

28.1.8

9b (היא עצמה אין נעשה אלא על גופה של קרן) → 10b (איתמר שחטה לשמה לזרוק דמה שלא לשמה)

1. וְסִמֵּן יָדוֹ עַל רֹאשׁ הַשְּׁעִיר וְשָׁחַט אֹתוֹ בַּמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁחַט אֶת הָעֵלָּה לִפְנֵי ה' חֲטָאת הוּא: וְיִקְרָא ד:כד
2. וְאָמְרָתָם זָבַח פֶּסַח הוּא לֵה' אֲשֶׁר פֶּסַח עַל בְּתִי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמִצְרַיִם בְּגִנְפוֹ אֶת מִצְרַיִם וְאֵת בְּתִינּוֹ הִצִּיל וַיִּקְדֵּי הָעָם וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲווּ: שְׁמוֹת יב, כז
3. וְהִקְטִיר אֹתָם הִכְהֵן הַמִּזְבֵּחַ אֲשֶׁה לֵה' אֲשָׁם הוּא: וְיִקְרָא ז:ה
4. לֹא תֹאפֶה חֹמֶץ חֶלְקִים נִתְּתִי אֹתָהּ מֵאִשִּׁי קֹדֶשׁ קִדְשִׁים הוּא פֶּחָטָא וְכֹאֲשָׁם: וְיִקְרָא ו:י
5. הִכְהֵן הַמִּחְטָא אֹתָהּ יִאֲכֹלָהּ בַּמָּקוֹם קֹדֶשׁ תֹּאכֵל בְּחֶצֶר אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד: וְיִקְרָא ו:ט

- I Dispute שלא לשמה שחיטה with proper intent, but done to perform עבודה
- a ז"ל: invalid
- i Reasoning: we infer from פיגול that in general we attach מחשבה from 1 עבודה to another
- b ז"ל: valid
- i Reasoning: we do not infer from פיגול → we do not attach מחשבה from 1 עבודה to another
- c Tangential question: they have a parallel (hence, superfluous) dispute re: שחיטה in order to perform ע"ז for זרה
- i Justification: if we only had that dispute, א"ס that ר"ל permits because he doesn't infer חוץ מפנים
- 1 But: in our case, he may invalidate as he may allow for מעבודה לעבודה
- 2 And: flip the צריכותא (if we only had our dispute, א"ס that ר"י would agree in ע"ז case)
- d ידמי's report: brought arguments on behalf of each position:
- i brought by ידמיה (ר' ידמיה): it is invalid using ק"ו reasoning:
- 1 If: a קרבן slaughtered with intent חוץ לזמנו is valid (intent has no meaning here), but if slaughtered with intent to perform חוץ לזמנו is invalid
- (a) Then: this קרבן, which if slaughtered with intent לשמו is invalid, ק"ו that intent to perform זרה"ד שלא לשמו will invalidate
- (b) Block: perhaps פיגול is more severe as it generates a כרת חיוב, rather...
- 2 If: a קרבן slaughtered with intent חוץ למקומו is valid (intent has no meaning here), but if slaughtered with intent to perform חוץ למקומו is invalid (but not פיגול → כרת no)
- (a) Then: this קרבן, which if slaughtered with intent לשמו is invalid, ק"ו that intent to perform זרה"ד שלא לשמו will invalidate
- (b) Block: that case applies to all קדשים, our application only applies to חטאת ופסח, rather...
- 3 If: a חטאת slaughtered with intent פלוני לשם is valid (זרה"ד only has effect in re: זרה"ד), but if slaughtered with intent to perform פלוני לשם is invalid
- (a) Then: this קרבן, which if slaughtered with intent (שנוי קודש) is invalid, ק"ו that intent to perform זרה"ד שלא לשמו will invalidate
- ii brought by אילא (ר' אילא): from "extra" inference that זרה"ד requires לשמה
- 1 Observation: there was no need for a פסוק to teach that זרה"ד requires לשמו; we could have inferred that from a combination of שחיטה and קבלה
- (a) Hence: it was written to isolate each עבודה → אין מחשבין מעבודה לעבודה
- (b) Challenge (ר"פ): perhaps it was written to attach the עבודות to each other!
- (c) Defense: then the text could've remained silent and we would've inferred it from ק"ו above (for ר"י)
- e Note: ר"י and רבה disagreed on this point; ר"י taking יוחנן's position
- i But then: רבה acceded and accepted פסול due to ק"ו brought above

