

One who brings a creeping animal carcass into the Temple – **הַמְכַבֵּשׂ שְׂרָץ לְמִקְדָּשׁ**: One who intentionally brings a creeping animal carcass into the Temple is subject to the punishment of *karet*. Even according to the second approach in the Gemara, which states that this opinion is not unanimous, Rabbi Akiva's opinion is accepted as *halakha* (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Beit HaMikdash* 3:16).

NOTES

Impurity in the Sanctuary – טומאה שבהיכל: According to some commentaries, this was an impurity imparted by a corpse itself, as priests are specifically prohibited from contracting impurity by touching a corpse (*Ge'on Ya'akov*).

Supports priests – מְסַיֵע בְּהֵנִי: Rashi explains that in several places, Rav Kahana cites teachings that elevate the status of priests above that of the rest of the people.

Beaten plates – רִיקוּעֵי פָתִים: The inside of the Holy of Holies was entirely overlaid with gold plates. To lay these golden plates, it was necessary in practice to allow artisans, either priests or others, to enter, despite the fact that the High Priest alone was permitted to enter the Holy of Holies, and then only on Yom Kippur.

BACKGROUND

Sanctuary repairs – תיקון ההיכל: This discussion concerning those suitable to enter the Sanctuary to build and to perform repairs had numerous practical ramifications, especially when the Temple was rebuilt by Herod. While the overall structure, particularly the large outer framework, was built relatively quickly, it took many years, some even say generations, before all the work was completed, as they wanted the work on the Temple itself to be performed by priests.

HALAKHA

Who enters the Sanctuary to perform repairs – מי נכנס להיכל לתקן: When it is necessary to perform repairs in the Sanctuary, the mitzva should be performed by ritually pure, unblemished priests. If no unblemished priests can do the repairs, blemished ones are allowed to enter. If there are no priests available, Levites enter, and if there are no Levites, Israelites enter. If no one is pure, then ritually impure people may enter to perform the repairs (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Beit HaBehira* 7:23).

Impure and blemished – טָמֵא וּבִעֻל מִים: If it is necessary to allow either an impure priest or a blemished one to enter to perform repairs in the Sanctuary, it is preferable that a blemished priest enter rather than an impure one. This ruling is based on the conclusion elsewhere that communal impurity is only suspended, not freely permitted. Consequently, a pure, blemished priest takes precedence (*Kesef Mishne*). According to an alternative reading, the Rambam reversed the opinions, and ruled in accordance with Rav, contrary to his disciple Rabbi Elazar (*Mishne LeMelekh*, in accordance with *Mabit*; Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Beit HaBehira* 7:23).

אלא בהני תנאי, דתנן: מהיכן מוציאין אותו כו'?

Rather, the Gemara suggests that this issue is the subject of a dispute between these *tanna'im*, as we learned in that same mishna: **From where does one remove the creeping animal carcass?** Rabbi Shimon ben Nannas and Rabbi Akiva disagree whether it is removed only from the Sanctuary, the Entrance Hall, and the area of the courtyard between the Entrance Hall and the altar, or from the entire area of the courtyard as well.

מאי לאו בהא קא מיפלגי: דמאן דאמר מעזרה – לא, קסבר: המכבים שרץ למקדש פטור, ומאן דאמר מכולה עזרה – קסבר: חייב.

Isn't it the case that the two *tanna'im* disagree about the following: **The one who said we do not remove it from the Temple courtyard maintains that one who brings a creeping animal carcass into the Temple^h is exempt**, and there is therefore no obligation to remove it from the courtyard on Shabbat. **And the one who said that it must be removed from the entire courtyard maintains that one who brings a creeping animal carcass into the Temple is liable.**

Perek X
Daf 105 Amud a

אמר רבי יוחנן: ושניהם מקרא אחד דרשו: "ויבאו הכהנים לפנימה בית ה' לטהר ויוציאו את כל הטומאה אשר מצאו בהיכל ה' לחצר בית ה' ויקבלו הלויים להוציא לגתל קדרון חוצה".

Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Both of them, Rabbi Shimon ben Nannas and Rabbi Akiva, derived their opinions from the same verse: "And the priests went into the inner part of the House of God, to cleanse it, and they brought out all the impurity that they found in the Temple of God into the courtyard of the House of God. And the Levites took it, to carry it out to the brook of Kidron" (II Chronicles 29:16).^N

מר סבר: מדאשתני בעזרה בלויים – טומאה בעזרה ליכא.

