

28.1.5

6a (לפרקליט שנכנס [ריצה פרקליט נכנס] דורון אחריו) 7b → (איבעיא להו כיפרו על מה שבאו או לא כיפרו)

1. וְסָמַךְ יָדוֹ עַל רֹאשׁ הָעֵלָה וְנִרְצָה לוֹ לְכַפֵּר עָלָיו: ויקרא א:ד

2. כִּי נִפְשׁ הַבָּשָׂר בָּדָם הוּא וְאֵינִי נֹתְתִי לָכֶם עַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ לְכַפֵּר עַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ לְכַפֵּר עַל נַפְשֵׁיכֶם כִּי הַדָּם הוּא בְּנִפְשׁ יִכְפֹּר: ויקרא ז:א

3. וְהוֹתֵר בְּשִׁמּוֹן אֲשֶׁר עַל כַּף הַהֶהָרִים יִתֵּן עַל רֹאשׁ הַמִּטְהָר וְכִפֹּר עָלָיו הַהֶהָרִים לִפְנֵי ה': ויקרא יז:ח

4. וְבָשָׂר זָבַח תּוֹדֹת שְׁלָמֵי בָיִם קָרְבָּנוֹ. אֲכָל לֹא יִנְיַח מִמֶּנּוּ עַד בֹּקֶר: ויקרא ז:טו

5. וְסָמַךְ אֶת יָדוֹ עַל רֹאשׁ הַחֲטָאֹת וְשָׁחַט אֹתָהּ לְחֲטָאֹת בְּמָקוֹם אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁחָט אֶת הָעֵלָה: ויקרא ד:לג

6. וְאֵת כָּל חֲלֵבָה יִסִּיר כְּאֲשֶׁר יוֹסֵר חֲלֵב הַקֶּשֶׁב מִזֶּבֶח הַשְּׁלָמִים וְהַקְטִיר הַהֶהָרִים אֹתָם הַמִּזְבֵּחַ עַל אֲשֵׁי ה' וְכִפֹּר עָלָיו הַהֶהָרִים עַל חֲטָאוֹתָם אֲשֶׁר חָטְאוּ וְנִסְלַח לוֹ: ויקרא ד:לז

7. מוֹצֵא שְׁפָתַיִךְ תִּשְׁמַר וְעֲשִׂיתָ כְּאֲשֶׁר נִדְרַתְּ לַה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ נִדְבָה אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ בְּפִיךָ: דברים כג:כד

