

28.1.10

11b (משנה ג) → 13a (לא אמרה אלא לחדד בה תלמידיו)

1. והיה לכם למשמרת עד ארבעה עשר יום לחדש הזה ושחטו אתו כל קהל עדת ישראל בין הערבים: שמות יב:ו

2. את הכבש האחד תעשה בבקר ואת הכבש השני תעשה בין הערבים: שמות כט:ט

3. ובהעלת אהרן את הנרות בין הערבים יקטירנה קטרת תמיד לפני ה' לדרתים: שמות לח:ח

4. באהל מועד מחויב לפרכת אשר על העדות יערך אתו אהרן ובניו מערב עד בקר לפני ה' חקת עולם לדרתם מאת בני ישראל: שמות כז:כא

5. כי אם אל המקום אשר יבחר ה' אלהיך לשכן שמו שם תזבח את הפסח בערב כבוא השמש מועד צאתך ממצרים: דברים טז:ו

6. שור או קשב או עז כי יולד והיה שבעת ימים תחת אמו ומיום השמיני והלאה ירצה לקרבן אשה לה: ויקרא כב:כו

7. והקרב והקרעים ירחץ במים והקריב הפהן את הפל והקטיר המזבחה עלה הוא אשה ריח ניחח לה: ויקרא א:יג

- I ג' משנה ג' status of פסח (slaughtered לשמו) during the morning of the 14th
- a ר' יהושע valid (as שלמים), just as if it were the 13th
 - b בן בתירה invalid, just as if it were slaughtered in the afternoon (זמנו)
 - c Addendum: ר' עזאי testified from 72 elders on the day that ראש סנהדרין was invested as ראב"ע that:
 - i All: eaten זבחים (i.e. not עולה) slaughtered לשמן are valid but don't count for owners, except for וחטאת פסח
 - 1 Note: he only extended ר"ת's position by adding עולה – but חכמים didn't accept his testimony
 - 2 Note: he mentioned "72 elders" because testimony was unanimous
- II Analysis:
- a ר' אושעיא holds that a פסח brought in the morning of the 14th is fully proper
 - i And: the wording "as if he brought it in the afternoon" is meant to respond to ר' יהושע "as if (it was the 13th)"
 - ii Challenge: let them disagree about this fundamental issue – whether the 14th in the morning is a valid time
 - iii Answer: if they disagreed there, ר' יהושע ס"א that ר' יהושע agrees that if brought then שלא לשמו – פסול – part of the day is fit
 - 1 Challenge: v. 1 stipulates that קרבן פסח be offered בין הערבים (which we assume means in the afternoon)
 - (a) Defense: בין הערבים may mean "from evening until evening" (24 hours)
 - (b) Challenge: based on this, the 2nd daily תמיד could be brought at any time! (v. 2)
 - (i) Defense: since v. 2 also commands a תמיד in the morning → בין הערבים there must mean "afternoon"
 - (ii) Challenge: perhaps in that case, one is in the morning, and the other can be at any time?
 - 1. Answer: אחד בבקר implies – only one in the morning
 - (c) Challenge: the מנורה, in that case, should be valid to be lit at any time (v. 3)
 - (i) Defense: v. 4 indicates מערב עד בקר → must be lit at end of day, as per 2 דרשות on v. 4
 - (d) Challenge: the קטורת should then be able to be lit at any time (v. 3)
 - (i) Answer: קטורת is compared, by analogy (v. 3) to נרות
 - (e) Challenge: same phrase appears in re: פסח (v. 5) – שם תזבח את הפסח בערב
 - (i) Answer: that is used to set its place in sequence – after בין הערבים תמיד של בין הערבים
 - (f) Challenge: how could something כשר in the morning be guided by principle of יאחר דבר (it's latest)
 - (i) Answer: as per ר' יוחנן's ruling about מנחה preceding מוסף if the זמן of both arrives
 - (g) Challenge: why then does the תורה use בין הערבים for קטורת ונרות?
 - (h) And: ר' רבי's answer on behalf of בן בתירה – none of 13th is "fit"; but part of 14th (afternoon) is fit
 - (i) But: if ר' אושעיא were right, he should have argued that the entire day of 14th is fit; rather...
 - b ר' יוחנן would invalidate any קרבן פסח offered in morning of 14th; לשמו or not לשמו, since part of the day is "fit"
 - i ר' אבהו rejected this: in that case, according to בן בתירה, there is no way to ever have a כשר פסח
 - 1 If: he designates the פסח in the morning, it's currently נדחה (cannot be brought as any קרבן) – ר' אחי מעיקרא –
 - 2 And if: he designated it beforehand, it is נראה ונדחה – which cannot be נראה חוזר ונראה
 - 3 Answer (ר' אבהו): if he designated it during the זמן (in the afternoon) – it would be valid
 - (a) Extension (אביי): even if הפריש בבקר, we do not consider a time-lag during the same day to be זמן מחוסר
 - (b) Extension (ר' פ): even if he designated the night before, time-lag from then is not זמן מחוסר
 - (i) Per: rulings of ר' ישמעאל and ר' אפטוריקי re: מעשר בהמה on 7th night/8th day (v. 6)
 - ii ר' זירא לר' אבהו shall we say that ר' יוחנן holds that נדחין בעלי חיים (i.e. an animal can be נדחה while alive)
 - 1 Answer: yes, per his ruling – a co-owned animal which one ½-owner was מקדיש, who then bought the other and was מקדיש the second half is fully קדוש but cannot be brought, can generate a תמורה, which is like it
 - (a) Implications:
 - (i) בעלי חיים נדחים: there is דחוי for a live animal
 - (ii) דחוי מעיקרא הוה דחוי: if unfit from the beginning, this is considered דחוי
 - (iii) יש דחוי בדמים: even though it never had הגוף קדושת, קדושת still applies

