

28.13.4

109a (משנה ד) → 110a (מישרא שרי או קליש מקלש תיקו)

1. וְאֵלֶּהָם תֹּאמַר אִישׁ אִישׁ מִבֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל וּמִן הַגֵּר אֲשֶׁר יִגֹּר בְּתוֹכָם אֲשֶׁר יַעֲלֶה עֹלָה אוֹ זֶבֶח: וְיִקְרָא ז', ח  
 2. וְאֵל פְּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד לֹא יִבְיָאוּ לַעֲשׂוֹת אֹתוֹ לֵה' וְנִכְרַת הָאִישׁ הַהוּא מֵעַמּוֹ: וְיִקְרָא ז', ט  
 3. וְלִקַּח מִלֵּא הַמִּחְתָּה גִּחְלִי אֵשׁ מֵעַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ מִלִּפְנֵי ה' וּמִלֵּא קִפְנָיו קִטְרֵת סָמִים דָּקָה וְהֵבִיא מִבֵּית לְפָרְקַת: וְיִקְרָא טו, יב

I איסור קדשים range of משנה דו

- a Whether: he offers קדשים כשרים, or invalid קדשים that became invalid בקדש (i.e. אם עלו לא ירדו) – liable
- i Support: ברייתא, interpreting vv. 1-2
- עולה refers to עולה
  - קדשים קלים or קדשי קדשים, whether זבחים, expands to include אימורים of all או זבח
  - פתח אהל מועד לא הביאו expands to include נסכים etc. – anything that ought to be brought to מ
  - לך, יוצא etc. expands to include שנפסלו בקדש לעשות
- b And: offering up one כזית of עולה (meat) and its אימורין – liable
- i Implication: only אימורי עולה and its meat can combine for כזית, not ואימוריהם
- ii Support: ברייתא – עולה and its אימורין combine for כזית for בחוץ and העלאה
- Note: העלאה is understood, as per our ruling
  - But: פני"ט explicitly states that all פיגולים and נותר combine to generate שעור
- (a) Answer: מחשבת פיגול does not combine (intent to burn ½ כזית and intent to eat ½ כזית); כזית itself merges
- (b) And: נותר combines, but combining remains to justify זרה"ד – don't combine
- (i) Per: יהושע – ר' if 1 כזית of meat and 1 כזית חלב remain – do זרה"ד; if only ½ כזית each – don't do זרה"ד
- However: if it is an עולה, the two halves combine to allow זרה"ד
  - 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 – but less than the proper amount – dispute משנה דו

- a If: he offered קומץ or לבונה (of a מנחה), קטורת, מנחת כהנים, (incl. מנחת כ"ג) or מנחת נסכים
- i חכמים: liable if he offered כזית
- ii ר"א: only liable if he offers the full amount (of the קרבן proper)
- 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 כזית מקטיר outside he's חייב; if he offers ½ פרס (the prescribed amount of קטורת) inside – פטור
- Assumption: 2<sup>nd</sup> clause refers to a non-כהן being exempt for offering קטורת
- (a) Challenge: he did offer a כזית – why should he be exempt
- Rather (רב): means the צבור is exempt, i.e. has fulfilled its obligation of קטורת
  - 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) חיוב (בחוץ) nor for מצוה
- Answer1 (רבה): in re: (daily) הקטרת, all agree that no שעור is needed, not for מצוה nor for חיוב
- (a) Dispute: is re: ה"כ of הקטרה, whether v. 3 indicates a שעור or not
- (b) Challenge (אב"י): but חוקה (indicating specificity) is written in re: ה"כ
- Answer2 (אב"י): all agree that הקטרה דיוה"כ requires a שעור;
- (a) Dispute: is re: ה"כ of הקטרה – whether we infer פנים or not
- (b) Challenge (רבא): חוקה מפנים, why would they infer חוץ, why would they infer חוץ מפנים
- (i) Background: no liability for less than 3 לוגים of wine – even though that includes more than כזית
- 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 לוגין 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): רבנן don't infer ניסוך from הקטרה, but are willing to infer הקטרה from the 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* (דב"א): 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: קדשים 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 is not a חציצה (all meat)
- IV הו 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 הו 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 בזיכי (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 *איסור 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