

29.1.2; 3a → 4a (משום קושיא דרב אחא בריה דרבא) → (קדשי קדשים) 29.1.2; 3a

1. וְזֹאת תֹּרַת הַמִּנְחָה הַקָּרֵב אֲתָהּ בְּנֵי אֶהְרֹן לִפְנֵי ה' אֶל פְּנֵי הַמִּזְבֵּחַ: וַיִּקְרָא ז',  
 2. דָּבָר אֶל אֶהְרֹן וְאֶל בְּנָיו לֵאמֹר זֹאת תֹּרַת הַחֲטָאֹת בַּמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁחָט הָעֵלָה תִּשְׁחָט הַחֲטָאֹת לִפְנֵי ה' קֹדֶשׁ קִדְשִׁים הוּא: וַיִּקְרָא ו, יח  
 3. הַמִּקְרִיב אֶת דָּם הַשְּׁלָמִים וְאֶת הַחֶלֶב מִבְּנֵי אֶהְרֹן לוֹ תִּהְיֶה שׁוֹק הַיָּמִין לְמִנְחָה: וַיִּקְרָא ז', לג  
 4. וְכָל מִנְחָה בְּלוּלָה בַשֶּׁמֶן וְחִרְבָּה לְכָל בְּנֵי אֶהְרֹן תִּהְיֶה אִישׁ כְּאָחִיו: וַיִּקְרָא ז', י

- I Continued analysis of רבא's resolution to ר"ש's approach to לשמן
- a Challenge: if מעשיה מוכיחין is a consideration, then קדשים slaughtered in N should be valid
    - i Reason: the location makes it obvious that they are קדשים
    - ii Block: קדשים קלים may also be slaughtered in N; S is just a license, not a requirement
  - b Challenge: קדשים קלים slaughtered in S should be valid – location proves they are קדשים
    - i Block: the onlooker might think them to be קדשי קדשים and the שוחט simply violated the law by performing in S
    - ii Challenge: if so, bringing מחבת and saying מרחשת לשם, the onlooker might just think him a sinner
      - 1 Answer: if he brings it in a מחבת, that's what it is, regardless of his נדר; but he doesn't fulfill the נדר
      - 2 Challenge: if he identified the כלי and said להביא במרחשת – in which case it is invalid (if he then says מחבת)
        - (a) Answer: that is valid for the רבנן; but ר"ש (our concern here) says that even in that case – יצא ידי נדרו
        - (b) Conclusion: he isn't concerned with the identification of the כלי – doesn't establish anything
  - c Challenge: (מעשיה מוכיחין), if he slaughters a חטאת לשם עולה it should be valid; עולה must be male, חטאת – female
    - i Answer: since שער נשיא (חטאת) is male, the onlookers may think that's what the חטאת is
    - ii Challenge: if he slaughters it יחיד לשם עולה – or a חטאת יחיד לשם עולה – should be valid
      - 1 Answer: if it is a lamb, the tail covers the genetalia
      - 2 However: if he brings a goat – should be valid
        - (a) Answer: people don't pay much attention to those details
  - d Challenge: if he brings a פסח לשם פסח it should be valid – פסח is a yearling, פסח must be 2 years old
    - i Answer: since נזיר ואשם מצורע are yearlings, it isn't fully distinguished
    - ii Challenge: if he states גזילות (e.g.) – should be valid
    - iii Furthermore: if he brings an אשם (גזילות) לשם פסח should be valid
      - 1 Answer: people don't notice the difference in age – some yearlings look older and vice-versa
    - iv Challenge: if he brings a goat (פסח) לשם אשם – should be valid – אשם must be a ram
      - 1 Answer: people may think it's a black (scrawny) ram
  - e Challenge: if he slaughters a calf לשם פסח or לשם אשם – should be valid (no way to mistake those for sheep)
    - i Answer: indeed – "זבחים" mentioned by ר"ש refers to most זבחים (where no obvious distinction sets proper intent)
- II רבא's resolution to the contradiction in ר"ש's words
- a בריתא (where he fully validates): מנחה לשם מנחה (e.g. מרחשת לשם מחבת)
  - b מנחה לשם זבח: בריתא
    - i Reason: v. 1 includes puts all מנחות into one grouping; but doesn't include זבחים in that group
    - ii Challenge: the reason given is not the verse, but that the actions are distinct
      - 1 Explanation: what that means is that although the actions are distinct (and the intent is indiscernible) – פסוק
      - 2 And: even though all actions of the זבחים are the same – no verse to tie them together
    - iii Challenge: if he brings a חטאת דם לשם חטאת (or any other sin) – should be valid, per v. 2 – תורת החטאת
      - 1 Answer: indeed, ר"ש concurs – רבנן (per רבא) limit range to חטאות of sins; not (e.g. חטאת מצורע) – come w/ עולה
      - 2 Note: ר' אחא בריה דרבא claims that all חטאות are limited to exact intent – per v. 3
- III ר"ש's resolution:
- a בריתא: if he said לשם מרחשת (for instance) – where his statement was about the dish – which is meaningless
  - b בריתא: if he said לשם מנחת מרחשת (for instance) – where his statement is about the קרבן – meaningful point of מחשבה
    - i Challenge: the reason given is that the actions are distinct – מעשיה מוכיחין עליה
    - ii Answer: meaning – in spite of distinct actions – it would be פסול; in זבחים, invalid due to מחשבה at point of עבודה
    - iii Challenge: ר"ש should invalidate בלולה לשם (כלי) (a: he means לשם בילה in general)
      - 1 Challenge: then שלמים בעלמא should be valid – he meant בעלמא
      - 2 Rejection: שלמים is the name of the קרבן (v. 3), but a בלולה is properly called בשמן (v. 4)
- IV Summary (all 3 "challenges" were considered by ר' הושעיא in answering whether ר"ש would validate לשם זבח)
- a דבה: others don't take his position, due to אביי's challenge (שינוי בעלים: שינוי קודש)
  - b דבא: others don't take his position, they don't understand the מנחה that way
  - c דאשי: others disagree due to challenge of ר' אחא בריה דרבא (חריבה/בלולה)