

28.2.4

(הכא נמי משום חולשא דכהן גדול) 20a → (תנן התם כהן שלקה באצבעו) 19a

1.	וְלִבֵּשׁ הַכֹּהֵן מִדּוֹ בַד וּמִכְנָסֵי בַד יִלְבֹּשׁ עַל בְּשָׂרוֹ וְהָרִים אֶת הַדָּשָׁן אֲשֶׁר תֹּאכַל הָאֵשׁ אֶת הַעֲלֵה עַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וְשָׂמוּ אֶצְלַי הַמִּזְבֵּחַ: וּיקרא ו, ג
2.	וְשָׂמֵת הַמִּצְנֶפֶת עַל רֹאשׁוֹ וְנָתַתְּ אֶת גִּזְרֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ עַל הַמִּצְנֶפֶת: שְׁמוֹת כֵּט, ו
3.	וְאִם לֹא תִמְצָא יָדָהּ דֵּי שָׁה וְלִקְחָהּ שְׁתֵּי תַרְיָם אוֹ שְׁנֵי בְנֵי יוֹנָה אֶחָד לְעֵלָה וְאֶחָד לְחִטָּאת וְכִפֶּר עָלֶיהָ הַכֹּהֵן וְטָהַרָה: וּיקרא יב, ח
4.	כִּתְנַתְּ בַד קָדֵשׁ יִלְבֹּשׁ וּמִכְנָסֵי בַד יִהְיוּ עַל בְּשָׂרוֹ וּבְאֲבָנֹת בַד יִחַר וּבְמִצְנֶפֶת בַד יִצְנַף בְּגָדֵי קָדֵשׁ הֵם וְרַחֵץ בְּמִים אֶת בְּשָׂרוֹ וּלְבָשָׁם: וּיקרא טז, ד
5.	וְרַחֲצוּ דִידֵיהֶם וְרַגְלֵיהֶם וְלֹא יָמְתוּ וְהִיָּתָה לָהֶם חֻק עוֹלָם לֹא יִלְוֲעוּ לְדוֹתָם: שְׁמוֹת ל, כא
6.	וְחָרַתְּ אֹתָם אֲבָנֹת אֶהָרָן וּבְנָיו וְחִבְשֶׁת לָהֶם מִגְבֵּעַת וְהִיָּתָה לָהֶם קֶהֱנָה לְחֻקֵּת עוֹלָם וּמִלֵּאֵת יַד אֶהָרָן וְיָד בְּנָיו: שְׁמוֹת כֵּט, ט
7.	וְרַחֲצוּ מַמְנוֹ מִשֶּׁה וְאֶהָרָן וּבְנָיו אֶת דִּידֵיהֶם וְאֶת רַגְלֵיהֶם: שְׁמוֹת מ, לא
8.	בְּבֹאֵם אֶל אֶהֱל מוֹעֵד רַחֲצוּ מִים וְלֹא יָמְתוּ אוֹ בְּנִשְׁתָּם אֶל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ לְשָׂרֵת הַהִקְטִיר אִשֶׁה לָהּ: שְׁמוֹת ל, כ

I Tangential discussions re: בגדי כהונה

a but not to exude blood (אין שבות במקדש) - מקדש in שבת may put a bandage on his finger on שבת

i version1: בגדיים only a גמי, but not a proper bandage – it is a surplus of בגדיים

1 dissent (ר' יוחנן): no problem of תיור בגדיים except on a spot where בגדיים are worn (not the finger)

(a) challenge: why isn't it a problem of חציצה (between finger and כלי or קרבן or כלי)?

(b) answer: could be on his left hand, or not at a spot where he uses that finger for עבודה

2 in apposition to ד"ח: in the place of בגדיים, even one string is "surplus"; elsewhere 3x3 is רב

(a) note: ר' יוחנן is certainly at odds with ד"ח; ר' יהודה may not be – since he made the צלצול, it is 3x3=שוב

ii version2: בגדיים only a גמי, but not a proper bandage – it is a surplus of בגדיים

1 dissent (ר' יוחנן): less than 3x3 is only a violation בגדיים; elsewhere, only 3x3 is a surplus – ר"ח כרבא בשם ר"ח

(a) question: is רבא now at odds with ד"ח בריה דר"ח?

(b) not necessarily: since he fashioned the צלצול, he gave it significance (like 3x3)

2 challenge (to יוחנן): why did the משנה choose גמי, if even a nice bandage is permissible?

(a) answer: incidentally teaches that גמי has healing powers

II series of questions posed by רבא (et al) regarding חציצה for בגדי כהונה (none resolved)

a if: wind gets into his garment, is this a lack of בשרו (v. 1) or is this the ways clothes are worn?

b if: a live louse gets in (dead lice certainly a חציצה); since it's alive, like a growth or since he cares to remove it – חוצץ?

c if: dust (not dirt, which is certainly חוצץ) gets between his body and the בגדיים – is it חוצץ?

d if: he lifts his arm so the space under his arm creates a "division" – is this חוצץ? (is it normal wear or a lack of בשרו?)

e if: he puts his hand inside of the garment – is his own body חוצץ?

f if: there is a thread hanging from the בגד – is this a חציצה? (a loose thread certainly is a חציצה)

g מר בר ר' אשי: if he has hair coming out of the garment – is this a חציצה? (i.e. is his hair considered his body?)

h זירא: is חציצה תפילין (according to תפילין חציצה) (מ"ד לילה זמן תפילין; if it isn't חציצה at night, then also by day)

i the question: is a חציצה done on his body a חציצה or not?

