

29.1.10

11b (משנה ג) → 13a (סיום הפרק)

1. והיתה לאהרן ולבניו ואכלהו במקום קדש כי קדש קדשים הוא לו מאשי ה' חק עולם: ויקרא כד, ט

- I מנחה guidelines for פיגול of a משנה ג-ד
- a *If*: the כהן does קמיצה with intent to eat שיריים (even a כזית) or to burn קומץ (even כזית) or to burn לבונה
- i *Outside*: פסול – כרת no
- ii *The next day*: פגול – and there is liability for כרת (for eating it)
- b *Rule*: קמיצה, or placing in the כלי, or walking it to מזבח or burning it with intent to eat edibles or burn burnables for:
- i *Outside*: פסול ואין בו כרת
- ii *Tomorrow*: כרת וחייבין עליו כרת
- iii *Stipulation*: the rest of the מתיר has to be brought properly
- 1 *Therefore*: if everything is done with no other wrong thought – those consequences obtain
 - 2 *But if*: some of the עבודות were done with חוץ למקומו and the rest with חוץ לזמנו – only פסול
 - (a) *And*: if מנחת חוטא/קנאות includes a שמן – only פסול
 - 3 *Within one act*: if he mixes intents (מקום and זמן) – only פסול
 - (a) *Dissent*: if ר' יהודה – if זמן came first – פגול; if מקום came first – פסול
 - (b) *חכמים*: in either case, only פסול
- II Question posed: according to מ"ד that if the שיריים are diminished after קמיצה, we still burn the קומץ
- a *And*: we hold that in that case, the שיריים can not be eaten
- b *If he*: had intent to eat them tomorrow, does the burning make the שיריים into פגול → no מעילה
- i *הונא ד' no* – even according to ר"ע, that זריקה מועלת ליוצא, doesn't help here
- 1 *Reason*: in that case, it's all "present" (but outside) and the פסול is extrinsic
- ii *דבא*: yes – even according to ר"א that מועלת ליוצא ר"א – does help here
- 1 *Reason*: in this case, it's in the same location as it should be
 - 2 *Argument*: או כזית חייא ר' חייא's version of our משנה does not include the phrase שיריים
 - (a) *Explanation*: it must be even a case where there's only a כזית left of the שיריים
 - (i) *Note*: since that is the case for מתן בכלי and on, the משנה omitted it for קמיצה as well
 - 3 *And*: in such a case, there is פיגול → even if שיריים are diminished, it's considered פגול
 - 4 *Rejection (אב"י)*: this follows ר"א (from זבחים יג:דו) who requires entire קומץ to be burnt for בחוץ
 - (a) *Challenge*: if ר"א, he should require the לבונה and קומץ to both be burnt – per זבחים יג:ו
 - (b) *Answer*: could be a case of מנחת חוטא (no לבונה)
 - (i) *Challenge*: could our תנא have constructed the entire משנה around that one case?
 - (ii) *Answer*: indeed – support from ר"א's report in ר"א's name – our משנה is דר"א and אליבא דר"א – מנחת חוטא
- iii *Backup (רבא)*: הקטרה will not help take this מנחה out of the status of מעילה (agrees with ר"ה)
- 1 *Proof*: v. 1 (re: לחם הפנים) → if one of them fell apart, all חלות are invalid
 - (a) *Implication*: if one was יוצא, the ones inside are still fit and may be eaten
 - (b) *Note*: this must be authored by ר"ע, who holds מועלת ליוצא ר"ע, yet if it is diminished – פסול
 - (c) *Challenge (אב"י)*: inference of יוצא isn't recommended, perhaps inference is if one was טמא
 - (i) *Reason (others aren't tainted)*: because the ציץ effects יוצא – but not יוצא (→ ר"א) – מועלת ליוצא – ר"א
 - (ii) *And*: the reason that נפרסה was mentioned – that even if its all inside, still invalid (certainly יוצא is)
 - (iii) *However*: according to ר"ע, just as מועלת ליוצא ר"ע, it also works for נפרסה
- III משנה ד: ½ כזית to burn and ½ כזית to eat (tomorrow) – not מצטרף, as אכילה והקטרה cannot be merged
- a *Inference*: if he intended to eat ½ כזית of eating edible and to eat ½ כזית of non-edible – מצטרף
- i *Challenge*: the rule in our משנה – only edibles are reckoned
- ii *Answer (ר' ירמיה)*: our תנא is ר"א who allows "cross-intent" from מזבח ↔ אכילת אדם (ahead, ג:א)
- iii *Counter (אב"י)*: could even be דר"א – רבנן דר"א – inference is incorrect; not ½ edible + 1/2 non-edible, but both are edibles
- 1 *challenge*: that's already inferred from רישא – since ½ בחוץ and ½ מחר aren't מצטרף → ½ מחר + ½ מחר are!
 - (a) *And*: this can't be teaching about אכילה not combining with הקטרה – that's inferred from רישא:
 - (i) *If*: eating (edibles) isn't מצטרף to eating (non-edibles), then certainly אכילה + הקטרה aren't מצטרף
 - (ii) *Rejection*: הקטרה and אכילה are a more likely pairing for צירוף, as each is being processed in its proper way; unlike eating לאכול דבר שדרכו לאכול with דבר שאין דרכו לאכול
 - (iii) *Therefore*: our part of the משנה is needed to teach that they are not מצטרף → אב"י is refuted