## II Analysis of אשם's opinion in משנה – extending invalidity of לשמו to אשם

## a אשם/חכמים (ר' יהושע) expanding on dispute ברייתא

## i אשם: just as חטאת comes to expiate sin, so too does אשם → אשם לשמו פסול

1 חטאת is significantly different – the דם goes above the חוט הסיקרא on the מזבח; אשם goes below

(a) פסח, the דם of which goes below, proves the point

(b) פסח is unique in that it has a set time

(i) חטאת, which has no set time, proves the point

(ii) ר' יהושע ("here we go again?"), so ר"א tries another approach...

## ii אשם: it states היא in re: שחיטת חטאת (v. 1) and הוא in re: שחיטת פסח (v. 2) and הוא in re: אשם (v. 3)

1 הוא in re: אשם, הוא is mentioned after burning אימורים – which itself is not an indispensable act

## iii אשם: v. 4 explicitly equates אשם to חטאת → just as חטאת is לשמו פסול, so too אשם is לשמו פסול

## b Analysis of ברייתא

## i Argument 1: why didn't ר"א (at [a I 1 b ii]) use חטאת ופסח to generate a במה הצד argument?

1 Answer: common denominator would exclude אשם as both חטאת ופסח involve כרת

(a) Explanation: חטאת comes for a כרת liability; the consequence of not bringing פסח is קרבן פסח, כרת is קרבן פסח

## ii Argument1 (earlier): why didn't ר' יהושע, instead of pointing to חטאת דם being above הסיקרא,

1 point to: חטאת's special character as its occasional entry into the מקדש (חטאת פנימית)?

(a) Answer: the entire discussion revolves around "normal" חטאות (חטאות חיצוניות)

2 Or point to: the fact that a חטאת, if non-פנימי, becomes פסול if the דם is brought inside

(a) Answer: ר"א holds the same to be true about אשם

3 Or point to: the fact that חטאת (alone) expiates for כרת חייבי כרת

(a) Answer: חטאת is not a כרת (עולה ויורד) שמיעת קול

4 Or point to: the unique character of חטאת as requiring four sprinkles of דם (on each wall)

(a) Answer: follows ר' ישמעאל who holds that to be the rule for all קרבנות

5 Or point to: the requirement to place דם right on the corners, or to use a finger or the sharp point of the קרן

(a) Answer: he chose one of several differences available to him

## iii Argument1 (further): ר"י pointed to distinction of דם being above the line

1 Why didn't: ר"א argue that אשם should also be above the line

(a) Block: no one can make that argument; if עולה goes below, and it is כלי, that אשם goes below

(i) Block: עולה doesn't expiate

(ii) Counter: חטאת העוף (which goes below) disproves that correlation

(iii) But: חטאת העוף is not a זבח – מין עולה counters

1. Common denominator: קדק"ד and the דם is below → אשם, which is קדק"ד, should have דם below

2. Block: could be argued that עולה and חטאת העוף can be bought for any price, unlike אשם (שתי כסף)

2 Rather: ר"א reads אותה (v. 6) as exclusive – only this one goes "above"

(a) Challenge: then why doesn't he accept אותה as limiting לשמה פסול שלא לשמה

(b) Answer: that אותה can't be read narrowly, as פסח is also invalid and isn't mentioned there

(i) Counter: אותה in v. 6 is also incomplete, as it omitted עולת העוף (which goes above)

(ii) Defense: within the range of זבחים alone, nothing was omitted

(iii) alternatively; follows ראב"ש who maintains that חטאת העוף and חטאת בהמה, while both being placed

למעלה, have distinct locations there; עולת העוף put against the wall; but חטאת בהמה must have its דם placed on the horn itself.