28.1.9

10b (תנן התם שהיה רבי עקיבא אומר) ← 11b (הא עיקר ההיא אגדרא נסבה)

> 1. לֹא תֵאָפֶה חָמֵץ חֶלְקָם נָתַתִּי אֹתָהּ מֵאִשָּׁי קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים הוּא כַּחַטָּאת וְכָאָשָׁם: *ויקרא ו:י*
> 2. וְכָל חַטָּאת אֲשֶׁר יוּבָא **מִדָּמָהּ** אֶל אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד לְכַפֵּר בַּקֹּדֶשׁ לֹא תֵאָכֵל בָּאֵשׁ תִּשָּׂרֵף: *ויקרא ו:כג*
> 3. וְלֹא יְחַלְּלוּ אֶת קָדְשֵׁי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל **אֵת אֲשֶׁר יָרִימוּ** לַה': *ויקרא כב:טו*

I   Analysis of זבחים ח:יא – dispute ר"ע/חכמים/ר"א as to which קרבנות are invalidated if their דם is (wrongly) brought inside
- a   ר"ע – all
- b   חכמים – only חטאת
- c   ר"א - חטאת and אשם
  - i   *Analysis*: ר"א's reason, as he states, is clear – v. 1 compares אשם to חטאת
    - 1   *However*: what is חכמים's reason for rejecting that comparison?
    - 2   *Answer1 (רבא)*: cannot argue that דם אשם שנכנס פוסל – because it isn't true for קל וחומר; דם עולה:
      - (a)   *If*: עולה, which is כליל, isn't invalidated
      - (b)   *Then certainly*: אשם, which isn't כליל, cannot be invalidated
      - (c)   *Block*: אשם is מכפר, unlike עולה
        - (i)   *Defense*: מנחת חוטא, which is מכפר, has no such invalidity (→ כפרה is not a cause for application)
        - (ii)   *(question*: why didn't he use חטאת העוף? *Answer*: that is an unresolved question of ר' אבין)
        - (iii)   *Challenge*: מנחת חוטא isn't a זבח (there is no blood → no way for this to be applied)
          - 1. *Save*: עולה proves the point – it has דם and isn't invalidated
      - (d)   *Result*: חזר הדין – the common factor – both are קדק"ד and aren't invalidated by being brought inside
        - (i)   *Application*: אשם, which is also קדק"ד, isn't invalidated by being brought inside
      - (e)   *Question*: why not break this צד השווה by pointing out that אשם, unlike the other two, has a set value?
    - 3   *Answer2*: v. 2, the invalidity of דם חטאת brought inside, is exclusive (דמה)
      - (a)   *Counter (ר"א)*: דמה is there to exclude its meat, not the דם of other זבחים
      - (b)   *Response*: דם/דמה allows for 2 דרשות (ר"א doesn't consider that to be significant)
- d   *Observation*:
  - i   *Clear*: we understand why v.1 compares מנחה to **both** חטאת and אשם according to רבנן, as per ר"ש:
    - 1   *מנחת חוטא*: like חטאת → if the קמיצה was done שלא לשמה, invalid
    - 2   *מנחת נדבה*: like אשם → if the קמיצה was done שלא לשמה, valid
  - ii   *Unclear*: why v. 1 compares מנחה to both חטאת ואשם according to ר"א
    - 1   *Answer*: per other ruling of ר"ש (מנחות ג:ד) – if the שירי מנחה became טמא not in the כלי שרת (e.g. in the hand), חכמים invalidate and ר"ש maintains כשר; as he reads v. 1 as allowing מנחה to be performed either with (right) hand (like חטאת) or with a כלי (like אשם – using left hand)
    - 2   *Challenge*: how can ר"ש use the same פסוק for 2 דרשות?
      - (a)   *Answer*: uses it for the latter one; he infers former ruling from common (מנחות חוטא::חטאת בהמה היא)
    - 3   *Note*: according to רבנן, why is אשם compared to חטאת (כחטאת כאשם)
      - (a)   *Answer*: just as חטאת requires סמיכה, so too does אשם require סמיכה
II   Analysis of משנה ב': opinions of שמעון אחי עזריה and יוסי בן חוני (above, p. 1)
- a   ר"א: ר' יוחנן has same approach as יוסי בן חוני,
- b   ר"א: רבה only invalidates a קרבן brought לשם פסח:
  - i   ברייתא: if a פסח "aged" (past 1 year) or another קרבן was brought לשם פסח – ר"א:בזמנו invalidates; ר' יהושע validates
    - 1   *ר' יהושע*:
      - (a)   *If*: שלא בזמן, when פסח brought (properly) is פסול, yet brought שלא לשמו is a valid שלמים
      - (b)   *Then*: בזמן, when פסח brought לשמו is valid, certainly אחרים לשם פסח are valid
    - 2   *ר"א*: invert reasoning, leading to *reduction ad absurdum*
      - (a)   *If*: other times, when פסח לשמו is invalid, but שלא לשמו is valid (as שלמים)
      - (b)   *Then*: בזמנו, when לשמו פסח is valid, שלא לשמו should be valid (as שלמים) – which is wrong!
        - (i)   *Self-block*: the reason that others לשם פסח are valid שלא בזמנו is reciprocal – פסח שלא בזמנו is a valid שלמים if brought שלא לשמו; but פסח בזמנו שלא לשמו is invalid → others brought בזמנו לשמו are invalid
    - 3   *ר' יהושע*: that line of reasoning makes שלמים more "sensitive" than פסח (and the opposite is true)

