

28.8.8

81b → 83a (משנה יא)

1. וְכָל חֲטָאת אֲשֶׁר יִבֶּא מִדְּמָה אֶל אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד לְכַפֵּר בְּקֹדֶשׁ לֹא תֹאכַל בְּאֵשׁ תִּשְׂרֹף: וּיקרא ו:בג
 2. לֹא תִאָּפֵף חֲמֵץ חֲלָקִים נִתְּתִי אֵתְּךָ מֵאֲשֵׁי קֹדֶשׁ קֹדְשִׁים הוּא פְחֻטָּאִת וְכֹאֲשֵׁם: וּיקרא ו,י
 3. הֵן לֹא הוּבָא אֶת דְּמָה אֶל הַקֹּדֶשׁ פְּנִימָה אֲכֹל תֹּאכְלוּ אֵתְּךָ בְּקֹדֶשׁ פְּאֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִי: וּיקרא י:ח
 4. וְהִנֹּחֵת מִבֶּשֶׂר הַזֶּבַח בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי בְּאֵשׁ יִשְׂרָף: וּיקרא ז:ז
 5. אִם הֵאָכַל יֹאכַל בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי פְּגוּל הוּא לֹא יִרְצָה:: וּיקרא יט:ז
 6. וְאֲנָשִׁי קֹדֶשׁ תִּהְיוּ לִי וּבִשֹׁר בְּשֻׂדָּה טְרֵפָה לֹא תֹאכְלוּ לְכָלֵב תִּשְׁלַכְנוּ אֹתוֹ: שְׁמוֹת כ:ב
 7. וְכָל אֲדָם לֹא יִהְיֶה בְּאֹהֶל מוֹעֵד בְּבֹאֵל לְכַפֵּר בְּקֹדֶשׁ עַד צֵאתוֹ וְכַפֵּר בְּעֵדוֹ וּבְעֵד בֵּיתוֹ וּבְעֵד כָּל קֹהֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל: וּיקרא טז:ז
 8. וְאֵת פֶּרֶי הַחֲטָאת וְאֵת שְׂעִיר הַחֲטָאת אֲשֶׁר הוּבָא אֶת דְּמָם לְכַפֵּר בְּקֹדֶשׁ יוֹצִיא אֶל מַחוּץ לְמַחֲנֶה וְשִׂרְפוּ בְּאֵשׁ אֶת עֶרְתָּם וְאֵת בְּשָׂרָם וְאֵת פְּרָשָׁם: וּיקרא טז:כז
 9. וְהִשְׂרֹף אֹתָם יַכְבֵּס בְּגָדָיו וְרַחַץ אֶת בִּשְׂרוֹ בַּמַּיִם וְאַחֲרֵי כֵן יָבוֹא אֶל הַמַּחֲנֶה: וּיקרא טז:כח

- I **יא** משנה: mixture of דמים פנימיים with דמים חיצוניים as stemming from v. 1
- a *if*: the two mixed – all are spilled out
 - i *question*: why doesn't ר"א disagree here as well (and employ "רואין")?
 - 1 *answer*: no solution –
 - (a) *cannot*: begin outside; just as there is a מצוה to start with עליונים, so too with פנימיים דמים
 - (b) *and if*: he starts inside, in the case of חטאת ואשם, that invalidates them – cannot declare a blanket ruling
 - b *if*: he put the mixture on the outer מזבח and then on the inner – valid
 - c *but if*: he put the mixture inside and then outside:
 - i *invalid*; *reason*: any דם that enters the היכל invalidates its קרבן ד"ע
 - ii *valid*; *counter*: above-stated rule only applies to דם חטאת חכמים
 - iii *also the אשם*, as per v. 2
- II Analysis of dispute ר"ע/חכמים, if v. 1 only applies to דם חטאת (חכמים) or to all קרבנות (ר"ע)
- a ר"ע's approach (interpreting v. 1 as applying to all קדשים [context: v. 1 is end of החטאת 'פ]); similar to servant pouring hot water for master, then his master requests that he pour – means both cold/hot, else no need to restate;
 - i *similarly*: text is already dealing with חטאת, no need to mention חטאת in v. 1 – if not to expand to all קדשים
 - ii *challenge* (ר' הונא בריה דר"י): but we extend ושיטה (ד"ר) (verse before v.1) to all קדשים
 - 1 *therefore*: more similar to slave pouring both, now master only wants "hot" – i.e. only applies to חטאת
 - b ר"ע infers from חטאת *וכל* – expanding to all קדשי קלים then to all קדשים קלים
 - i *cannot expand beyond חטאת* וכל expands to חטאת יחיד and even חטאת זכר (שעיר נשיא) חטאת זכר
 - ii *challenge*: ריה"ג understands v. 1 to be in re: פרים הנשרפים, that they are burnt הבירה and there is a ל"ת for eating
 - 1 *response to ריה"ג*: what is source for פסול of blood that went inside? (answer: v. 3)
 - 2 *answer*: he was responding to ר"ע (and his derivations from v. 1) – but he doesn't accept it at all
- III **יב** משנה: relationship between דם חטאת holding כוסות when one goes inside
- a *if*: a חטאת's blood was received in two chalices
 - i *if*: one went out of the עזרה, the other is still כשר
 - ii *but if*: one went into the היכל,
 - 1 *ריה"ג*: one that remained outside is still valid
 - 2 *חכמים*: all דם (→ קרבן) is invalid
 - (a) *argument* (ריה"ג): if outside, where intent to offer there invalidates קרבן ("מחשבת חוץ"), but one כוס doesn't
 - (i) *then certainly*: inside, where intent is not פוסל, one כוס shouldn't invalidate the other
 - (b) *response* (חכמים בברייתא): v. 1 – מדמה implies "even any of its blood"
 - (i) *counter* (ריה"ג בברייתא): then יוצא should invalidate all of the blood via ק"ו (from no מחשבת חוץ re: פנים)
 - (c) *response*: verse states אשר יובא – only דם going inside invalidates (rest), not יוצא
 - (i) *counter*: מחשבת פנים should invalidate, via ק"ו from מחשבת חוץ (where some דם doesn't rest פוסל)
 - (d) *response*: v. 4 uses שלישי → only a location which is משולש (דם, בשר, אימורים) can count for חוץ מחשבת חוץ
 - (i) *counter*: then מחשבת חוץ should not invalidate, ק"ו from מחשבת פנים
 - (e) *response*: v. 5 – שלישי refers to חוץ לזמנו – חוץ למקומו
 - (i) *addendum* (to ברייתא) בשר which goes out is פסול, but if it goes into היכל – valid
 - 1. *in spite of ק"ו*: if דם going in invalidates, certainly בשר (which even invalidates if "out") should
 - 2. *then בשר ק"ו* outside should not be פוסל based on above ק"ו turned inside-out
 - a. *response*: v. 6- any meat outside of its precinct is (considered like) טריפה - אסור

