

33.1.11

13a → 13b (סיום הפרק) → (משנה ו)



I תמורה excluded classes from משנה ו

- a *Types*: bird offerings and grain offerings (per בהמה – v. 1)
- b *Groups*: קרבנות-צבור or partner cannot be used to generate, per תמורתו (v. 1)
- c *Classes*: תמורה קדשי בדק הבית cannot generate
- d *ל"ש* source for these exclusions – מע"ב was singled out as an exemplar of תמורה (v. 5), to be a model:
- i *Just as*: קרבן מזבח and קרבן יחיד מע"ב
 - ii *So too*: תמורה only applies to קרבן יחיד (not even co-owned, per מע"ב) and קרבן מזבח (not בדק הבית)
 - iii *ברייתא*: infers exclusion of בדק הבית from "קרבן" (v. 2, the preface to תמורה in v. 1)
 - 1 *Challenge*: "קרבן" implies בדק הבית as well, per ברייתא which allows for possibility of בדק הבית being included in פתח א"מ (vv. 3-4), only excluded due to א"מ (v. 3)
 - 2 *Answer*: that ברייתא follows ר"ש, who, in our משנה, excludes בדק הבית via מע"ב; רבנן would agree that בדק הבית isn't called קרבן
 - (a) *Challenge*: v. 4 refers to קדשי בדק הבית as "קרבן"
 - (b) *Answer*: they are called "קרבן ה", but not "קרבן לה"
 - iv *ברייתא*: justifying v. 5 (repetition of תמורה דין) – v. 1 would have allowed for any קרבן to be able to generate תמורה
 - 1 *Therefore*: v. 5 attaches to מע"ב to teach (per ר"ש's explanation);
 - (a) *Just as*: מע"ב is a קרבן יחיד, קרבן מזבח, an obligation (not נדבה) and not able to be brought by partners
 - (b) *So too*: only קרבנות which fit those four criteria can generate תמורה
 - (c) *Analysis*: דבר שבחובה cannot exclude נדבה עולה
 - (d) *לכא*: once he accepts the obligation to bring, it becomes like חובה → generates תמורה
 - (i) *Exception*: is עולה which comes from surplus funds
 - (ii) *However*: if we hold that those funds go to צבור נדבת צבור, already excluded (as צבור)
 - (iii) *Therefore*: ר"ש must hold that surplus קרבן-funds go to עולת יחיד (yet unable to generate תמורה)
 1. *Challenge*: ר"א is the author of the opinion that מותרות go to יחיד
 2. *And*: he holds that they can generate תמורה
 3. *Answer*: ר"ש agrees with him that מותרות → עולת יחיד, but disagrees – cannot generate תמורה
 - a. *Challenge*: ר"א's complex theoretical (above) about designating אשם, making תמורה from it and losing original and bringing third, then finding index animal – whether it could make another תמורה (only asked according to ר"ש [according to יוחנן ר"י's position]) – no question
 - b. *Answer*: he was asking – if there were a תנא who agreed with ר"ש that ומירין וממירין and who held like ר"א that עולת נדבת יחיד הבאה מן המותרות עושה תמורה – could it be reused
 - i. *In other words*: 2 קדושות in same body (then, 2 bodies with same קדושה)
 - v *רבנן's take on v5 (contra ר"ש)*: (ר"ש rejects need for מע"ב as model to exclude שותפין, צבור, etc.
 - 1 *Reason*: infers יחיד-only from "ימיר", he holds that "קרבן" doesn't include בדק הבית and holds מותרות go to צבור (נדבת צבור)
 - 2 *מע"ב*: singled out to teach difference between "תמורת שמו" (e. g. he erred and called #9 "ten" etc.) and תמורת גופו
 - (a) (תמים) דבר ראוי ומוחלט, can be redeemed and applies only to *תמורת שמו*
 - (b) בע"מ (בכור::), cannot be redeemed and applies even to *תמורת גופו*
 - 3 *Challenge* (to רבנן): it was "expanded" – why would it then constrict (to prevent תמורת מע"ב from הקרבה)?
 - 4 *Answer*: whatever was expanded (תמורת שמו) was expanded (that תמורת גופו applies at all) – but only that
 - (a) *Source* (ר"י הונא בריה דר"י): מע"ב was in the general rubric of קרבנות, singled out to teach something new
 - (i) *Rule*: אין לך בו אלא חידושו – we can only expand to include its חידושו – no more (only תמורת שמו is offered)