

29.1.10

11b (משנה ג) → 13a (סיום הפרק)

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

- I מנחה: guidelines for a **מנחה** of a **מנחה** ג-גד
- 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*: **כרת** **ואין בו כרת**
- ii *Tomorrow*: **כרת** **והייבין 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 **מקומו** **חוץ** **מחשבת** **חוץ** **לזמנו** – only **פסול**
 - (a) *And*: if he mixes **קנאות**/**חוטא** includes a **לשמן** – only **פסול**
 - (b) *And*: if he mixes intents (**מקום** and **זמן**) – only **פסול**
 - (a) *Dissent*: if he came first – **פגול**; if **מקום** came first – **פסול**
 - (b) *And*: 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 more מעילה?
- i *הונא*: 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 *הבא*: yes – even according to **ר"א** that **זריקה** **מועלת** **ליוצא** – does help here
- 1 *Reason*: in this case, it's in the same location as it should be
 - 2 *Argument*: **ר"א**'s version of our **משנה** does not include the phrase **כזית** **או**
 - (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* (**אבני**): this follows **ר"א** (from **זבחים** יג:ד) who requires entire **קומץ** to be burnt for **בחוץ** **איסור העלאת**
 - (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 **ד"א** and **אליבא ד"א** and **מנחת חוטא**
- iii *Backup* (**רבא**): the **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** (**סילוק בזיכין**) **זריקה**, yet if it is diminished – **פסול**
 - (c) *Challenge* (**אבני**): inference of **יוצא** isn't recommended, perhaps inference is if one was **טמא**
 - (i) *Reason* (*others aren't tainted*): because the **ציע** effects **ריצוי** – but not **יוצא** (→ **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**, it also works for **נפרסה**
- III **משנה** ג: $\frac{1}{2}$ **כזית** to burn and $\frac{1}{2}$ **כזית** to eat (tomorrow) – not **מצטרף**, as **אכילה** and **הקטרה** cannot be merged
- a *Inference*: if he intended to $\frac{1}{2}$ **כזית** of eating *edible* and to eat $\frac{1}{2}$ **כזית** of *non-edible* – **מצטרף**
- i *Challenge*: the rule in our **משנה** – only *edibles* are reckoned
- ii *Answer* (**ירמיה**): our **תנא** is **ר"א** who allows "cross-intent" from **מזבח** ↔ **אכילת אדם** (ahead, ג:א)
- iii *Counter* (**אבני**): could even be **ד"א** – inference is incorrect; not $\frac{1}{2}$ *edible* + $\frac{1}{2}$ *non-edible*, but both are *edibles*
- 1 *challenge*: that's already inferred from **רישא** – since $\frac{1}{2}$ **בחוץ** and $\frac{1}{2}$ **מחר** aren't **מצטרף** → $\frac{1}{2}$ **מחר** + $\frac{1}{2}$ **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*: **אכילה** and **הקטרה** are a more likely pairing for **צירוף**, as each is being processed in its proper way; unlike eating **לאכול** with **דבר שדרכו לאכול** with **דבר שדרכו לאכול**
 - (iii) *Therefore*: our part of the **משנה** is needed to teach that they are not **מצטרף** → **אבני** is refuted