One Sage, Rabbi Shimon Ben Nannas, maintains: **As there was a change from the priests who removed the ritual impurity from the inner part of the Temple to the Levites, who took over in the courtyard, this indicates that there is no obligation to remove impurity in the courtyard**, and consequently the priests are not required to do so.

ומר סבר: עד היכא דלא אפשר בלויים – מפכי בהנים, השתא דאפשר בלויים – תו לא מטמאי בהנים.

And one Sage, Rabbi Akiva, maintains: **Up to where it is impossible for the task to be performed by the Levites, as it is prohibited for Levites to enter the Sanctuary, the priests took it out.** However, now in the courtyard, where it is possible for the ritual impurity to be removed by the Levites, the priests no longer render themselves ritually impure, as they are prohibited from maintaining contact with ritual impurity for any longer than necessary. That is to say, the Levites removed it from any place where they were permitted to enter.

תנו רבנן: הכל נכנסין בהיכל לבנות לתקן ולהוציא את הטומאה, ומצוה בכהנים. אם אין שם כהנים – נכנסין לויים, אין שם לויים – נכנסין ישראלים. ואידי ואידי טהורין – אין, טמאין – לא.

The Sages taught in a *baraita*: It is permitted for everyone to enter the Sanctuary to build, to repair, or to remove impurity from inside. However, wherever possible, the mitzva is for these tasks to be performed by priests.^B If no priests are available, Levites enter; if no Levites are available, Israelites enter. In both cases, if they are ritually pure, yes, they may enter, but if they are impure, no, they may not enter the holy place.^H

אמר רב הונא: רב כהנא מסייע בהני, דתני רב כהנא: מתוך שנאמר: "אך אל הפרוכת לא יבא" כול לא יהו כהנים בעלי מומין נכנסין בין האולם ולמזבח לעשות ריקועי פתחים –

Rav Huna said: Rav Kahana, who was a priest, supports priests^N by emphasizing their special sanctity. As Rav Kahana taught in a *baraita*: Since it is stated with regard to a priest who has a physical blemish, "Only he shall not go in unto the veil, nor come near to the altar, because he has a blemish, that he profane not My holy places; for I am the Lord who sanctifies them" (Leviticus 21:23), I might have thought that priests with blemishes may not enter the area between the Entrance Hall and the altar to manufacture beaten plates^N of gold for the Holy of Holies.

תלמוד לומר: "אך" – חלק. מצוה בתמימים, אין שם תמימים – נכנסין בעלי מומין. מצוה בטהורין, אין שם טהורין – נכנסין טמאין. אידי ואידי, כהנים – אין, ישראלים – לא.

Therefore the verse teaches "only" as an expression of exclusion, which means that there is a distinction here: Although the mitzva should be performed with unblemished priests *ab initio*, if no unblemished priests are available, blemished ones may enter. Likewise, it is the duty of ritually pure priests; if no pure priests are available, impure ones may enter.^H In both cases, if they are priests, yes, they may enter, but if they are Israelites, no, they may not enter the holy place. According to Rav Kahana, ritually impure priests take precedence over ritually pure Israelites.

The statement of Rabbi Shimon – דברי רבי שמעון: Rabbi Ovadya Bartenura explains that Rabbi Shimon sought to clarify why he is so stringent in the case of the broken harp string, despite his leniency with regard to one outside the Shabbat boundary. His explanation is that the Sages permit only activities prohibited by rabbinic decree, as: From your own they grant you. Consequently, they were lenient in the case of boundaries, where the surveyors' measurements allow for a certain leeway, but they were stringent in a case involving a Torah prohibition.

The conclusion of the tractate – סיום המסקנת: The Maharsha adds that although the Gemara suggests particular sources for Rabbi Shimon's statement, his teaching basically applies to the entire tractate, according to all opinions. In other words, the guiding principle of rabbinic prohibitions and the leniencies granted by the Sages with respect to their own stringencies, pertain to all the *halakhot* of *eirubin*. Likewise, in the *Tosefta* and the Jerusalem Talmud, the concluding statement is: Tongs are formed with tongs, i.e., one set of tongs can be used to produce many tongs. Analogously, all rabbinic decrees intended to enhance the character of Shabbat as a day of rest were derived from the basic principle of rest.

