

28.3.3

34b (המעלה מאימוריהן בחוץ פטור הא מאימורי אימן חייב) → 35b (וכולן שקבלו)



- I End of 'א – משנה א – if פסולים did קבה"ד with קבה"ד חוץ לזמנו/מקומו, a כשר may go back and do קבה"ד (if there's still הנפש דם)
 - a question version 1 (ר"ל לר"י): if פסול does זרה"ד, is the rest of the דם now שיריים (→ can no longer perform זרה"ד) or not?
 - i answer: only זריקה פסולה which "counts" (thereby generating שיריים) is מחשבת חוץ לזמנו/מקומו, since its מרצה לפיגולו
 - b version2 (per ר"ל זבד): asked if כוס פסול (e.g. יוצא) is used, does that generate שיריים?
 - i answer: whatever you contend is true about a פסול doing זרה"ד (per v. 1), same will apply to כוס פסול
 - c version3 (per ר' ירמיה מדפתי): what does כוס 1 make the other (if דם was collected in multiple כוסות)?
 - i דחוי and it is spilled out in אמה that cuts through עזרה, OR
 - ii שיריים and is spilled, like all "remainders", at יסוד המזבח
 - iii Answer: it is a dispute רבנן ש"ר, רבנן ברייתא, in רבנן which reconciles vv. 1-2 (כל הדם vs. דם)
 - 1 חכמים: if he got חטאת דם in 4 cups and used each for 1 מתנה, rest of each goes to יסוד; if one wasn't used – לאמה
 - 2 ר' אבהו: in all cases, all goes to יסוד; v. 1 excludes remainders that were דם הצוואר (i.e. never made it to כלי)
- II קבלה status of "interrupted" משנה ב'
 - a If: a כשר did proper קבלה (with his right hand in a שרת) and then gave to a פסול, put into his left, or into חול
 - i Solution: he should put take/put it back (into right hand/שרת) כלי
 - b If: it spilled out of the כלי and he gathered it up - valid
 - c If: he put the דם in an incorrect locus (per ב:א above), if there is any הנפש דם left, a כשר should go back and do קבלה
- III Analysis of 'ב:
 - a Justification (of 3 cases – פסול, left hand, כלי חול):
 - i If: only taught פסול סד"א, טמא (only), who is permitted צבור (when צבור טמא מת) – but not שמאל
 - ii And if: taught שמאל סד"א, since it is validly used on יוה"כ (when עבודה יוה"כ brings the קטורת in), but not חול כלי
 - iii And if: taught חול סד"א, כלי שרת, since they could (at any time) be sanctified to be שרת כלי, valid; but not פסול and שמאל
 - b Question: why isn't every one of these cases דחוי (i.e. once it goes to left hand, e.g., should be irrevocably invalidated)
 - i Answer1 (ר' ירמיה מדפתי): follows חנן המצרי, who doesn't read such cases as דחוי
 - 1 Background: in case of יוה"כ שעייר, even if the דם השעייר (לה') was in the כוס and the המשתלח died
 - (a) We don't rule: that the דם should be spilled and another pair must be brought (דחוי)
 - (b) Rather: we may bring another שעייר to be sent out
 - ii Answer2 (ר' אשי): all would agree – דחוי in case of something that the officiant can repair (e.g. put in right)
 - 1 Support: יהודה ר' accepts דחויין (such as these) – per his ruling re: שעייר יוה"כ, yet he holds that כל שבידו – דחוי no
 - 2 Background: he reports that they would collect דם from all the פסחים and, at the end of the day (יד) they would perform one זריקה towards the יסוד – ostensibly to repair any mis-performed פסחים
 - (a) Analysis: כלי חול challenged ר"י – but the דם may not have had proper קבלה בכלי
 - (i) ר"י are כהנים, and don't allow it; problem is the haste which may lead to spillage from כלי
 - (b) Challenge: דם התמצית is mixed in
 - (c) Answer: ר"י is consistent – he holds that דם התמצית דם is considered דם, per his dissent and ruling that there is a חיוב כרת for eating התמצית
 - (i) block: ר"א noted that even ר"י agrees that דם התמצית דם cannot generate כפרה – per v. 3
 - (d) rather: ר"י is consistent – he holds that דם cannot nullify דם → דם התמצית דם doesn't "blot out" דם הנפש
 - (e) Challenge (ר"י לחכמים): why are drains stopped up in עזרה
 - (i) Answer: it is aesthetically pleasing to have כהנים walking in דם (of קרבנות)
 - 1. Note: not a חציצה, as it is liquid
 - 2. Note: not a problem of doing עבודה in stained clothes, even though they don't lift them up (v. 4)
 - a. But: they walk on איצטבאות from place to place, except to perform non-essential acts, like placing wood on מערכה at which time they may lift up garments

