

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

1. וְזֹאת תִּזְכֹּר הַמִּנְחָה הַקְּרֵב אֶתְּךָ בְּנֵי אֱהֲרֹן לִפְנֵי ה' אֵל פְּנֵי הַמִּזְבֵּחַ: וַיִּקְרָא ז',
 2. דָּבַר אֵל אֱהֲרֹן וְאֵל בְּנָיו לֵאמֹר זֹאת תִּזְכֹּר הַמִּנְחָה הַקְּרֵב בְּמִקוֹם אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁחַט הַעֲלֵה תִשְׁחַט הַחֲטָאת לִפְנֵי ה' קֹדֶשׁ קֹדְשִׁים הוּא: וַיִּקְרָא ו, יח
 3. הַמִּקְרֵב אֶת דָּם הַשְּׁלָמִים וְאֶת הַחֶלֶב מִבְּנֵי אֱהֲרֹן לוֹ תִּהְיֶה שׂוֹק הַיָּמִין לְמִנְחָה: וַיִּקְרָא ז, לג
 4. וְכָל מִנְחָה בְּלוּלָה בְּשֶׁמֶן וְחֹרְבָהּ לְכָל בְּנֵי אֱהֲרֹן תִּהְיֶה אִישׁ כְּאָחִיו: וַיִּקְרָא ז, י

- I Continued analysis of רב's resolution to ר"ש's approach to לשמן
- a Challenge: if מעשיה מוכיחין is a consideration, then קדשי קדשים slaughtered in N קלים should be valid
 - i Reason: the location makes it obvious that they are קדשי קדשים
 - ii Block: קדשי קדשים may also be slaughtered in N; S is just a license, not a requirement
 - b Challenge: קדשי קדשים slaughtered in S קדשי קדשים should be valid – location proves they are קדשי 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: קדשי קדשים – female, חטאת, must be male, עולה it should be valid; (מעשיה מוכיחין), if he slaughters חטאת לשם חטאת
 - i Answer: since שעייר נשיא (חטאת) is male, the onlookers may think that's what the חטאת is
 - ii Challenge: if he slaughters חטאת יחיד לשם חטאת – or a חטאת יחיד לשם חטאת – should be valid
 - 1 Answer: if it is a lamb, the tail covers the genitalia
 - 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 פסח לשם פסח it should be valid – פסח is a yearling, פסח must be 2 years old
 - i Answer: since פסח נזיר ואשם מצורע are yearlings, it isn't fully distinguished
 - ii Challenge: if he states לשם פסח (e.g.) – should be valid
 - iii Furthermore: if he brings פסח לשם פסח (גזילות) 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 פסח לשם פסח (פסח) – should be valid – פסח must be a ram
 - 1 Answer: people may think it's a black (scrawny) ram
 - e Challenge: if he slaughters פסח לשם פסח or פסח לשם פסח – 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 רב's resolution to the contradiction in ר"ש's words
- a ברייתא (where he fully validates): מנחה לשם מנחה (e.g. מרחשת לשם מחבת)
 - b מנחה לשם זבח ברייתא
 - 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 חטאת דם לשם חטאת חלב (or any other sin) – should be valid, per v. 2 – תורת החטאת – מנחה
 - 1 Answer: indeed, ר"ש concurs – רבנן (per רבא) limit range of חטאות of sins; not (e.g. חטאת מצורע – come w/ עולה)
 - 2 Note: ר"ש claims that all חטאות are limited to exact intent – per v. 3
- III ר"ש's resolution:
- a ברייתא: if he said לשם מרחשת (for instance) – where his statement was about the dish – which is meaningless
 - b ברייתא: 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 – פסוק; in זבחים, invalid due to מחשבה at point of עבודה
 - iii Challenge: ר"ש should invalidate לשם בלולה (כלי no) (א: he means לשם בילה in general)
 - 1 Challenge: then לשם בעלמא should be valid – he meant לשם שלמים
 - 2 Rejection: לשם שלמים is the name of the קרבן (v. 3), but בלולה is properly called בשמן (v. 4)
- IV Summary (all 3 "challenges" were considered by ר"ש in answering whether ר"ש would validate לשם זבח)
- a דבה: others don't take his position, due to אב"י's challenge (שינוי בעלים: שינוי קודש)
 - b דבא: others don't take his position, they don't understand תורת המנחה that way
 - c דאשי: others disagree due to challenge of ר"ש אחא בריה דרבא (חריבה/בלולה)