8. זָבַח וְשָׁחַט תּוֹעֵבָה אִף כִּי בְזַמְּהָ בְּיָאֲנֹהּ: משלי כא:כז

- I Continued analysis of status of קרבן that was נזבח שלא לשמו but is yet offered
- a question: do they generate כפרה for the sin that occasioned the offering?
- i answer (ר' ששת בריה דר' אידי): stands to reason that they do not; else, why bring the 2nd one?
- 1 challenge: in that case, why bring the 1st one?
- 2 אש' ד: what he was really asking was: if we accept the notion that the 1st is not מכפר, we understand why it's brought – generated by the proper designation לשמו; but if it is מכפר, why bring the 2nd?
- b Question: does a קרבן עולה achieve atonement for עשה squandered post-designation?
- i Lemma1: similar to חטאת, which only expiates for sins committed pre-designation (and which occasioned it)
- ii Lemma2: dissimilar; חטאת requires separate קרבן for each sin; since עולה covers many, perhaps הפרשה as well
- 1 Proposed solution: חטאת ברייתא interpreting v. 1 – סמיכה cannot generate רצוי, that is what דם does (v. 2)
- (a) Rather: means that if he disregarded סמיכה and omitted it, considered as if he wasn't מתכפר – but he was
- (i) Proposed meaning: he was מתכפר for מ"ע until הפרשה, but not his omission of סמיכה (post-הפרשה)
- (ii) Challenge (זבא): he doesn't "omit" until שחיטה; post-שחיטה sins are not even under consideration
- (iii) Suggestion to זבא: perhaps כיפר means "man has been [formally] cleansed", – לא כיפר – with God
1. As per: נורי בן נורי's application of v. 3 – he is formally complete, but לא כיפר – with God
2. Rejection: there, too, he is complete with בהונות, מתן, but not the head (must refill oil and pour)
- 2 Proposed solution: ר"ש poses the question (in re: כפרת שעירי חטאת as to purpose of 2 עצרת 2 כבשי עזרת 2 (טומאת מקדש for כפרת שעירי חטאת) as to purpose of 2 עזרת 2 כבשי עזרת 2
- (a) Since: first achieves כפרה for מקדש, 2nd comes for טומאה that occurred since offering of first
- (b) Proving: that טומאה that took place post-designation is covered by this offering
- (i) Rejection: if they were designated simultaneously, the question would be valid
1. But: the circumstance is when they were designated in sequence – and 1st only cleanses for הפרשת ראשון טומאה that occurred before its designation; 2nd covers טומאה that occurred after ראשון
- a. Challenge: why doesn't text tell us that they must (annually) be designated in sequence?
- (c) Block (ר"פ): no proof from קרבנות צבור, which are controlled by תנאי ב"ד
- (i) Per: שמואל – all קרבנות צבור take on the identity as per the "knife's" discretion
- (ii) Challenge: ר"ש doesn't accept the notion of ב"ד
1. Proof: he holds (contra חכמים) that "leftover" תמידין cannot be redeemed תמימים
- (d) Further block: question asked of ר' זירא – if he took דם עזרת 2 כבשי עזרת 2 in 2 כוסות and sprinkled 1st – what is purpose of sprinkling 2nd? Perhaps for טומאה that occurred between the דם זריקות?
- (i) Note: he only asked about טומאה after שחיטה, but obviously after הפרשה is included
- (ii) Block (to this challenge): perhaps he was phrasing this as את"ל and both were asked →no resolution
- II תודה slaughtered לשם another man's תודה
- a valid – v. 4 → תודה is a subset of שלמים and not vice-versa → תודה לשם שלמים is invalid → but תודה לשם תודה is valid
- i Doesn't this mean: even if it belongs to another
- ii Rejection: perhaps it means תודה לשם תודה שלו,
- (a) Challenge: if so, should state לשם תודת חברו and all the more so תודה לשם שלמים
- (b) Answer: תודה לשם שלמים שלו needed; countering possibility that תודה לשם תודה שלו, per inverse
- b invalid – must be offered for his own שלמים ד' חסדא

III Series of מימרות by רבא regarding לשמה:

- a לשם חטאת slaughtered לשם חטאת is valid; לשם עולה is invalid
 i Reason: v. 5 demands that it be slaughtered לשם חטאת
- b לשם חטאת slaughtered for another who is also חייב חטאת – invalid; if חייב עולה – valid
 i Reason: v. 6 identifies כפרה as עליו, excluding על חברו
 1 But: חייב חטאת must be akin to him – חייב חטאת
- c חטאת: slaughtered for someone who has no formal liability – invalid
 i Reason: everyone has some liability for an עשה
 1 Explanation: since he didn't designate an עולה, these sins are absolved via חטאת, considered "מחוייב חטאת"
- d חטאת: atones for מצוות עשה via ק"ו reasoning
 i If: it can atone for כריתות, certainly it can atone for עשה חייבי עשה
 1 Challenge: does this mean that רבא considers the כפרות to be of a kind
 (a) But: רבא taught that if offered for עולה מחוייב עולה – valid
 2 Answer: although there isn't full כפרה from the עשה without עולה, partial כפרה is obtained
- e עולה: that was slaughtered לשמה שלא may not have דם sprinkled (or any other עבודה) done לשמה שלא
 i Source: may be text – v. 7, as presented above, or reasoning, as presented at the beginning of the פרק
- f עולה: brought posthumously
 i דבא: if שנוי קודש, invalid; but בעלים (שמתו) – valid,
 1 Reason: there are no בעלים לאחר מיתה
 ii בעלים לאחר מיתה ד' פנחס בריה דר' אמאי
 1 Question (ר' אשי): does he mean that the heirs are full בעלים and they are liable to bring a replacement
 (a) Or: that they achieve some partial כפרה?
 2 Answer: heirs are full בעלים
- g עולה: is a gift
 i Case: if the donor didn't yet do תשובה – invalid offering per v. 8
 1 But if: he did תשובה – not needed; as תשובה alone fully cleanses (immediately) for מצוות עשה
 ii Therefore: must be a pure gift, not an expiation
 iii Support: ברייתא in which ר"ש explains why חטאת (cleanses) precedes עולה (tribute)