- b if he went inside (with **דם חיצון**) to be **מכפר**
- i **ל"א**: invalid once he enters
 - ii **ל"ש**: only invalid after he puts it on **מזבח** (or **פרוכת**)
 - iii **ל"ה יהודה**: if he took it in **בשוגג** – doesn't invalidate
- c *role of the ציץ*: any **דם פסול** put on **מזבח** doesn't effect **כפרה**; **ציץ** only effects for **קרבן** brought **בטומאה**, not for **יוצא**
- IV Source for **דם פסול** of **דם** going inside (v. 1)
- a **ברייתא** v. 1 implies only **קודש**, **אל הקודש**, **קדק"ד** expands to **היכל**
 - i *challenge*: why not just state **קודש** (=היכל) then **פנימה** is *ipso facto* an invalidating locus
 - 1 *answer1* (**רבא**): **קודש** informs us that **קודש** means **היכל**, not **קדק"ד**, per our read of **תושב ושכיר**
 - (a) (*background*): neither a **תושב** or **שכיר** of a **כהן** eats **תרומה**; w/o **שכיר**, we might have thought that **תושב** referred to a "simple" **עבד עברי**, but a **נרצע** eats → we need both, to "push" **תושב** to mean **נרצע** (נרצע **תושב** to mean **נרצע**)
 - (b) *challenge* (**אביי**): in that case, there are two distinct people; even if the **תורה** stated **לא ירצע**, **שכיר** would be derivable via **ק"ו** and sometimes the **תורה** states such things (**קרא**); but here, once you've gone in to the **היכל**, already **פסול** – no need to state that **לפני ולפנים** invalidates
 - 2 *answer2* (**אביי**): **פנימה** is needed for case where he brought the **דם** in through e.g. a window
 - (a) **רבא**: that isn't called **הבאה**
 - 3 *answer3* (**רבא**): means that if he had intent to bring to **קדק"ד**, not invalidated (yet) in **היכל**
- V **רבא**: sequence of questions applying v. 1
- a *first*: if he brings **דם פנימי** into **קדק"ד**
 - i *lemma1*: only invalid if there is a prohibition of bringing into **קודש**; here, it belongs there → **פסול** no
 - ii *lemma2*: it isn't the proper place for this **דם** → **פסול**
 - iii *if we accept lemma2*: **פר ושעיר של יוה"כ** that were brought into **קדק"ד**, with **הזאה**, then brought to **היכל** and back in
 - 1 *lemma1*: this one really does belong here (earlier) → **כשר**
 - 2 *lemma2*: once it has gone out, it has gone out → **פסול**
 - 3 *if we accept lemma2*: if he put that **דם** on the **פרוכת**, then brought to **מזבח פנימי** and back between **מזבח** and **פרוכת**
 - (a) *lemma1*: this is all one place
 - (b) *lemma2*: this is called **תיקו** – **יציאה**?
- VI Analysis of end of **משנה** – dispute **ר"א/ר"ש** and **ר' יהודה** about intent
- a **ברייתא** **ר"א** connects our verse (**לכפר בקודש**) with v. 7 – which is before **כפרה** (→ once he brings in – **פסול**)
 - i **ל"ש**: connects our verse with v. 8 – which is after **כפרה** (meat is being burnt at this point)
 - ii *point of disagreement*: whether it is preferable to learn **חוץ מחוץ** (**ר"א**), rather than **חוץ מפנים** (from **יהוה"כ**)
 - 1 **ל"ש**: prefers to learn **בהמה מבהמה**, not from **אדם** (v. 7 warns people to be out of **היכל** when **כה"ג** is doing **עבודה**)
 - b *inference from יהודה*: if he brought it in **במזיד** – **פסול**
 - i *question*: per **ר"א** (even without **כפרה**) or only per **ר"ש** (after **כפרה**)?
 - ii *answer* (**ר' ירמיה**): from **ברייתא**, where **ר' יהודה** sees extra word **והשורף** (v. 9)
 - 1 *block*: **והשורף** is not extra – needed to teach that anyone burning **פר ושעיר של יוה"כ** has **טומאת בגדים**
 - 2 *rather*: extra word **חטאת** (twice – in v. 8) – teaches that anyone burning any **פריים הנשרפים** has **טומאת בגדים**
 - 3 **ל"מ**: not needed, inferred from **לכפר** (v. 8)
 - (a) **ל"ה יהודה**: didn't use **לכפר** because he needed for **גז"ש** (a la **ר"ש**)
 - (i) *therefore*: **ר' יהודה** only invalidates if brought in **במזיד** and **כפרה** is effected