

28.1.8

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

- .1 וְסָמַךְ יָדוֹ עַל רֹאשׁ הַשְּׁעִיר וְשָׁחַט אֹתוֹ בְּמָקוֹם אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁחַט אֶת הָעֹלָה לִפְנֵי ה' חֲטָאת הוּא: וְיִקְרָא ד:כז
 .2 וְאִמְרַתֶּם זָבַח פֶּסַח הוּא לֵה' אֲשֶׁר פֶּסַח עַל בְּתֵי גְבֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמִצְרַיִם בְּנִגְפוֹ אֶת מִצְרַיִם וְאֶת בְּתֵינּוּ הִצִּיל וַיִּקְדֵּם הָעָם וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ: שְׁמוֹת יב, כז
 .3 וְהִקְטִיר אֹתָם הִכְהֵן תִּמְזַבְּחָה אֲשֶׁה לֵה' אֲשֶׁם הוּא: וְיִקְרָא ז:ה
 .4 לֹא תֹאפֶה חֶמֶץ חֶלְקִים נִתְתִּי אִתְּהָ מֵאֲשֵׁי קֹדֶשׁ קִדְשִׁים הוּא פֶחֶסֶת וְכֹאֲשִׁם: וְיִקְרָא ו:י
 .5 הִכְהֵן הִמְחִטָּא אֲתָה יֵאָכְלָה בְּמָקוֹם קֹדֶשׁ תֹּאכַל בְּחֶצֶר אֶהֱל מוֹעֵד: וְיִקְרָא ו:ט

- I Dispute שלא לשמה שחטה with proper intent, but done to perform re: יוחנן/ר"ל
- a ד"י invalid
- i Reasoning: we infer from פיגול that in general we attach משחבה from 1 עבודה to another
- b ד"ל valid
- i Reasoning: we do not infer from פיגול → we do not attach משחבה from 1 עבודה to another
- c Tangential question: they have a parallel (hence, superfluous) dispute re: שחטה in order to perform ע"ז for זרה"ד
- i Justification: if we only had that dispute, ס"א that ר"ל permits because he doesn't infer מפנים חוץ, חוץ מפנים
- 1 But: in our case, he may invalidate as he may allow for לעבודה מעבודה
- 2 And: flip the צריכותא (if we only had our dispute, ס"א that ר"י would agree in ע"ז case)
- d דימ' report: brought arguments on behalf of each position: ארץ ישראל
- i brought by (ר' ירמיה לר' יוחנן) reasoning: ק"ו
- 1 If: a קרבן slaughtered with intent לזמנו חוץ is valid (intent has no meaning here), but if slaughtered with intent to perform לזמנו חוץ זרה"ד חוץ is invalid (פיגול is זרה"ד חוץ לזמנו חוץ is valid)
- (a) Then: this קרבן, which if slaughtered with intent שלא לשמה is invalid, ק"ו that intent to perform זרה"ד שלא לשמה will invalidate
- (b) Block: perhaps פיגול is more severe as it generates a כרת, חייב כרת, rather...
- 2 If: a קרבן slaughtered with intent לזמנו חוץ is valid (intent has no meaning here), but if slaughtered with intent to perform לזמנו חוץ זרה"ד חוץ is invalid (but not פיגול → כרת)
- (a) Then: this קרבן, which if slaughtered with intent שלא לשמה is invalid, ק"ו that intent to perform זרה"ד שלא לשמה will invalidate
- (b) Block: that case applies to all קדשים, our application only applies to פסח ופסח, 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 זרה"ד is invalid
- (a) Then: this קרבן, which if slaughtered with intent (שנוי קודש) שלא לשמה is invalid, ק"ו that intent to perform זרה"ד שלא לשמה will invalidate
- ii brought by (ר' אילא לר"ל): from "extra" inference that זרה"ד requires לשמה
- 1 Observation: there was no need for a פסוק to teach that זרה"ד requires לשמה; we could have inferred that from a combination of שחטה and קבלה
- (a) Hence: it was written to isolate each עבודה → עבודה לעבודה 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 ר"י 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 שלא לשמו to אשם
- a ר"א/חכמים (ר' יהושע) expanding on dispute ברייתא
- i ר"א: just as חטאת comes to expiate sin, so too does אשם → שלא לשמו פסול
- 1 חוט הסיקרא on the מזבח; אשם goes below
- (a) ר"א: פסח, the דם of which goes below, proves the point
- (b) ר' יהושע: 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 ר"א: 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 ר"א: v. 4 explicitly equates אשם to חטאת → just as חטאת is שלא לשמו, so too אשם is שלא לשמו
- b Analysis of ברייתא
- i *Argument 1*: why didn't ר"א (at [a I 1 b ii]) use חטאת ופסח to generate a בצד במה 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 is כרת
- ii *Argument 1 (earlier)*: why didn't יהושע, instead of pointing to חטאת דם being above חוט 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) חטאות
- 2 *Or point to*: the fact that חטאת, if non-מימי, 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 (עולה ויורד) is not a כרת חיוב כול
- 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 *Argument 1 (further)*: ר"א 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 כליל ק"ו that אשם goes below
- (i) *Block*: עולה doesn't expiate
- (ii) *Counter*: חטאת העוף (which goes below) disproves that correlation
- (iii) *But*: עולה – מין זבח – חטאת העוף counters
1. *Common denominator*: חטאת and the דם is below → אשם, which is חטאת, 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 שלא לשמו to חטאת?
- (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 חטאת העוף (which goes above)
- (ii) *Defense*: within the range of זבחים alone, nothing was omitted
- (iii) *alternatively*; follows ר' אב"ש who maintains that עולה העוף and חטאת בהמה, while both being placed למעלה, have distinct locations there; עולה העוף put against the wall; but חטאת בהמה must have its דם placed on the horn itself.