

28.3.3

34b (וכולן שקבלו) → 35b (המעלה מאימוריהן בחוץ פטור הא מאימורי אימן חייב)



- I End of 'א משנה – if פסולים did קבה"ד with חוץ לזמנו/מקומו a כשר may go back and do קבה"ד (if there's still הנפש דם) or not?
- a question version 1 (ר"ל לר"י): if פסול does זרה"ד, is the rest of the דם now שיריים (→ can no longer perform זרה"ד) or not?
- i answer: only זריקה פסולה which "counts" (thereby generating שיריים) is מחשבת חוץ לזמנו/מקומו, since its לפיגולו ורמזה
- b version2 (per זבנד ר"ל: ר' זבנד asked if a כוס פסול (e.g. יוצא) is used, does that generate שיריים?
- i answer: whatever you contend is true about a פסול doing זרה"ד (per v. 1), same will apply to כוס פסול
- c version3 (per ירמיה מדפתי ר': ירמיה asked רבה אביי): what does 1 כוס make the other (if דם was collected in multiple כוסות)?
- i דחוי and it is spilled out in אמה that cuts through עזרה, OR
- ii שיריים and is spilled, like all "remainders", at יסוד המזבח
- iii Answer: it is a dispute רבנן/ש"ר, in בריתא which reconciles vv. 1-2 (דם vs. הדם)
- 1 חכמים: if he got חטאת דם in 4 cups and used each for 1 מתנה, rest of each goes to יסוד; if one wasn't used – לאמה-
- 2 דאב"ש: in all cases, all goes to יסוד; v. 1 excludes remainders that were הצוואר דם (i.e. never made it to כלי)
- II קבלה "interrupted" status of 'ב משנה:
- a If: a כשר did proper קבלה (with his right hand in ארת) and then gave to a פסול, put into his left, or into חול כלי
- i Solution: he should put take/put it back (into right hand/רת) כלי
- b If: it spilled out of the כלי and he gathered it up - valid
- c If: he put the דם in an incorrect locus (per ב:א above), if there is any הנפש דם left, a כשר should go back and do קבלה]
- III Analysis of 'ב משנה:
- a Justification (of 3 cases – פסול, left hand, חול כלי):
- i If: only taught פסול כשר, סד"א that was a טמא (only), who is permitted צבור (when צבור טמאי מת) – but not שמאל
- ii And if: taught שמאל כשר, סד"א since it is validly used on עבודת יוה"כ (when כה"ג brings the כטורת in), but not חול כלי
- iii And if: taught חול כשר, סד"א since they could (at any time) be sanctified to be שרת כלי, valid; but not פסול and שמאל
- b Question: why isn't every one of these cases דחוי (i.e. once it goes to left hand, e.g., should be irrevocably invalidated)
- i Answer1 (ר': ירמיה מדפתי): follows חנון המצרי, who doesn't read such cases as דחוי
- 1 Background: in case of יוה"כ שעיירי יוה"כ, even if the דם השעייר (לה) was in the כוס and the המשתלח שעייר died
- (a) We don't rule: that the דם should be spilled and another pair must be brought (דחוי)
- (b) Rather: we may bring another שעייר to be sent out
- ii Answer2 (ר': אשי): all would agree – no דחוי in case of something that the officiant can repair (e.g. put in right)
- 1 Support: דחויין ר' יהודה (such as these) – per his ruling re: שעיירי יוה"כ, yet he holds that כלי שבידו – כל שבידו דחוי – no דחוי
- 2 Background: he reports that they would collect דם from all the פסחים and, at the end of the day (יד) they would perform one זריקה towards the יסוד – ostensibly to repair any mis-performed פסחים
- (a) Analysis: ר"י challenged חכמים – but the דם may not have had proper קבלה בכלי כשר
- (i) ר"י are כהנים, and don't allow it; problem is the haste which may lead to spillage from כלי
- (b) Challenge: דם התמצית is mixed in
- (c) Answer: ר"י is consistent – he holds that דם התמצית is considered דם, per his dissent and ruling that there is a חיוב כרת for eating דם התמצית
- (i) block: ר"א noted that even ר"י agrees that דם התמצית cannot generate כפרה – per v. 3
- (d) rather: ר"י is consistent – he holds that דם cannot nullify דם → דם התמצית doesn't "blot out" הנפש דם
- (e) Challenge (ר"י לחכמים): why are drains stopped up עזרה
- (i) Answer: it is aesthetically pleasing to have כהנים walking in דם (of קרבנות)
1. Note: not a חציצה, as it is liquid
2. Note: not a problem of doing עבודה in stained clothes, even though they don't lift them up (v. 4)
- a. But: they walk on איצטבאות from place to place, except to perform non-essential acts, like placing wood on מערכה at which time they may lift up garments

