

Daf Digest for this month is dedicated in memory of) אשר אנטשיל ע"ה (Babby Weiss) בת ר' and רבקה יענטא (Weiss) יוסף בן חיים הכהן

By the Weiss brothers—London, Staten Island, Yerushalayim

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the Mishnah (cont.)

The Gemara further develops its question as to whether the Mishnah refers to a case of two intents in one avodah or two avodos.

Four unsuccessful attempts are made to resolve the question and it is ultimately left unresolved.

2) Multiple intents when offering a korban

The Gemara asks: If one brings a Korban Pesach during the rest of the year with the intent for a Pesach and a Shelamim is it a valid korban?

R' Dimi suggested an answer but was refuted by R' Yirmiyah.

Rava argues that the korban is valid and his logic is unsuccessfully challenged.

3) Incorrect intent when offering a korban

The Gemara asks: If one brings a Korban Pesach during the rest of the year with intention for a change of owner, is it valid?

R' Pappa suggested an approach to resolve the question but he reports that Rava refuted his logic. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. Explain the dispute between R' Meir and R' Yosi regarding a person's speech.
2. What is the status of an animal designated as a Korban Pesach any day other than the fourteenth of Nissan?
3. When is the latest time to join a group for the Korban Pesach?
4. Explain: שינוי קודש and שינוי בעלים.

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by Dr. & Mrs. Justin Gordon
In memory of their father
ר' יחיאל בן ר' יהודה אביגדור, ע"ה*

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by Mr. and Mrs. Daveed Rine
In loving memory of their grandfather
הרב אהרן משה בן הרב דוד ז"ל—Rabbi Aaron M. Rine*

Distinctive INSIGHT

Why should שינוי בעלים be acceptable?

איבעיא להו פסח ששחטו בשאר ימות השנה בשינוי בעלים מהו? שינוי בעלים כשינוי קדש דמי ומכשיר ליה או לא

An animal designated for a Korban Pesach which is slaughtered throughout the year as a Pesach is thereby disqualified, because the only time such an offering is valid is during the day before Pesach (from midday until the evening). However, if this animal is slaughtered throughout the year having in mind for it to be a korban shelamim (a peace-offering), the שחיטה is valid. The question in our Gemara is what would the halachah be if the animal was slaughtered as a korban Pesach, but for owners other than the actual ones who were designated and signed up for it. Is this variation enough of a deviation from the Pesach intent, as we find regarding changing the type of korban, and the offering would be kosher, or is this still a Pesach being offered during the year, and it is therefore not kosher?

In his קובץ שיעורים, R' Elchonon Wasserman inquires about the question of the Gemara. When an animal intended as a Pesach is brought as a shelamim, the reason it is acceptable is because its designation as "Pesach" is uprooted, and the animal is now considered מותר פסח (extra or leftover Pesach), which is by definition a shelamim. However, simply slaughtering the animal without its owners in mind does not remove the Pesach designation. Being that it is not erev Pesach, how can we consider this offering to be kosher?

R' Elchonon answers that the Gemara must have had a different understanding of why שינוי קדש is generally kosher. It is not kosher simply because the title of the korban has been changed from Pesach to shelamim. Rather, it is because we find that שלא לשמו has the ability to undermine the validity of a korban Pesach on the 14th of Nisan. This shows us that a condition which undermines the Korban Pesach on the 14th can be effective throughout the year as well, and the korban Pesach which is brought as a shelamim is valid. Therefore, we might evaluate the שינוי בעלים in the same light. Just as having the wrong owners in mind on erev Pesach undermines the validity of the Korban, so too, all year long, slaughtering the animal with שינוי בעלים should be acceptable as a non-Pesach offering, and it should be a valid shelamim. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Having intent to perform a mitzvah

אמר רבא וכו' דהא סתמו לשמו קאי וכו'.

Rava said...Because status quo is for its sake...

The Aruch HaShulchan¹ asks, according to this, why do mitzvos² require specific intent— that one must intend to perform a mitzvah for the sake of Hashem³? Are mitzvahs more special than holy offerings? And yet we see that regarding korbanos, even simple performance without specific intent is considered like one had intent. Therefore, it would seem reasonable to assume that a mitzvah performed with no specific intent should also fulfill one's obligation. He answers that the reason why kodoshim are valid even without specific intent is that since the animal has already been sanctified it is prepared and waiting for more sanctification. The performance of a mitzvah, however, requires the action to be sanctified, and without the requisite intent the action alone is meaningless.

