

28.1.9

10b (הא עיקר ההיא אגרא נסבה) → 11b (תנן התם שהיה רבי עקיבא אומר)

1. לא תאפה חמץ חלקם נתתי אתה מאשי קדש קדשים הוא פחטאת וכאשם: ויקרא ו:  
 2. וכל חטאת אשר יובא מדמה אל אהל מועד לכפר בקדש לא תאכל באש תשרף: ויקרא ו:בג  
 3. ולא תחלו את קדשי בני ישראל את אשר ירימו לה: 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 חטאת – only חכמים
- c אשם and חטאת – ר"א
- i Analysis: ר"א's reason, as he states, is clear – v. 1 compares אשם to חטאת
- 1 However: what is חכמים' reason for rejecting that comparison?
  - 2 Answer1 (ר"בא): cannot argue that אשם שנכנס פוסל – because it isn't true for עולה ודם וחומר; דם עולה – because it isn't true for עולה ודם:
    - (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 העוף? Answer: that is an unresolved question of ר' אבין)
      - (iii) Challenge: מנחת חוטא isn't a זבא (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 השווה צד 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: דמה/דם 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 ר"ש, as per ר"ש:
- 1 מנחת חוטא: like חטאת → if קמיצה was done לשמה, invalid
  - 2 מנחת נדבה: like אשם → if קמיצה was done 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 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 היא (מנחות חוטא::חטאת בהמה)
  - 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 יוסי בן חוני and שמעון אחי עזריה (above, p. 1)
- a יוסי בן חוני ר"א: ר' יוחנן has same approach as ר"א
- b לשם פסח קרבן brought ר"א only invalidates רבה:
- i if א: ברייתא: aged "פסח" (past 1 year) or another קרבן was brought לשם פסח – ר"א invalidates; ר' יהושע validates ר' יהושע
- 1 ד' יהושע
    - (a) If: פסח brought (properly) is פסול, yet brought לשמו is a valid שלמים
    - (b) Then: בזמן, when פסח brought לשמו is valid, certainly פסח לשם אחרים are valid
  - 2 ר"א: invert reasoning, leading to reduction ad absurdum
    - (a) If: other times, when פסח לשמו is invalid, but פסח לשמו is valid (as שלמים)
    - (b) Then: בזמן, when פסח לשמו is valid, פסח לשמו should be valid (as שלמים) – which is wrong!
      - (i) Self-block: the reason that others פסח לשם are valid בזמן is reciprocal – פסח לשמו is a valid שלמים if brought לשמו; but פסח לשמו is invalid → others brought לשמו are invalid
  - 3 ד' יהושע: that line of reasoning makes שלמים more "sensitive" than פסח (and the opposite is true)

- 4 *א"א* (2nd lines of reasoning):
- Premise*: מותר פסח becomes שלמים, but not the inverse
  - If*: מותר פסח becomes שלמים, yet לשם שלמים is invalid
  - Then*: מותר פסח which do not become פסח, certainly לשם פסח are invalid
- 5 *ד' יהושע*:
- premise*: מותר חטאת becomes an עולה, yet not the inverse
  - If*: מותר חטאת becomes an עולה, yet לשם עולה is פסול
  - Then*: מותר עולה which does not become חטאת, certainly לשם חטאת should be פסול (but its not)
- 6 *א"א*: counter to above
- חטאת*: is כשר לשמו all year, unlike פסח which is invalid if brought לשמו outside of its זמן
  - Therefore*: since it is פסול לשמו, others brought פסח should be פסול as well
- III Analysis of end of *משנה ב'* of שמעון אחי עזריה: משה ב' hierarchical system
- Source* (*ר' ינאי* 'ר' יוחנן): v. 3 → only that which is 'higher' is valid
    - Challenge*: this verse is needed for a דרשה:
    - שמואל*: source for חיוב מיתה בידי שמים for eating טבל
      - Interpretation*: את אשר ירימו (in the future tense) – referent is things which have yet to be מורם (=טבל)
      - Defense*: if all it meant to teach was our דרשה, would have stated הורמו (past tense); *ירימו* teaches both
  - זירא* 'ד' question:
    - Does*: שמעון אחי עזריה claim that if brought for higher class, they are valid – but not מרצה
      - In which case*: he disagrees in one area (about invalidity of one brought for lower class)
    - Or*: does he claim that if brought for higher class it is מרצה,
      - In which case* – he disagrees on two fronts
    - Proof from our משנה* (*אביי*) ומעשר: בכור ומעשר brought as שלמים; כשר שלמים brought as בכור ומעשר are פסול
      - But*: בכור has no רצוי; since first case is w/o רצוי, so is earlier case (קדק"ל לשם קדק"ד)
      - Block*: perhaps each case works within its own parameters; where רצוי applies, it may still hold
        - Rather*: what is the purpose of mentioning בכור ומעשר?
        - Answer*: to teach that hierarchy also exists within שלמים
          - Challenge*: this is taught later – בכור precede שלמים, as they have נסכים, סמיכה, and שוק and תנופת חזה ושוק
          - Answer*: our case is the main locus of that information; the other is incidental