

28.1.5

6a (לפרקליט שנכנס [ריצה פרקליט נכנס] דורון אחרי) 7b → (איבעיא להו כיפרו על מה שבאו או לא כיפרו)

1. **יִסְמַךְ** יָדוֹ עַל רֹאשׁ הָעֵלָה וְנִרְצָה לוֹ לְכַפֵּר עָלָיו: ויקרא א:ד  
 2. כִּי נֶפֶשׁ הַבֶּשֶׂר בְּדָם הוּא וְאֵינִי נֹתְתִיו לָכֶם עַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ לְכַפֵּר עַל נַפְשֵׁיכֶם כִּי הַדָּם הוּא בִּנְפֹשׁ יִכְפֹּר: ויקרא ז:יא  
 3. וְהוֹתֵר בְּשֶׁמֶן אֲשֶׁר עַל כַּף הַכֹּהֵן יִתֵּן עַל רֹאשׁ הַמִּטְהָר וְכִפֹּר עָלָיו הַכֹּהֵן לִפְנֵי ה': ויקרא יד:ח  
 4. וּבָשָׂר זָבַח תּוֹדַת שְׁלָמוֹ בַּיּוֹם קָרְבָּנוֹ יֵאָכֵל לֹא יִנִּיחַ מִמֶּנּוּ עַד בֶּקֶר: ויקרא ז:טו  
 5. יִסְמַךְ אֶת יָדוֹ עַל רֹאשׁ הַחֹטָאֹת וְשָׁחַט אֹתָהּ לְחֹטָאֹת בְּמָקוֹם אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁחַט אֶת הָעֵלָה: ויקרא ד:לג  
 6. וְאֵת כָּל חֲלָבָהּ יְסִיר כַּאֲשֶׁר יוֹסֵר חֲלֵב הַקֶּשֶׁב מִזֵּבַח הַשְּׁלָמִים וְהִקְטִיר הַכֹּהֵן אֹתָם הַמִּזְבֵּחַ עַל אֲשֵׁי ה' וְכִפֹּר עָלָיו הַכֹּהֵן עַל חֹטָאֹתָו אֲשֶׁר חָטָא וְנִסְלַח לוֹ: ויקרא ד:לה  
 7. מוֹצֵא שְׁפָתַיִךְ תִּשְׁמֹר וְעֲשִׂיתָ כַּאֲשֶׁר נִדְרַתְּ לֵה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ נִדְבָה אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ בְּפִיךָ: דברים מג:כד  
 8. זָבַח וְשָׁעִים תּוֹעֵבָה אִף כִּי בְזָמָה וְבִיאָנוּ: משלי כא:כו

