

28.2.10

26a (משנה א) → 27b (האי רצפה והאי כלי שרת)

1. כי נפש הבשר בדם הוא ואני נתתי לכם על המזבח לכפר על נפשתיכם כי הדם הוא בנפש ויקרא יז:א
2. ואם האכל יאכל מבשר זבח שלמיו ביום השלישי לא ירצה המקריב אתו לא יחשב לו פגול יהיה והנפש האכלת ממנו עונה תשא ויקרא ז:ח
3. צו את אהרן ואת בניו לאמר זאת תורת העלה הוא העלה על מוקדה על המזבח כל הלילה עד הבקר ואש המזבח תוקד בו ויקרא ו:ב

- I כרת נסתור, but there is no פסול - in all these cases (זרה"ד) - status of קרבן if דם was placed in the incorrect location (for זרה"ד)
- a If: he placed the דם on the ramp (כבש) away from the סוד
- b Or: placed דם that is to be put above the חוט הסיקרא below (or vice-versa)
- c Or: placed דם that is to go inside the מקדש on the outer מזבח (or vice-versa)
- II Dispute שמואל/רשב"ל as to extent of the פסול in these cases
- a שמואל: only the meat is פסול (may not be eaten), but the קרבן is valid and counts for the בעלים' obligation
- i Source: v. 1 – as long as דם goes on the מזבח, there is כפרה
- 1 Challenge: if so, it should be fully valid (even meat)
- (a) Answer: לכפר (v. 1) – but not for other consequences
- ii Inference: שמואל maintains that דם placed in the incorrect location is considered to have been placed in correct one
- 1 Challenge: גב: זבחים – if דם was placed (per all of our examples) – יחזור הכשר ויקבל (and then do proper זרה"ד)
- (a) And if: שלא במקומו כמקומו – no need for this
- (i) And cannot be: for purposes of permitting the meat to be eaten
- (ii) Reason: we don't allow a new זרה"ד just for that purpose
- 2 Answer: in this case, a פסול (e.g. זור, אונן) did קבלה (hence "יחזור הכשר ויקבל")
- (a) Challenge: if so, קרבן should be considered "rejected" (דחוי) as if פסול had done זרה"ד in the right place
- (b) Explanation: גא: מחשבת חוץ לזמנו/מקומו פסול with קבה"ד was done by a פסול stipulates that if דם was done by a פסול
- (i) Then: if there is any הנפש left, a כשר should redo קבלה
- (ii) Inference: this will only work if the קבלה was done in this manner, not זרה"ד – assumedly, due to דחוי
1. Correction: reason that זרה"ד is no longer an option is due to מחשבת פסולה
2. Challenge: then it should apply to קבלה
3. Furthermore: רבא - מחשבת פסול is only meaningful by proper person, item and location
- (iii) Rather: proper inference – only works if קבלה is done in this manner – excluding שחיטה
1. Challenge: if this teaches that פסול can have meaningful מחשבת פסול at שחיטה – already taught (גא:)
2. Answer: גא: teaches that from קבלה onward, מחשבת פסול isn't meaningful (if פסול is acting) - per רבא
- 3 Challenge: if he intended to put דם in wrong place today – כשר; subsequent למקומו/זמנו פסול → פיגול (only) פסול → מחשבת חוץ למקומו/זמנו invalid
- (a) But if: he intended to put דם in wrong place tomorrow – פסול; subsequent ... מחשבת חוץ למקומו/זמנו invalid
- (i) Explanation: if שלא במקומו כמקומו (שמואל) – this last case should be פיגול (intent for tomorrow)
- (ii) Defense (מר זוטרא): only זרה"ד which could allow meat to be eaten could lead to פיגול – per v. 2
1. Challenge (ר' אשי): then it shouldn't be פסול at all
2. Answer (רנב"י): still an invalid מחשבת דם, per יהודה's approach to הינוח
- b רשב"ל: it is fully פסול; tho he also rules that במקומו כמקומו – פסול
- i Resolution: if he placed it w/o saying anything – valid (מכפר); if he had מחשבת פיגול – not מכפר
- 1 Continuation: per above דין, following same challenges and conclusion (ר' יהודה's solution, following רנב"י)
- c ר' יוחנן: it is fully פסול and both cases are בשתיקה and במקומו דמי
- i Resolution: if there is enough דם left to complete process, he may do so; if not, no solution
- d Challenge (to all 3): why, after intent to put דם in wrong place, does מחשבת פיגול lead to כרת ואין בו כרת?
- i To ז"ל: clear; as the intent wouldn't invalidate קרבן
- ii To יוחנן: challenge – misleading, as that first intent would have invalidated קרבן (already פסול ואב"כ)
- iii To שמואל: challenge, as he must interpret משנה as having put דם w/o לזמנו – why is it פסול?
- 1 Answer: means – and if he added מחשבת חוץ לזמנו, it would be פסול ואב"כ (per מר זוטרא's explanation)