- iii 2 rulings of ר' יוחנן relating to דחי
- 1 If: he ate חלב, was מפריש חטאת, became an apostate, returned – cannot bring קרבן; as it was נדחה
 - 2 If: he ate חלב, was מפריש חטאת, became an imbecile, recovered – cannot bring קרבן; as it was נדחה
 - (a) Justification:
 - (i) If: we only had first case, א"ס invalid since he was מדחה by volition
 1. But: in 2nd case (שוטה) where his "pushing away" קרבן was involuntary, א"ס it would be נראה
 - (ii) And if: we only had 2nd case, א"ס since he doesn't control his own תשובה –
 1. But: in 1st case (מומר), where his pushing away קרבן was under his control – א"ס it would be נראה
 - 3 Question (ר' ירמיה): if he ate חלב, designated a קרבן, then הגדול ב"ד ruled that חלב was permitted, then they retracted the ruling – is his קרבן considered ונדחה?
 - (a) Answer: ר' יוחנן used to begin his discussions of דחויין with this case – and it is certainly נדחה
 - (i) Reason: in other cases (שוטה, מומר), only the man was נדחה; here, both the man and קרבן were נדחה
- III Analysis of בן עזאי's addition (of עולה) to list
- a Source: v. 7 – עולה היא
 - i Challenge: in re: אשם, also states הוא אשם
 - ii Answer: that is written in re: after אימורין
 - 1 Block: v. 7 is also after אימורין הקטרת
 - 2 Answer: there are two occasions of היא in re: עולה
 - (a) Retort: there are two occasions of היא in re: אשם, rather...
 - b Source (ר' הונא): used ק"ו –
 - i If: חטאת, which is not כליל לה', is invalid if slaughtered שלא לשמה
 - ii Then: certainly עולה, which is כליל לה', should be פסול if לשמו
 - 1 Challenge: חטאת achieves atonement
 - (a) Response: פסח disproves that correlation
 - 2 Challenge: פסח is unique in that it has a set time
 - (a) Response: חטאת disproves that correlation
 - 3 Common denominator: they are קדשים and if slaughtered שלא לשמן, invalid
 - (a) Application: עולה is also קדשים → if slaughtered שלא לשמן, should be invalid
 - (i) Block: there is an exclusive common denominator – both חטאת and פסח have a כרת-connection
 - (ii) Defense: בן עזאי doesn't see that as significant
 - (b) Question: based on this השווה צד, why doesn't בן עזאי include אשם as well?
 - (i) Answer: he has a different השווה צד which excludes אשם – both פסח וחטאת are/can be קרבן צבור
 - (ii) Or: he really does accept כרת צד as a קל-והומר, has עולה as a tradition
 1. And: ר' הונא, who presented the ק"ו, was only testing the students