

28.1.12

14b → (ר"ש מכשיר בהילוך) 15b (סיום הפרק)

1. ואם האכל יאכל מבשר זבח שלמים ביום השלישי לא ירצה המקריב אתו לא יחשב לו פגול יהיה והנפש האכלת ממנו עונה תשא: ויקרא ז:יח
 2. וישחטו הפסח ויזרקו הכהנים מידם והלויים מפשיטתם: דברי הימים ב לה:יא
 3. והקריב והקריעים ירחץ במים והקריב הכהן את הכל והקטיר המזבחה עלה הוא אשה ריח ניחח לה: ויקרא א:יג
 4. גרב עם הדות מלך ובאפס לאם מחתת רזון: משלי יד:כח

I Analysis of ר"ש's opinion – negating הולכה as a significant עבודה vis-à-vis פיגול

- a ר"ש agrees that in the case of חטאות פנימיות, since הולכה is necessary, מחשבה invalidates
 i Challenge: ר"ש ruled that anything not on the outer מזבח does not attach to פיגול
 ii Answer (ר' יוסי בר חנינא): but he agrees that מחשבת חוץ לזמנו will invalidate ('tho not rendering פיגול)
 1 Reason: שלמים from ק"ו, which aren't invalidated by לשמה yet are invalidated by חוץ לזמנו מחשבת חוץ לזמנו
 2 Question: can this פסול be extended to מקומו?
 (a) From: חוץ לזמנו – it cannot, as חוץ לזמנו (generally) carries כרת (if it is proper פיגול)
 (b) Perhaps from: מחשבת שלא לשמה – but that also applies on a במה (and חוץ למקומו does not)
 (i) Point: פסח וחטאת, our points of reference, cannot be brought on a במה
 (ii) Or: "שלישי" (v. 1) is חוץ לזמנו, "פיגול" (ibid) is חוץ למקומו
 b whittling down ר"ש's acceptance of the significance of הולכה for internal עבודות דבא
 i If he holds like his son, that between the אולם and altar is considered "צפון", then the only necessary walking – hence the only הולכה where מחשבה could count – is from the door of the אולם in
 ii And if he holds like ר' יהודה – that the entire floor of the עזרה is מקדש (for בויכי לבונה), then the only place where הולכה could count for them is from the door of the היכל (the שלחן could be anywhere in the עזרה) out
 iii And if he holds that קדושת אולם and קדושת היכל are one – only from door of אולם out
 iv And if he holds that the opening has קדושת אולם, then מחשבה has no steps where it counts – only יד הושטת יד
 v And if he holds that non-pedial הולכה (e.g. handing something over, throwing it) is not הולכה – there is none

II Discussion re: status of הולכה

- a ר' חסדא's query of בור: is הולכה invalid?
 i Answer: no – still כשר – from v. 2
 ii Challenge (ר' ששת): זר (along with others) who perform זריקה, הולכה, קבלה, invalidate; ר' חסדא is refuted
 1 Question: but he invoked v. 2
 2 Answer: the דם didn't walk the דם, they just held it in place until the הזורק came along and took it
 b ר' יוסף's answer: follows dispute ר"ש/רבנן; if הולכה is considered an עבודה (רבנן) – invalidates; if not (ר"ש) – doesn't
 i Challenge (אב"י): שחיטה, which is absolutely necessary (→ "עבודה"), yet is בור
 ii Defense: שחיטה is not considered an "עבודה"
 1 Response: it ought to be, as ר' זירא ruled that פרה אדומה שחיטת פרה is invalid if performed by זר
 (a) Reason: אלוזר uses במדבר יט (כהן הדיוט) חוקה (implying it must be done exactly as stated)
 2 Defense: פרה אדומה isn't מזבח, קדשי בדה"ב it's, קדשי מזבח פרה אדומה
 (a) Counter: then שחיטה should be considered an עבודה via ק"ו – if קדדי בדב"ה – קדשי מזבח to ק"ו
 (i) Defense (ר' שישא בריה דר"א): as per מראות נגעים – not an עבודה, yet must be done by כהן
 iii challenge: walking limbs to ramp, a dispensable עבודה, yet must be done by כהן (per v. 3)
 1 answer: where the תורה explicates כהן, it does; where it doesn't – no כהן needed
 (a) challenge: if הולכת אברים, non-essential for כפרה, requires כהן; then ק"ו that הולכת דם – should – מעכב כפרה – should
 (b) support: ר"א ruled that even ר"ש agrees that הולכה בור פסולה
 c Question: is non-pedial הולכה considered הולכה (for purposes of פסול זר (מחשבה פוסלת, פסול זר)
 i Answer: מושב ב:א – קבלת הדם (of פסולים mentioned among יושב)
 1 Implication: עומד, of any sort, is valid, even if he doesn't move (i.e. hands the דם over without walking)
 2 Rejection: perhaps יושב means that he moves on his bottom; עומד is where he walks a bit
 ii Answer: from description of פסח – קרבן פסח – דם handed down line of כהנים until it reaches מזבח → valid
 1 Rejection: each one may have moved a bit; point of משנה is to teach value of large congregation (v. 4)
 iii Answer: from ruling that if a כשר hands the דם to a פסול, he should return it → that transfer is not a הולכה
 1 Modification: may read that the כשר should walk to the מזבח and take it from him → original הולכה was valid

