

28.13.4

109a (משנה ד') → 110a (קליש מקלש תיקו)

1. ואלהם תאמר איש איש מבית ישראל ומן הגר אשר יגור בתוכם אשר יעלה עלה או זבח: ויקרא יז, ח
 2. ואל פתח אהל מועד לא יביאנו לעשות אתו לה' ונכרת האיש ההוא מעמיו: ויקרא יז, ט
 3. ולקח מלא המחיתה גחלי אש מעל המזבח מלפני ה' ומלא חפניו קטרת סמים דקה והביא מבית לפרכת: ויקרא טז, יב

I איסור קדשים range of משנה 10

a Whether: he offers קדשים כשרים, or קדשים invalid that became invalid בקדש (i.e. אם עלו לא ירדו) – liable

i Support: ברייתא, interpreting vv. 1-2

1 עולה refers to עולה

2 זבח expands to include אימורים of all זבחים, whether קדשי קדשים or קדשים קלים

3 פתח א"מ expands to include מנחות, נסכים etc. – anything that ought to be brought to מ' א"מ

4 לן, יוצא e.g. קדשים שנפסלו בקדש; קדשים שנפסלו בקדש לעשות etc.

b And: offering up one כזית of עולה (meat) and its אימורין – liable

i Implication: only שלמים ואימוריהם and its אימורי עולה and its meat can combine for כזית, not אימוריהם

ii Support: פנ"ט and העלאה בחוץ for כזית and its אימורין combine for כזית – ברייתא

1 Note: העלאה is understood, as per our ruling

2 But: פנ"ט explicitly states that all פיגולים and נותר combine to generate שעור

(a) Answer: פיגול itself merges (כזית ½ and intent to eat ½ כזית and intent to burn ½ כזית)

(b) And: נותר combines, but combining remains to justify זרה"ד – don't combine

(i) Per: ר' יהושע – if 1 כזית of meat and 1 כזית חלב remain – do זרה"ד; if only ½ כזית each – don't do זרה"ד

1. However: if it is an עולה, the two halves combine to allow זרה"ד

2. Addendum: in re: מנחת נסכים (that accompanies a קרבן) – even if it is entirely present, no זרה"ד is

performed (if there isn't sufficient אימורין left)

II מנחות ונסכים – of כזית but less than the proper amount – dispute חכמים ר"א about 20 משנה

a If: he offered קומץ or לבונה (of a מנחה), קטורת, מנחת כהנים, מנחת כ"ג (incl. מנחת נסכים) or מנחת נסכים

i חכמים: liable if he offered כזית

ii ר"א: only liable if he offers the full amount (of the proper קרבן)

b If: he offered all but כזית inside then offered the last כזית outside – all agree he is liable

i Related, ברייתא: if he is חייב כזית outside he's מקטיר; if he offers פירס ½ (the prescribed amount of קטורת) inside – פטור

1 Assumption: 2nd clause refers to a non-כהן being exempt for offering קטורת

(a) Challenge: he did offer a כזית – why should he be exempt

2 Rather (רב): means the צבור is exempt, i.e. has fulfilled its obligation of קטורת

3 Challenge (ר' זירא): רב commented that ר"א would assent to this ruling

(a) Explanation: in our משנה ר"א requires full offering for liability → would require full for מצוה (inside)

4 Answer1 (רבא): in re: (daily) הקטרת in היכל, all agree that no שעור is needed, not for מצוה nor for בחוץ (חיוב)

(a) Dispute: is re: הקטרה of יוה"כ, whether v. 3 indicates a שעור or not

(b) Challenge (אב"י): but חוקה (indicating specificity) is written in re: יוה"כ

5 Answer2 (אב"י): all agree that הקטרה דיוה"כ requires a שעור;

(a) Dispute: is re: הקטרה of היכל – whether we infer from פנים or not

(b) Challenge (רבא): חכמים aren't even willing to infer מחוץ, why would they infer מפנים

(i) Background: no liability for less than 3 לוגים of wine – even though that includes more than כזית

6 Answer3 (רבא): case where he put both ½ כזיתים in one כלי; dispute is whether the כלי joins them

(a) Observation: the one who maintains that they are not joined would hold that if you put 6 לוגים for a פר, took out 4 and offered them up outside, liable (as 4 is the שעור נסכים for a ram); if he set aside 4 and took out 3 – liable (as 3 is the שעור נסכים for a lamb); but if any less – exempt

(b) Defense (of אב"י's position, contra רבא's challenge): הקטרה don't infer ניסוק from הקטרה, but are willing to infer

בחוץ from הקטרה, even though one is בפנים and the other בחוץ

- c *And if*: any of it was lost before offering it up and he offered it outside – all agree he is exempt
- i *Question*: if it is lost outside, is that considered חסרון?
- 1 *Lemma1*: once its gone out, its פסול – doesn't matter if it's complete or not
 - 2 *Lemma2*: only חוץ which is "extant" is liable
 - 3 *Answer* (אב"י): ר"א's approach – must be שלם
 - (a) *Challenge* (רבא): how can we infer from ר"א?
 - (b) *Answer*: he heard in רב's name – explicitly – that רבנן only disagree with ר"א if it is all there, but if חסר, they agree
 - (i) *Counter*: perhaps that only means if it was חסר while inside
 - (c) *Proposal*: from end of משנה – if any of them were missing – פטור
 - (i) *Counter*: that means if they were חסר while still inside
- III הו משנה: and their אימורים offered together generate liability
- a *Challenge*: there is a חציצה (between אימורין and מזבח – the meat!)
- i *Answer1* (שמואל): if he turned them over
 - ii *Answer2* (ר' יוחנן): even if he didn't turn them over – follows ר"ש – even putting it up on a rock is חייב
 - iii *Answer3* (רב): מין במינו (רב) is not a חציצה (all meat)
- IV ה2 משנה: special status of מנחה שלא נקמצה
- a *If*: he had a מנחה that hadn't yet had קומץ taken and offered it outside – exempt
- b *But if*: the קומץ fell back in to the מנחה and he offered it בחוץ – liable
- i *Question*: why don't שיריים nullify קומץ (which fell back in)?
 - ii *Answer* (ר' זירא): הקטרה is a rule of קומץ and of שיריים, just as קומץ doesn't nullify קומץ, so שיריים don't nullify קומץ
- V ה1 משנה: dispute ר"א/חכמים about offering part of the קומץ outside
- a *If*: he offered either קומץ or לבונה outside
- i חכמים: liable
 - ii ר"א: exempt until he offers both outside
 - iii *However*: if he offered one inside and the other outside – all agree that he is liable
- b *If*: he offered 1 of the לבונה בויכי (לחם הפנים) outside
- i חכמים: liable
 - ii ר"א: exempt – until he offers both
 - iii *However*: if he offered one inside and the other outside – all agree that he is liable
- c יצחק נפחא's query: does קומץ alone permit half the מנחה to be eaten or not?
- i *Explanation*: he is wondering if each מתיר (קומץ and לבונה) is מתיר half or "weakens" the איסור
- 1 *Question*: according to whom is he asking
 - (a) *If*: according to ר"מ – who maintains בחתי מתיר – obviously each מתיר permits half
 - (b) *If*: according to רבנן (of ר"מ) – obviously it does neither (אין מפגלין בחצי מתיר)
 - (c) *If*: according to ר"א (here) – he holds like רבנן דר"מ
 - (d) *Rather*: he is asking according to רבנן דר"א (here)
 - (i) *Do they hold*: that each מתיר is מתיר half –
 - (ii) *Or do they hold*: that each מתיר weakens the איסור - תיקו