- IV 'ג' משנה ג' that doesn't invalidate (I)
- a *If*: he intended to eat an inedible or burn a non-burnable – כשר
 i *Dissent*: ר"א invalidates
- b *If*: he intended to eat ½ כזית (of בשר) or burn ½ כזית (of אימורין) – כשר
- c *If*: he intended to eat ½ כזית (of בשר) and burn ½ כזית (of אימורין) – כשר
 i *Reason*: הקטרה and אכילה cannot be merged
- V 'ד' משנה ד' – focus on non-essential and inedibles
- a *Intent*: to eat skin, gravy, spices (left in pot), neck tendons, bones, tendons, horns, feet לזמנו/מקומו
 i *And*: these are not affected by נותר וטמא פיגול
- VI 'ה' משנה ה' – focus on by-products of animal
- a *If*: he did שחיטה (e.g.) with intent to eat the foetus or placenta – no פיגול
- b *If*: he did מליקה with intent to eat the birds' eggs לזמנו – no פיגול
- c *Byproducts*: milk of מוקדשים and eggs of the fowl do not attach to נותר וטמא
 i פיגול ל"א uni-directional
 1 *If*: he effected פיגול on a זבח, the placenta is included; but not the inverse
 2 *If*: he effected פיגול on the edible neck-tendon, the esophagus is included; but not the inverse
 3 *If*: he effected פיגול on the אימורין (of פרים הנשרפים) – the פרים are included; but not the inverse
 ii *Proposed support*: ר"ש וחכמים, who disagree about "reach" of פיגול, agree that intent re: פרים doesn't make פיגול
 1 *Inference*: inverse is effective – פיגול about אימורין renders פרים into פיגול
 2 *Rejection*: inference is that if he intended פיגול about אימורין, that is effective – אימורין (alone)
 iii *Proposal*: חטאות הנשרפות have מעילה from moment of הקדש; once slaughtered, they are now vulnerable to invalidity via touch of טב"י כפורים, טב"י לניה.
 1 *Assumption*: לניה refers to לינת בשר → intent to burn meat after its time is also פיגול
 2 *Rejection*: אימורין לניה
 (a) *Challenge*: סיפא states that מעילה applies as long as the meat is being burned, until it is melted
 (b) *Implication*: entire משנה is referring to בשר, not אימורין
 (c) *Rejection*: each section is referring to its own precinct; אימורין to רישא; בשר to סיפא
 iv *Challenge (רובה)*: list of animal parts, including placenta, that aren't מתפגל nor מפגל; no liability for בחוץ and no attachment to נותר וטמא
 1 *Assumption*: מפגל – errant thoughts about them have no effect; מתפגל – cannot be affected by פיגול
 2 *Rejection*: מפגל – as above; מתפגל – in and of themselves
 (a) *Challenge*: סיפא teaches מתפגלים ואין מתפגלים – unnecessary
 (i) *And*: no liability for פנ"ט – unnecessary
 (b) *Rather*: each is taught in its own context
 v *Support (רובה)*: שחיטה done with מחשבות about foetus doesn't create פיגול
 1 *Nor*: מליקה with מחשבות about eggs – פיגול no
 2 *then*: no פנ"ט for eggs or milk of מוקדשין
 (a) *Implication*: but placenta could be under ban of פנ"ט
 (b) *Resolution*: they could be included if essential קרבן was מתפגל; but not מחמת עצמן
 d Side-door: ר"ע dissents and allows מום בעלי מום that were put on מזבח to remain (*contra* חכמים – אם עלו ירדו – בעופות מום, and only if מום came after הקדש)
 i ר"ע permits only "fine" מום since such a מום is valid בעופות, and only if מום came after הקדש (בשם ר"י)
 ii ר"ע agrees that an עולת נקבה is considered מום בעלת מום before הקדש
 1 *Challenge*: inference from ברייתא (above) – המעלה מהן בחוץ פטור – but from their mothers – חייב
 (a) *But*: that must be an עולת נקבה; how can there be חייב if ירדו? אם עלו ירדו?
 2 *Answer*: inference is incorrect – not the mothers but their אימורין generate liability for בחוץ
 (a) *Challenge*: but אימורין are not parallel to "מהן"
 (b) *Rather*: מאימורי אמן חייב → המעלה מאימוריהן בחוץ פטור ברייתא