- IV 'ג משנה ג' that doesn't invalidate (I)
- a If: he intended to eat an inedible or burn a non-burnable – כשר
    - i Dissent: ר"א invalidates
  - b If: he intended to eat ½ כזית (of בשר) or burn ½ כזית (of אימורין) – כשר
  - c If: he intended to eat ½ כזית (of בשר) and burn ½ כזית (of אימורין) – כשר
    - i Reason: הקטרה and אכילה cannot be merged
- V 'ד משנה ד' that doesn't invalidate (II) – focus on non-essential and inedibles
- a Intent: to eat skin, gravy, spices (left in pot), neck tendons, bones, tendons, horns, feet, hooves, and hooves – כשר
    - i And: these are not affected by פיגול, נותר וטמא
- VI 'ה משנה ה' that doesn't invalidate (III) – focus on by-products of animal
- a If: he did שחיטה (e.g.) with intent to eat the foetus or placenta – no פיגול
  - b If: he did מליקה with intent to eat the birds' eggs לזמנו – no פיגול
  - c Byproducts: milk of מוקדשים and eggs of the fowl do not attach to וטמא, נותר וטמא
    - i פיגול uni-directional ד"א
      - 1 If: he effected פיגול on a זבח, the placenta is included; but not the inverse
      - 2 If: he effected פיגול on the edible neck-tendon, the esophagus is included; but not the inverse
      - 3 If: he effected פיגול on the אימורין (of פרים הנשרפים) – the פרים are included; but not the inverse
    - ii Proposed support: ר"ש וחכמים, who disagree about "reach" of פיגול, agree that intent re: פרים doesn't make פיגול
      - 1 Inference: inverse is effective – פיגול about אימורין renders פרים into פיגול
      - 2 Rejection: inference is that if he intended פיגול about אימורין, that is effective – for אימורין (alone)
    - iii Proposal: חטאות הנשרפות have מעילה from moment of הקדש; once slaughtered, they are now vulnerable to invalidity via touch of טב"י, מוחסר כפורים, and לינה.
      - 1 Assumption: לינה refers to לינת בשר → intent to burn meat after its time is also פיגול מחשבת
      - 2 Rejection: לינה refers to אימורין
        - (a) Challenge: סיפא states that מעילה applies as long as the meat is being burned, until it is melted
        - (b) Implication: entire משנה is referring to בשר, not אימורין
        - (c) Rejection: each section is referring to its own precinct; אימורין to רישא, בשר to סיפא, אימורין to רישא
    - iv Challenge (רבה): list of animal parts, including placenta, that aren't מפגל nor מתפגל; no liability for בחוץ and no attachment to וטמא, נותר וטמא
      - 1 Assumption: מפגל – errant thoughts about them have no effect; מתפגל – cannot be affected by פיגול מחשבת
      - 2 Rejection: מפגל – as above; מתפגל – in and of themselves
        - (a) Challenge: סיפא teaches מתפגלים ואין מתפגלים – unnecessary
          - (i) And: no liability for פני"ט – unnecessary
          - (b) Rather: each is taught in its own context
    - v Support (רבה): שחיטה done with מחשבות חוץ about foetus doesn't create פיגול
      - 1 Nor: מליקה with מחשבות חוץ about eggs – no פיגול
      - 2 then: no פני"ט for eggs or milk of מוקדשין
        - (a) Implication: but placenta could be under ban of פני"ט
        - (b) Resolution: they could be included if essential was קרבן; but not עצמן
  - d Side-door: ר"ע dissents and allows מום בעלי that were put on מזבח to remain (contra חכמים – אם עלו ירדו)
    - i ר"ע permits only "fine" מום since such a מום is valid בעופות, and only if מום came after הקדש (בשם ר"י)
    - ii ר"ע agrees that an עולת נקבה is considered מום בעלת מום before הקדש
      - 1 Challenge: inference from ברייתא (above) → but from their mothers – חייב
        - (a) But: that must be an עולת נקבה; how can there be חיוב if עלו ירדו?
      - 2 Answer: inference is incorrect – not the mothers but their אימורין generate liability for בחוץ
        - (a) Challenge: but אימורין are not parallel to "מהן"
        - (b) Rather: מאימורי אמן חייב → המעלה מאימוריהן בחוץ פטור ברייתא