4 *ר״א* (*2nd lines of reasoning*):

    (a) *Premise*: מותר פסח becomes שלמים, but not the inverse

    (b) *If*: מותר פסח becomes שלמים, yet פסח בזמנו לשם שלמים is invalid

    (c) *Then*: מותר שלמים which do not become פסח, certainly שלמים בזמן פסח לשם פסח are invalid

5 *ר׳ יהושע*:

    (a) *premise*: מותר חטאת becomes an עולה, yet not the inverse

    (b) *If*: מותר חטאת becomes an עולה, yet חטאת לשם עולה is פסול

    (c) *Then*: מותר עולה which does not becomes חטאת, certainly עולה לשם חטאת should be פסול (but its not)

6 *ר״א*: counter to above

    (a) חטאת is כשר לשמו all year, unlike פסח which is invalid if brought לשמו outside of its זמן

    (b) *Therefore*: since it is פסול לשמו, others brought לשם פסח should be פסול as well

III Analysis of end of שמעון אחי עזריה:משנה ב's hierarchical system

  a *Source (ר׳ ינאי or ר׳ יוחנן)*: v. 3 → only that which is 'higher' is valid

    i *Challenge*: this verse is needed for a different דרשה:

    ii *שמואל*: source for חיוב מיתה בידי שמים for eating טבל

      1 *Interpretation*: את אשר ירימו (in the future tense) – referent is things which have yet to be מורם (=טבל)

      2 *Defense*: if all it meant to teach was our דרשה, would have stated הורמו (past tense); ירימו teaches both

  b *ר׳ זירא's question*:

    i *Does*: שמעון אחי עזריה claim that if brought for higher class, they are valid – but not מרצה

      1 *In which case*: he disagrees in one area (about invalidity of one brought for lower class)

    ii *Or*: does he claim that if brought for higher class it is מרצה,

      1 *In which case* – he disagrees on two fronts

    iii *Proof from our משנה (אביי)*: בכור ומעשר are פסול brought as שלמים; שלמים are כשר brought as בכור ומעשר

      1 *But*: בכור has no רצוי; since first case is w/o רצוי, so is earlier case (קדק״ל לשם קדק״ד)

      2 *Block*: perhaps each case works within its own parameters; where רצוי applies, it may still hold

        (a) *Rather*: what is the purpose of mentioning בכור ומעשר?

        (b) *Answer*: to teach that hierarchy also exists within שלמים

          (i) *Challenge*: this is taught later – שלמים precede בכור, as they have נסכים, סמיכה and תנופת חזה ושוק

          (ii) *Answer*: our case is the main locus of that information; the other is incidental