- iv *Conclusive answer*: הולכה is **not** considered as ruling that non-pedial הולכה is **not** considered
- 1 *Question*: can it be repaired or not?
 - 2 *Answer*: from last ruling – even with modification, how can כשר take it back for זריקה
 - (a) *Conclusion*: it **can** be repaired
 - (b) *Rejection*: perhaps the זר is standing further from the מזבח, in which case this "הולכה" is absolutely unnecessary and is reparable
 - 3 *Answer*: הולכה is פסול → can't be repaired
 - (a) *Challenge* (ר"נ לעולא) - משנה ג: if כלי spilled from כלי (after קבלה) and he scooped it up – כשר
 - (i) *Implication*: the דם's movement (שלא ברגל) doesn't invalidate
 - (ii) *Block*: perhaps the דם moved away from מזבח,
 1. *Challenge*: why would it only move in one direction?
 - a. *Answer*: could have been sloped, or fell into a hole or been thick (and not moved)
 - b. *Challenge*: why would the תנא teach a rule for such unlikely circumstances?
 - c. *Further*: in ב:א – if דם fell straight from neck to floor and was scooped up – פסול
 - i. *And*: in ג:ב, the משנה should've stipulated that this is only if it moved away from מזבח
 - ii. *Therefore*: הולכה's second report is refuted → הולכה שלא ברגל **can** be repaired
- III *re: הולכה* regarding scope of dispute ר"ש/רבנן
- a *Version1*: they only disagree about "small הולכה" (i.e. transferring w/o moving); agree that "big הולכה" (moving) is a significant עבודה and מוסלת בה
 - i *laughed at the מימרא*
 - 1 *Explanation1*: if so, there can never be מחשבה פוסלת in a חטאת העוף (which is bled next to מזבח)
 - (a) *If* he had the improper מחשבה before מליקה – too early
 - (b) *And if* he had it afterwards – already done
 - (i) *Provisional answer*: he could've had improper מחשבה from time that דם left bird until it reached מזבח
 - (ii) *Proof*: ר' זירא asked ר' ירמיה – what would be the ruling if between הזאת הדם and it reaching the מזבח, the officiant became a בעל מום (e.g. his arm was cut off) and he answered that it would be פסול
 1. *Reason*: הזאת and נתינה of דם are juxtaposed (ויקרא ד) → part of הזאת is reaching the מזבח
 - 2 *Explanation2* (ר"פ ור"ה בריה דר"י): they laughed because the dispute is explicitly about "big הולכה"; rather...
 - b *Version2*: they disagree about walking, but agree that "non-pedial הולכה" is not a significant עבודה
- IV *Question*: if a זר walks the דם to the מזבח, and a כהן takes it back and returns it to מזבח – is this valid?
- a *Dispute*: בני ר' חייא (יהודה וחזקיה) vs. ינאי
 - i *Valid*: it can be repaired
 - ii *Invalid*: cannot be repaired
 - iii *Follow-up question*: in a flipped case; if a כהן walked it to מזבח, then a זר returned it and brought it back –
 - 1 *ד' שימי בר ר' אשי*: the one (above) who invalidates, would validate and vice-versa
 - 2 *דבא*: even the one who validates above would invalidate here
 - (a) *Reason*: it still needs to reach מזבח (from a כהן); even though we could ignore second walking, the next step invalidates
 - (b) *Comment* (רבינא לר' אשי): this significance of "צריך לאמטוייה" (must properly reach) is a dispute ר"א/רבנן:
 - (i) *our משנה* says any necessary walking is considered הולכה, any unnecessary walking is not
 1. *דבא's comment*: all agree that if he got the דם further from the מזבח and walked it closer, that is considered "necessary"; if he got it closer and walked away with it – unnecessary
 - a. *disagreement*: if he brought it to the מזבח and then took it away – is the return trip to the הולכה considered הולכה
 - i. *דבנן*: consider צריך לאמטוייה (it must reach מזבח) as a significant consideration
 - ii. *ר"א*: considers it unnecessary as it already arrived there
 2. *challenge* (אב"י): ר"א gives examples of הילוך שצריך and צריך שלא
 - a. *צריך*: to bring it close
 - b. *אינו צריך*: to take it away
 - i. *and*: returning it is certainly צריך → no dispute between ר"א/רבנן
 3. *response* (דבא): if we have an explicit ברייתא that ר"א and רבנן do not disagree – we'll accept it...