

### 33.3.2

18b (משנה ב') → 19b (אימא וילד קרב אשם קמ"ל)

1. **אם על תודה יקריבנו והקריב על זבח התודה חלות מצות בלולת בשמן ורקיקי מצות משחים בשמן וסלת מרבכת חלת בלולת בשמן:** ויקרא ז, יב

- I לחם – but not תודה – offered as תודה for infinite generations, for infinite generations, are offered as תודה: משנה ב
- a Source: v. 1 – יקריבנו teaches that if his תודה was lost and he designated a replacement and then found original תודה
- i He may: offer either one with לחם (תודה יקריב)
- ii But: only one (the first) has bread offered with it, per יקריבנו (singular)
- iii And: all “offspring” (וולדות, תמורות) are offered as תודה, per על תודה
- 1 However: none of them require bread, per על זבח התודה – only the תודה, not its “offspring”
- II משנה ב: תמורת עולה and its young, for infinite generations, are considered עולה – requiring הפשט and to be all burnt up
- III משנה ג: if someone designates a נקבה for his עולה, and she births a male
- a חכמים: that male grazes until it gets a מום, is sold and an עולה is brought with those funds
- b דא: the male offspring is brought itself as עולה
- IV Analysis of ב and ג:
- a The dispute: between ר”א/חכמים is only mentioned in re: מפרש נקבה for an עולה, but not in re: תמורת עולה
- i דב”ח: they disagree about both; ב משנה follows ר”א
- ii דבא: the first passage is a consensus, רבנן agree in the case of תמורת עולה, where the “mother” (עולה original) is offered, the “offspring” (תמורה) is also offered
- b דא’s position: how could he rule that תמורת עולה קריבה? He rules (end of ג משנה) that תמורת אשם is redeemed for דמים → עולה (רבנן – רבנן) נדבת יחיד (נדבת צבור) – should be נדבת צבור (נדבת צבור) – should be נדבת יחיד (נדבת צבור)
- i דא: ר”א was responding to רבנן (it grazes and money goes to צבור) – should be נדבת יחיד (נדבת צבור)
- ii דבא: ר”א only held that in a case of מפרש נקבה לעולה, the וולד is offered, since the mother has a עולה שם
- 1 Reason: there is a female עולה that is brought – עולת העוף;
- 2 But: in case of אשם תמורת אשם, where the mother has no עולה שם, it is redeemed instead
- 3 Challenge (אבני): ר”א doesn’t require “שם עולה” on the mother for the “offspring” to be offered
- (a) ברייתא: if someone designates a female as פסח, it grazes and money is used for פסח, same with its וולד; if it doesn’t get a מום before פסח, let it graze and money is used for שלמים
- (b) דא: it is offered as שלמים (no grazing → redeeming)
- (i) אבני: here, the mother didn’t have a שלמים שם, but ר”א has the וולד offered as שלמים
- (ii) Defense (דבא): if it is after פסח, even the mother would be offered as שלמים – מותר פסח לשלמים
1. Counter (אבני): if so, ר”א should disagree in רישא (status of וולד before פסח)
2. Answer (דבא): indeed, they disagree there as well
3. אבני: they don’t disagree – ר”א has rule – מותר וולד
- a. After פסח: מותר שלמים is וולד → שלמים
- b. Before פסח: mother was sanctified for פסח דמי וולד → וולד is also sanctified פסח לדמי (רועה)
- i. Challenge (ר’ עוקבא בר חמא): ר”א doesn’t hold that וולד follows mother for דמים
- ii. ברייתא: if someone designates female for פסח, she and her וולדות graze, sold for פסח
- iii. דא: וולד is offered itself as פסח (doesn’t follow status of mother)
- iv. Answer (דבא): case where נקבה was already pregnant בשעת הפרשה
- v. And: ר”א holds like יוחנן עובר – ר’ יוחנן is distinct and he may designate it separately
- vi. Support: from language of ברייתא – היא וולדותיה → already pregnant
- iii דא agrees in case where he designates a female for אשם, that וולד is not offered as אשם
- 1 Challenge: should be obvious; he only allowed it in case where mother has עולה שם → קרב עולה
- 2 Defense: we may have thought that ר”א’s reason was that as long as וולד is fit for הקרבה, שם of mother irrelevant
- (a) Challenge: if so, let ריב”ח teach that the וולד isn’t offered as עולה, and we’ll know that it is also unfit for אשם
- (b) Defense: if he had taught that, we would have allowed for אשם, as the mother was designated as אשם
- (i) And: we would have reasoned that the וולד is unfit for עולה (mother wasn’t called עולה)
- (ii) But: it is fit for אשם, as the mother was called אשם, therefore he teaches that it is unfit for אשם