## Introduction to פרק שנים עשר – עבול יום

This chapter is focused on issues of פסול – beginning with the status of various פסולי עבודה vis-à-vis taking a קרבנות to be eaten, continuing with detailing who gets which part of קרבנות of the officiant

## 28.12.1

98b (משנה א) <del>></del> 99b (משנה א)

1. **הַמַּקְרִיב** אֶת דַּם הַשְּׁלְמִים וְאֶת הַחֵלֶב מִבְּנֵי אָהַרֹן **לוֹ תִהְיָה** שׁוֹק הַיָּמִין לְמָנָה: ייקרא ז, לג 2. **הַפֹּהָן הַמְחַשֵּא אֹתָה יֹאבֶלְנָה** בְּמָקוֹם קָדֹשׁ תַּאָכֵל בַּחֲצֵר אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד: ייקרא ו, יט 3. **כָּל זָכֶר בַּפֹהָנִים** יֹאכַל אֹתָה קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים הָוֹא: ייקרא ו, כב.

- I משנה אי: which כהנים may divide קדשים, which may perform עבודה
  - a Banned: (even) מחוסר כפורים (who will be fit to eat later) may not divide
  - b אונן an אונן may touch קדשים but not offer, nor may he divide to eat at night
  - c בעלי מום בעלי מום whether permanent or temporary- may divide to eat, but may not perform עבודה
  - d Rule(s): anyone who may not perform אבודה may not divide; and anyone who may not eat the meat may not take pelts
    - Even if: he is טמא at the point of זרה"ד and טהור by the time the fats are burned (that night) per v. 1
  - e Source (ל"ל): v. 2 only the כהן performing may eat
    - i Challenge: the entire משמרה eats, 'tho they only work one day of that week
    - ii Answer: he means "fit to perform"
      - 1 Challenge: a minor, who is not fit to perform עבודה, may eat
      - 2 Answer: he means that anyone who is fit to do אבודה may divide (קולק isn't קולק, but he may eat)
        - (a) Challenge: מעל מום may not perform עבודה, yet he may divide up קדשים for eating
        - (b) Answer: the חילוק included him in חילוק, per v. 3
          - (i) Challenge: perhaps the תורה meant to include טבו"י
          - (ii) Answer: reasonable that בעל מום is included, as he can eat
            - 1. Counter: reasonable that ישבר"י is included, as by nightfall he is fully "fit"
            - 2. Block: indeed but right now he is unfit (to eat or do עבודה)
      - 3 Answer2 (יאכלנה: מיסד): מאכלנה doesn't mean "divide", it means "eat"; anyone who may eat divides; if not doesn't
    - iii טמא (טומאת ערב) is also טמא (טומאת ערב), may they divide for him?
      - 1 Lemma1: the תורה already "overlooked" his blemish and allowed him to eat even if he is שמא
      - 2 Lemma2: only one who may eat divides; if not may not divide (nor be included in division by others)
      - 3 Solution: מה"ג a מחלק → may offer as an אינו מחלק שינו מחלק → must be fit now for eating אינו מחלק
    - iv קרבנות צבור (parallel) question: if a אמש is offering קרבנות, may he divide (to eat that night)?
      - 1 Lemma1: since he is fit to perform עבודה, he may divide
      - 2 Lemma2: since he may not eat during the day, he may not divide
      - 3 Solution: from rule of בה"ג אונן (above) → must be fit to eat during the day to divide → אינו מחלק
- II Analysis of second clause an עבודה may touch קדשים but not perform עבודה
  - a Challenge: מחוסר כפורים an אונן co have contact with טבילה to have contact with
    - i Answer (ד' יוחנן): our משנה s ruling is re: a case where he already went into מקוה
    - ii Challenge: how does his ablution help? His אנינות immediately "springs back"
      - 1 Answer: if he maintains vigilance (no סומאה) regarding טומאה
      - Challenge: if he doesn't maintain vigilance, he requires full טומאת מת from טומאת (3rd/7th day) per ר' יוחנן
        - (a) Answer: he could have maintained vigilance from שרץ but not שרץ
        - (b) Challenge: in that case, he is still (presumably) אמא (not אונן) and he is also banned from תרומה
          - (i) Answer: if he claims that he maintained vigilance against anything rendering him טמא, not נסול
          - (ii) Challenge: can there be "partial vigilance"?
          - (iii) Indeed: per ruling about the basket with shovel on his head only כלי he attended to is טהור
            - 1. Note: shovel doesn't "infect" basket since אין כלי מטמא כלי
            - 2. Question: why doesn't it "infect" that which is inside?
              - a. Answer (רבא): he claims he maintained vigilance against מטמאים, not פוסלים ("partial")
  - b *Note*: entire discussion was presented to ר' יוחנן, who was surprised that they hadn't noted ruling of תרומה if someone ate a שלישי he may touch but not eat תרומה
    - Demonstrating: that רבנן made extra precautions for eating, not touching (as in our case of אונן)