- e Challenge to יוחנן if דם במקומו if ד' יוחנן – שלא במקומו if ד' יוחנן – consider דם put in wrong place as הכלי – and he can (re-)collect it
- i Answer: ר' יוחנן holds that our תנא follows approach of לא יאספנו – may not be re-collected
- 1 all agree that if דם were put in proper place incorrectly (e.g. בשמאל) – cannot do new זרה"ד
(a) Disagreement: if דם were put in improper place (up/down, in/out) – ר' יוסי – no re-do; ר"ש – redo
(i) And: our משנה follows ר' יוסי
- 2 all agree that even if דם were placed down instead of up (and ק"ו up instead of down, as it ends up "down" anyway) that the מזבח already "captured" it and no new זרה"ד is possible
(a) Disagreement: ר"ש, זריקה-re-יוסי permits a in/out; ר' יוסי does not allow
- 3 Support (רנב"י): ר' יהודה vs. ר"ש in re: v. 3 (for יוחנן's position (and אבימי's) – dispute)
(a) אם עלו – ידרו) מזבח remaining on מיעוטין 3 – זאת היא העולה ד' יהודה:
(i) Slaughtered at night; if the blood was spilt (before קבלה) and if the דם went out of its precinct
(b) חוץ extends to include the above, plus טמא, יוצא, לון, if it was slaughtered with intent of חוץ or למקומו or לזמנו, or if the blood was put in the incorrect locus (up/down, in/out) or פסח וחטאת that were slaughtered לשמן – all of these, if put on מזבח, remain there
(i) Per: העולה – one rule for all קרבנות that have been brought "up"
(ii) However: this does not extend to נרבע, גורע, נועד, מוקצה, זונה, מחיר כלב/אתנת, דופן, כלאים/טרפיפה/יוצא דופן, מחריר כלב/אתנת, זונה, מוקצה/נועד, רובע/נרבע
1. Justifying distinction: 1st list has their פסול in the קודש; 2nd list were פסולים beforehand
(iii) Point: ר"ש's list includes דם placed in wrong locus and ר' יהודה doesn't disagree
1. Implication: the מזבח already "absorbed" the דם (successfully) → לא יאספנו (cannot do another זרה"ד)
- III ר' אליעזר – the inner מזבח (זהב) also "absorbs" פסולים
- a Question: what is he teaching? ברייתות (above) all mention "in/out", which includes דמים חיצוניים going on מזבח הפנימי
- i Answer: from our ברייתות, we would only know that דם בפנים is נקלט בפנים (since there is דם בפנים);
(עבודת דם בפנים);
1 But: we wouldn't know that קומץ (which never goes inside) would remain up, inside
2 Challenge: a foreign קטורת that goes on מזבח should go down
(a) Reason: only the outer מזבח sanctifies that which is (generally) fit for it
(i) Inference: but the inner מזבח doesn't "absorb" anything put errantly
(ii) Incorrect: proper inference – but outer מזבח only "accepts" that which is otherwise fit – not קטורת
(iii) But: inner מזבח – accepts both that which is fit and that which isn't fit
(iv) Reason: outer מזבח is considered like כלי שרת (more "powerful")