"ה סי' ב. [משא"כ בשלושת השבועות מברך שהחיינו על פדיון הבן באו"ח סוף סימן תקנ"א]
2. כמבואר בגמ' כאן שהשהחיינו הוא של האב ולא של הכהן. וכן משמע מסתימת השו"ע ביו"ד ש"ה ס"ח במתנה ע"מ להחזיר דמהני. וליעב"ץ דלהלן צריך להחזירו ואע"פ שמתמא האב בירך שהחיינו. ודו"ק
3. בשו"ת היעב"ץ. ח"א סימן קנ"ה. והובא בפתחי תשובה שם ס"ק י"ב וכן בגליון מהרש"א שם, [וע"ע ביש"ש בב"ק פ"ה סימן ל"ה ובמהרי"ל שהובא במ"א בסימן תנ"ז וש"ף ביו"ד סימן קכ"ב] וע"ע בגליון מהרש"א ביו"ד סימן ש"ה בסעיף י"ח
4. כ"כ העה"ש שם סנ"ה. וכן ע"ש גליון מהרש"א הנ"ל, וע"ע ביד אפרין לעיל שם. [וכן נוהגים שמברכים ואין חוששים לחשש ברכה לבטלה. וכ"כ בשו"ת שבט הלוי ח"ב סוף סימן קע"ג שנוהגים להקל ודלא כיעב"ץ. [ושיש מחמירים להדר אחר כמה כהנים מה"ט. עכ"ל] וע"ע בדברי מרן הגר"ח קניבסקי בדרך אמונה בהלכות תרומות פ"ב ס"ק קל"ט, וע"ע בהלכה י"ד בבאה"ל בסעוד"ה מדליקין, ובפי"ב ס"ק ק"ה
5. כ"כ בגליון מהרש"א שם. וע"ע ש בפת"ש בשם החת"ס
6. שו"ע שם ס"ח ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The father, or the Kohen?

אבי הבן מברך שתים והילכתא אבי הבן מברך שתים

Rav Tzaddok HaKohen זת"ל brings a general principle and relates it to the end of our mesechta: the siyum of a tractate is always related to the conceptual root of the statement with which it began. Pesachim began with an allusion to the necessity of human input and effort, symbolized by the search for chometz in the home by the light of an actual candle. It ends with the pidyon ha'ben—an act that embodies acceptance that holiness descends from Above through the orchestration of

Divine Providence. How is this seen in the pidyon ha'ben? It is by the very fact that it was Providence that determined that the first-born has a special measure of kedushah, and that the kohen is Hashem's emissary to redeem it. So although we are duty-bound to make our efforts to "light the candle" of kedushah in this world, our success is dependent on the Will of Hashem alone.

Once, a great tzaddik asked the Rebbe of Kobrin, זת"ל, if he could spend Shabbos with him.

The Rebbe demurred, "Unfortunately, I really cannot agree to it. You see, Shabbos is pure unity, and between us there is a division. It would not suit the spirit of Shabbos for us to be together."

The other tzaddik was puzzled, for the two were very close. "Could you explain this?" he asked.

The Kobriner Rebbe answered, "When people come to you for advice, you use your great wisdom and insight to guide them. But their faith in Hashem is not strengthened until the matter they came about is well-settled in their favor."

His visitor agreed that this was, in fact, the case.

"As for myself," the Rebbe went on, "When someone comes with a problem I tell him straight out: 'If you don't believe that even a wisp of straw doesn't budge without Divine intervention, you have no business coming to ask me for help!'" ■