- I Continued analysis of status of קרבן that was נזבח שלא לשמו but is yet offered
- a question: do they generate כפרה for the sin that occasioned the offering?
    - i answer (ר' ששת בריה דר' אילאי): stands to reason that they do not; else, why bring the 2<sup>nd</sup> one?
      - 1 challenge: in that case, why bring the 1<sup>st</sup> one?
      - 2 ר' אשי: what he was really asking was: if we accept the notion that the 1<sup>st</sup> is not מכפר, we understand why it's brought – generated by the proper designation לשמו; but if it is מכפר, why bring the 2<sup>nd</sup>?
  - b Question: does a קרבן achieve atonement for עשה מצוות squandered post-designation?
    - i Lemma1: similar to חטאת, which only expiates for sins committed pre-designation (and which occasioned it)
    - ii Lemma2: dissimilar; חטאת requires separate קרבן for each sin; since עולה covers many, perhaps הפרשה as well
      - 1 Proposed solution: חטאת ברייתא interpreting v. 1 – סמיכה cannot generate רצוי, that is what דם does (v. 2)
        - (a) Rather: means that if he disregarded סמיכה and omitted it, considered as if he wasn't מתכפר – but he was
          - (i) Proposed meaning: he was מתכפר מ"ע until הפרשה, but not his omission of סמיכה (post-הפרשה)
          - (ii) Challenge (רבא): he doesn't "omit" until שחיטה; post-שחיטה sins are not even under consideration
          - (iii) Suggestion to רבא: perhaps כיפר means "man has been [formally] cleansed", – לא כיפר – with God
            - 1. As per: יוחנן בן נורי application of v. 3 – he is formally complete, but לא כיפר – with God
            - 2. Rejection: there, too, he is complete with בהונות, מתן, but not the head (must refill oil and pour)
      - 2 Proposed solution: ר"ש poses the question (in re: כפרת שעירי חטאת as to purpose of 2 עצרת
        - (a) Since: first achieves כפרה for מקדש, 2<sup>nd</sup> comes for טומאה that occurred since offering of first
        - (b) Proving: that טומאה that took place post-designation is covered by this offering
          - (i) Rejection: if they were designated simultaneously, the question would be valid
            - 1. But: the circumstance is when they were designated in sequence – and 1<sup>st</sup> only cleanses for הפרשת ראשון טומאה that occurred before its designation; 2<sup>nd</sup> covers טומאה that occurred after ראשון
              - a. Challenge: why doesn't text tell us that they must (annually) be designated in sequence?
- (c) Block (ר' פ): no proof from קרבנות צבור, which are controlled by ב"ד תנאי
  - (i) Per: שמואל – all קרבנות צבור take on the identity as per the "knife's" discretion
  - (ii) Challenge: ר"ש doesn't accept the notion of ב"ד לב
    - 1. Proof: he holds (contra חכמים) that "leftover" תמידין cannot be redeemed תמימים
- (d) Further block: question asked of זירא ר' – if he took דם of עצרת in 2 כוסות and sprinkled 1<sup>st</sup> – what is purpose of sprinkling 2<sup>nd</sup>? Perhaps for טומאה that occurred between the דם and זריקות הדם
  - (i) Note: he only asked about טומאה after שחיטה, but obviously after הפרשה is included
  - (ii) Block (to this challenge): perhaps he was phrasing this as את"ל and both were asked → no resolution
- II תודה slaughtered לשם another man's תודה
- a דבה: valid – v. 4 → תודה is a subset of שלמים and not vice-versa → תודה לשם שלמים is invalid → but תודה לשם תודה is valid
    - i Doesn't this mean: even if it belongs to another
    - ii Rejection: perhaps it means תודה שלו, תודה לשם תודה
      - (a) Challenge: if so, should state תודה חברו לשם תודה and all the more so תודה לשם תודה
      - (b) Answer: כשר, per inverse לשם שלמים תודה לשם שלמים needed; countering possibility that תודה שלו is invalid – must be offered for his own חסדא

III Series of **מימרות** by רבא regarding לשמה:

- a **חטאת** slaughtered **חטאת** לשם **עולה** is valid; לשם **עולה** is invalid  
 i *Reason*: v. 5 demands that it be slaughtered לשם **חטאת**
- b **חטאת** slaughtered for another who is also **חטאת** – invalid; if **חטאת** – valid  
 i *Reason*: v. 6 identifies **חטאת** as **חטאת**, excluding **חטאת**  
 1 *But*: **חטאת** must be akin to him – **חטאת**
- c **חטאת**: slaughtered for someone who has no formal liability – invalid  
 i *Reason*: everyone has some liability for an **עשה**  
 1 *Explanation*: since he didn't designate an **עולה**, these sins are absolved via **חטאת**, considered "מחוייב **חטאת**"
- d **חטאת**: atones for **עשה** via **חטאת** reasoning  
 i *If*: it can atone for **חטאת**, certainly it can atone for **חטאת**  
 1 *Challenge*: does this mean that רבא considers the **חטאת** to be of a kind  
 (a) *But*: רבא taught that if offered for **חטאת** – valid  
 2 *Answer*: although there isn't full **חטאת** from the **עשה** without **חטאת**, partial **חטאת** is obtained
- e **חטאת**: that was slaughtered לשמה **חטאת** may not have **חטאת** sprinkled (or any other **חטאת**) done לשמה  
 i *Source*: may be text – v. 7, as presented above, or reasoning, as presented at the beginning of the **חטאת**
- f **חטאת**: brought posthumously  
 i **חטאת**: if **חטאת**, invalid; but **חטאת** – valid,  
 1 *Reason*: there are no **חטאת**  
 ii **חטאת**: there *are* **חטאת**  
 1 *Question* (**חטאת**): does he mean that the heirs are full **חטאת** and they are liable to bring a replacement  
 (a) *Or*: that they achieve some partial **חטאת**?  
 2 *Answer*: heirs are full **חטאת**
- g **חטאת**: is a gift  
 i *Case*: if the donor didn't yet do **חטאת** – invalid offering per v. 8  
 1 *But if*: he did **חטאת** – not needed; as **חטאת** alone fully cleanses (immediately) for **חטאת**  
 ii *Therefore*: must be a pure gift, not an expiation  
 iii *Support*: **חטאת** in which **חטאת** explains why **חטאת** (cleanses) precedes **חטאת** (tribute)