The Chayei Adam⁴ adds that when a mitzvah is performed and, based upon the surrounding context it is evident that the action is indeed for the sake of the mitzvah, one would be yotzai, **בדיעבד**, even without specific intent for the mitzvah's performance. The Mishna Berura⁵ concurs with this opinion.

(See footnote below) The populace generally relies upon this opinion. However, the Aruch HaShulchan does not agree.⁶ Ideally, all are of the opinion that prior to the performance of any mitzvah one should have specific intent to perform the mitzvah.⁷ ■

1. העה"ש באו"ח סימן אות ח' ועי"ש שדייק כן מרש"י בסוף פ"ד דזבחים.
2. כן פסק שו"ע שם ס"ד. ועי"ש במ"ב בריש ס"ק י' במחלוקת במצוה דרבנן אמנם באה"ל בסימן תע"ה ס"ד בד"ה לא יצ"א, מבואר שחושש שגם במצוה דרבנן לא יצא אם לא כיון.
3. המ"ב בסימן ס' ס"ק ז'.
4. חה"י"א בכלל ס"ח סעיף ט'.
5. המ"ב בסימן ס' ססק"י. אמנם בספרו שם עולם בשער ההתחזקות פ"ז כתב שבמצוות בהמ"ז ג"כ יש את הסוגיא דמצות צריכות כוונה. ואע"פ שמוכח שמצוה הוא. וכן משמע בבה"ל סימן ס"ד בסוד"ה וי"א, כתב שמצוה צריכות כוונה גם בטלית המיוחד למצוה, ואע"פ שדיבר ברוצה לברך, ואע"פ שה"ז מוכח. וגם בסימן תרכ"ה ססק"א כתב שאם לא כיון לטאת לא יטא י"ח. וכן כתב המ"ב בעוד מצות. וצ"ע.
6. העה"ש באו"ח תקפ"ט י"ד שפירש בירושלמי שרק יצא י"ח כששכח האם כיון, ודלא שפי' הבה"ל בסוף סימן ס' בירושלמי שיצא י"ח מפני שמוכח ודו"ק. וכן העה"ש בסימן ס' אות ח' הנ"ל מדויק דלא כח"א ואכמ"ל ואפשר שנחלקו בזה רש"י ותוס' בזבחים ב' ע"ב. וברש"י ושיטמ"ק בברכות י"ג א' משמע כעה"ש דע עוד ששע"ת סימן ס' ס"ק ט"ו כתב שמי שתמיד מכין ופ"א לא כיון אדעתא דתמיד עושה והוי ככיון.
7. כמפורש במ"ב סימן ס' ססק"י. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Bris of Pesach

שחטו שלא לאוכליו, ושלא למנויו, לערלים ולטמאים, פסול.

Only two positive mitzvos bear the penalty of kareis if they are neglected: the eating of the Korban Pesach and bris milah. The Sfes Emes explains that this punishment is a direct consequence. Since the Korban Pesach and the milah are the two main wellsprings of vitality within a person, anyone who cuts himself off from them remains detached from spiritual life – he suffers kareis. According to Rav Hirsch, ז"ל, the root of the word bris is “barah,” or the rejuvenation that comes from nourishment. Milah represents purity of the body, and its life-force is expressed when it serves as the channel for fresh

Jewish souls to come down to this world. Similarly, pure speech has the power to infuse us with new life and enthusiasm, or **המחדשות**.

Korban Pesach rectifies the bris halashon in a number of ways. It is the **פה שח**—the mouth opened to tell the story of the miracles of yetzias Mitzrayim the night it is offered, and the gateway through which it enters into the body is the same door through which words emerge. One cannot attain the spiritual renewal of the Korban Pesach until the body is purified, therefore any Korban Pesach slaughtered on behalf of **ערלים** alone is automatically disqualified—and this is just one sign of the greatness of bris milah.

The Brisker Rav, ז"ל, once served as sandek at the bris, that of a new member of the family, which was held in his home. Afterward, the mohel ap-

proached Rav Yitzchok Zev and exclaimed, “Boruch Hashem, we were privileged to make a bris. And what a bris!”

He meant to convey his joy in the Brisker Rav's presence, but Rav Soleveitchik gently upbraided him. “What is the sense of saying, ‘What a bris’?! What could be more momentous than the bris itself—over which thirteen covenants were sealed? You could compare this to a simple and desperately poor teacher who says, ‘If I had the wealth of Rothschild, I would be wealthier than him! How? Well, I would have all his money, plus what I make as a Rebbe!’ People would consider such a man a complete fool. The value of a bris is inestimable—how could one possibly add to its worth just because it happened to take place in the home of a melamed like the Brisker Rav?” ■

