

POINTS TO PONDER

- 1. The קרבן חטאת says that חסידים הראשונים wanted to bring a קרבן חטאת and looked for a way to obligate themselves to bring a חטאת, because הקב״ה does not bring a תקלה to them. How does this reconcile with the fact that אין אדם צדיק בארץ אשר לא יחטא?
- 2. Further to the above, why didn't they have the same concern regarding bringing a אשם, which is also brought for a sin?
- 3. חלות Says that they brought a תודה along with 40 חלות. Why is the fact that a תודה comes with 40 חלות mentioned here? Other קרבנות which are not mentioned because it a given, so why specify the חלות.
- 4. מנאים says that three תנאים are in agreement that a נזיר is considered a תנאים lt would seem that this statement is in support of the notion that כארים don't make a נדר to become כשרים. If that is the case, how do we explain שמעון הצדיק in this context? Since he was only concerned about a נזירים, why wouldn't the חסידם הראשונים become נזירים and make sure not to become טמא?
- 5. ריש לקיש and רבי יוחנן argue about the nature of כינוים do they argue regarding all כינוים?
- 6. Further to the above, what would be the נפקא מינא between רבי יוחנן and רבי since both agree that it's a valid נדר.

בן ר׳ קיים משה יצחק ז"ל ע״נ הרב צבי ליפא בן יחיאל ישראל זצ״ל

If you have any comments or suggestions, please email Rabbi Grunhaus at Ygrunhaus@gmail.com