28.2.10

26a (משנה אז) → 27b (משנה אז)

7. כִּי נֶפֶשׁ הַבָּשֶׂר בִּדָּם הָוֹא **וַאֲנִי נְתַתִּיו לֶכֶם עַל הַמְּזְבֵח לְכֵפֵּר** עַל נַפְשׁתֵיכֶם כִּי הַדָּם הוֹא בַּנֶּפֶשׁ יְכַבֶּר: יִיק*רא יוּ:יא* 2. וְאָם **הַאָלֵל יֵאָכֵל** מִבְּשַׁר זֶבַח שְׁלָמִיו בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי לֹא יֵרְצֶה הַמַּקְרִיב אֹתוֹ לֹא יֵחָשֵׁב לוֹ **בְּנִּיב** מְהָיְרֶה הָאַלֶּה תְּשְׁא: יִיקרא יִיכּה 3. צֵו אֶת אָהַרֹן וָאָת בָּנִיו לֶאמֹר זֹאת תּוֹרָת הַעַלָּה הָוֹא הָעָלָה עָל מוֹקְדָה עַל הַמַּזְבָּח כָּלְ

- נרת אב status of פרול, if שו was placed in the incorrect location (for "דרה"ד in all these cases, משנה אב but there is no סרת
  - a If: he placed the סוד on the ramp (כבש) away from the יסוד
  - b Or: placed דם that is to be put above the חוט הסיקרא below (or vice-versa)
  - on the outer מזבח (or vice-versa) מזבח on the outer מקדש (or vice-versa)
- II Dispute שמואל/רשב"ל as to extent of the פסול in these cases
  - a שמואל: only the meat is בעלים (may not be eaten), but the קרבן is valid and counts for the בעלים's obligation
    - i Source: v. 1 as long as דם goes on the מזבח, there is
      - 1 *Challenge*: if so, it should be fully valid (even meat)
        - (a) Answer: לכפר (v. 1) but not for other consequences
    - ii Inference: אמואל maintains that דם placed in the incorrect location is considered to have been placed in correct one
      - 1 Challenge: יחזור הכשר ויקבל if יחזור המשר יוקבל was placed (per all of our examples) זבחים ג:ב (and then do proper זרח"ר
        - (a) And if: שלא במקומו 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. זר, אונן) did קבלה (hence "יחזור הכשר ויקבל")
        - (a) Challenge: if so, קדבן should be considered "rejected" (דחוי) as if מסול had done זהה"ד in the right place
        - (b) Explanation: ג:א stipulates that if קבה"ד was done by a מחשבת with מקומו אווע לזמנו/מקומו
          - (i) Then: if there is any דם הנפש left, a כשר should redo קבלה
          - (ii) Inference: this will only work if the קבלה was done in this manner, not דחרי assumedly, due to
            - 1. Correction: reason that זרה"ד is no longer an option is due to מחשבה פסולה
            - 2. Challenge: then it should apply to קבלה
            - 3. Furthermore: מחשבת פסול רבא 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 א an שמיטה at מחשבת פסול already taught (ג:א)
            - 2. Answer: א: 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 − פיגול subsequent; subsequent מיגול למקומר/זמנו counts → פיגול
        - (a) But if: he intended to put דם in wrong place tomorrow פסול, subsequent ... מחשבת חוץ invalid מסול (only)
          - (i) Explanation: if שמאל במקומו (per 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 (ד' אשי): then it shouldn't be פסול at all
            - 2. Answer (רנב"י): still an invalid מחשבת הינוח 's approach to מרשבת (ג:ו)
  - b במקומו: it is fully פסול; 'tho he also rules that שלא
    - i Resolution: if he placed it w/o saying anything valid (מכפר); if he had מכפר not מדשבת פיגול
      - 1 Continuation: per above דיון, following same challenges and conclusion (ר' יהודה solution, following הייד, following ר' יהודה
  - c בשתיקה and both cases are בשתיקה and במקומו לאו כמקומו דמי at it is fully שלא במקומו לאו כמקומו דמי
    - i Resolution: if there is enough T 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! ead to מחשבת פיגול?
    - i To יד"ל. clear; as the intent wouldn't invalidate קרבן
    - ii To ייחנן (already ד' challenge misleading, as that first intent would have invalidated די ייחנן, (already קשיא (פסול ואב"כ
    - iii To שמואל: challenge, as he must interpret משנה as having put דם w/o מחשבת חוץ לזמנו why is it מסול ?
      - 1 Answer: means and if he added מר זוטרא (per מר זוטרא) (per מר זוטרא) (sexplanation)

- e Challenge to נשפך מן הכלי if יוחען consider ב put in wrong place as נשפך מן הכלי and he can (re-)collect it
  - Answer: ל יוחנן הlolds that our ל follows approach of לא יאספנו may not be re-collected
    - 1 איי. all agree that if שם were put in proper place incorrectly (e.g. בשמאל) cannot do new זרה"ד
      - (a) Disagreement: if א were put in improper place (up/down, in/out) ר"ש no re-do; ר"ש redo
        - (i) And: our משנה follows ר' יוסי
    - 2 אבימי 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: in/out; ר' יוסי permits a re-דיקה does not allow
    - 3 Support (ר' יוחגן: for ר' יוחנן): for ר' יוחנן: oposition (and אבימי's) dispute ר' יהודה יהודה ייהודה in re: v. 3
      - (a) איעוטין 3 זאת היא העולה .*ד' יהודה*, excluding the following from remaining on מיעוטין 3 ירדו):
        - (i) Slaughtered at night; if the blood was spilt (before קבלה) and if the אדם went out of its precinct
      - (b) ממא ,יוצא ,לן פתרת העולה והיש extends to include the above, plus טמא ,if it was slaughtered with intent of חוץ למקומו or היוע, or if the blood was put in the incorrect locus (up/down, in/out) מזבח that were slaughtered שלא לשמן all of these, if put on מזבח, remain there
        - (i) Per: תורת העולה one rule for all קרבנות that have been brought "up"
        - (ii) However: this does not extend to כלאים/טריפה/יוצא דופן, מחיר כלב/אתנן זונה, מוקצה/נעבד, רובע/גרבע מחיר כלב/אתנן זונה, מוקצה/נעבד מוקצה/נעבד וועד דופן, מחיר כלב/אתנן 2nd list were פסולים beforehand
- III ר' אליעזר the inner מזבח (מזבח הזהב) also "absorbs" פסולים
  - a Question: what is he teaching? ברייתות (above) all mention "in/out", which includes מזבח הפנימי going on מזבח הפנימי
    - i Answer: from our בפנים, we would only know that דם בפנים (since there is נקלט 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 is a מזבח is a כלי שרת (more "powerful")