איבעיא להו: טמא ובעל מום איזו מהן נכנס? רב חייא בר אשי אמר רב: טמא נכנס, דהא אישתרי בעבודת ציבור. רבי אלעזר אמר: בעל מום נכנס, דהא אישתרי באכילת קדשים.

”רבי שמעון אומר וכו’.” רבי שמעון היכא קאי? הַתָּם קָאִי, דְּתַנּוּ: מִי שֶׁהֶחֱשִׁיד חוּץ לְתַחוּם, אֶפְּלוּ אִמָּה אַחַת לֹא יִכְנֵס. רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן אָמַר: אֶפְּלוּ חֲמֵשׁ עֶשְׂרֵה אִמָּה יִכְנֵס, לְפִי שְׂאִין הַמְּשׁוּחָחוֹת מִמְצַעֲוֵן אֶת הַמְּדוֹת מִפְּנֵי הַטּוֹעִים.

דְּקָאֵמַר תַּנָּא קָמָא לֹא יִכְנֵס, וְאָמַר לִיהַ רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן יִכְנֵס.

”שִׁלָּא הֵתִירוּ לְךָ אֶלְא מְשׁוּם שְׁבוּת.” היכא קאי? הַתָּם קָאִי, דְּקָאֵמַר תַּנָּא קָמָא: קוֹ שְׂרָה, וְאָמַר לִיהַ רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן: עוֹנֵבָה.

עֲנֵבָה דְּלֹא אֲתִי לְיַדִּי חַיִּיב חֲטָאֵת – שְׂרוּ לִיהַ רַבִּנָּן, קְשִׁירָה דְּאֲתִי לְיַדִּי חַיִּיב חֲטָאֵת – לֹא שְׂרוּ לִיהַ רַבִּנָּן.

הדרן עלך המוצא תפילין
וסליקא לה מסכת עירובין

A dilemma was raised before the Sages: If one priest is ritually impure and another has a blemish, which of them should enter to perform repairs? Rav Hiyya bar Ashi said that Rav said: The impure one should enter, as he is permitted to participate in communal service. If the entire community is ritually impure, even impure priests may perform the service, whereas blemished priests may not serve under any circumstances. Rabbi Elazar says: The one with the blemish should enter, as he is permitted to eat consecrated foods, which indicates that he retains the sanctity of the priesthood despite his blemish. The Gemara leaves this question unresolved.

We learned in the mishna that Rabbi Shimon says: Wherever the Sages permitted an action to you, they granted you only from your own. The Gemara asks: With regard to Rabbi Shimon, on the basis of what mishna did he formulate this principle? The Gemara answers: He taught this principle on the basis of the mishna there, as we learned: With regard to one for whom it grew dark while he was outside the Shabbat limit, even if he was only one cubit outside the limit he may not enter the town. Rabbi Shimon says: Even if he was fifteen cubits outside the limit, he may enter the town, because when the surveyors mark the Shabbat limit, they do not measure precisely. Rather they position the boundary mark within the two-thousand-cubit limit, because of those who err.

With regard to that which the first *tanna* said, i.e., that he may not enter, Rabbi Shimon said to the *tanna*: He may enter. His reason, as stated, is that the limit does in fact extend that far, as any area the Sages granted to a person was actually permitted to him by Torah law.

Rabbi Shimon further said: As they permitted to you only activities prohibited due to rabbinic decree, but not actions prohibited by Torah law. The Gemara asks: On the basis of what teaching did he formulate this principle? The Gemara answers: He taught it on the basis of the mishna there, where the first *tanna* said with regard to a harp string in the Temple that broke on Shabbat, that one may tie it with a knot, and Rabbi Shimon said: He may form only a bow.^N

The reason why only forming a bow is permitted, is that it cannot lead to liability for a sin-offering, as forming a bow cannot constitute a violation of the category of the prohibited labor of tying. Consequently, the Sages permitted it. However, with regard to tying a knot, which can lead to liability for a sin-offering when performed outside the Temple, the Sages did not permit it, as Rabbi Shimon maintains that the Sages permitted only activities whose prohibition involves a rabbinic decree.^N