ii חציצה תפילין – ד' אמי has a clear teaching – חציצה תפילין are considered a חציצה

iii challenge: חציצה תפילין – not "אסורים" → חציצה תפילין are considered אסורים from פטורים at their מעמד in ישראל and דוכן לויים, עבודה כהנים

1 defense: had to say פטורים, to include לויים וישראלים, where אסורים wouldn't make sense

iv challenge: חציצה תפילין teaches that חציצה תפילין are not חוצץ

1 resolution: חציצה תפילין are חוצץ (due to כותנת), not ראש של

(a) challenge: ד' is a violation of v. 1; but ראש של is a violation of v. 2

(b) answer: description of חציצה תפילין has hair showing between the חציצה and מצנפת – and that's where חציצה תפילין goes

III Analysis of item #5 on list – מחוסר כפורים

a source: v. 3 – וטהרה implies that until that point she is טמאה (and we already learned that חציצה תפילין is טמאה)

IV Analysis of item #6 on list – שלא רחץ ידים ורגלים

a source: חוקה::חוקה from חוקה בגדיים (vv. 5-6)

b ברייתא: if חציצה תפילין omits one of the טבילות or קידושין יום (between changes) – עבודה is valid

i but: if he or any כהן that performed עבודה without קידושין יום ורגלים

1 challenge (ר' אסי לר' יוחנן): since we hold that all 5 טבילות and 10 קידושין יום are מה"ת – and the word חוקה appears there – they should withhold and invalidate

- 2 *answer* (ר' יוחנן): v. 4 stipulates ולבשם – only wearing the garments is indispensable
 (a) אסי was happy – but ר' יוחנן dismissed his own answer – if that were the case, even קידוש ידים ורגלים of the morning would be dispensable
- 3 *resolution #1*: חזקיה – v. 5 stipulates לו ולזרעו → only that which is indispensable for his children is for him
- 4 *resolution #2*: חזקיה – v. 7 lists משה אהרון ובניו – only that which is necessary for his children is indispensable for him
 (a) *note*: חזקיה reads this verse as defining the size of a כוור – it must have at least enough for 4 כהנים
 (b) *note*: ר' יונתן sees v. 5 as directed לדורות → mention of his sons
- V קידוש ידים ורגלים – method of ברייתא
- a ת"ק: place right hand over right leg; left hand over left leg and allow water to come over
- b ר' יוסי ב"ר יהודה: place right hand over left hand, place them over crossed legs and מקדש
- i *challenge*: this is impossible
- ii ד' יוסף: not impossible – friend supports him
- iii *point of contention* (אב"י): whether standing with support is considered עמידה
- 1 *question* (לרבינא): why not allow him to sit down?
- 2 *answer*: v. 8 states לשרת; equating קידוש י"ר with service (which must be done מעומד)
- VI קידוש ידים ורגלים: time-frame of requirement of ברייתא
- a דב"י: every morning before עבודה, but not at nightfall
- i *reason*: לינה is impactful on קידוש י"ר
- b דאב"ש: if he was performing עבודה all night, no need for קי"ר in morning
- i *reason*: לינה has no impact on קי"ר
- c *parallel ברייתא*: if he was doing עבודה all night and then it became light
- i דב"י: requires new קי"ר
- ii דאב"ש: if he did קי"ר before onset of עבודה, he can continue for days without needing a new קי"ר
- d *justification*:
- i *if*: we only had 1st ברייתא א, סד"א that רבי requires a new קי"ר because he wasn't necessarily continuing an עבודה
- 1 *but*: in case he was continuing, רבי might agree that he needs no new קי"ר
- ii *and if*: we only had 2nd ברייתא א, סד"א that רבי would agree with רבי in case he wasn't performing straight through
- e *sources/rationale*:
- i דב"י (v. 8): בגשתם is needed to ensure that we don't err to think he needs new קי"ר for each עבודה
- ii ביאה ריקנית (v. 8): בגשתם is needed to exempt a כהן who isn't going to perform עבודה
- 1 *challenge*: ביאה ריקנית clearly doesn't require it – v. 8 stipulates לשרת
- 2 *rather*: בגשתם is needed to teach that כה"ג of קי"ר (טבילה) is done when dressed – ready to serve (בגשתם)
- iii *note*: what is the need for אשה להקטיר?
- 1 *answer*: to expand requirement of קי"ר beyond עבודות that are indispensable for כפרה
- f discussion about ר' יוחנן's report of אילפא regarding the waters of the כוור and if they become בלינה
- i *report1* (ר' דימי): posed question according to ראב"ש
- 1 *since*: they are for קי"ר, which isn't affected by לינה – ok
- 2 *or*: since they were sanctified in (כוור) כלי שרת, they are vulnerable to פסול לינה
- ii *report2* (רבינא): later solved it himself – the same מחלוקת applies (i.e. ראב"ש holds they are not בלינה)
- 1 *challenge*: ר' יוחנן ruled that if the waters were not sunk in at night, they may be used for evening עבודה but not the next morning
- (a) *and*: we weren't sure if the reason is because there is no need for קי"ר or because they are נפסלים
- (b) *so*: how could אילפא have solved it?
- iii *suggested proof*: יומא ג:ט - יומא ג:ט - בר קטין made the special כוור fixture to ensure no לינה
- 1 *and*: that follows משנה, as earlier יומא in סדר כה"ג has פרוח בין כה"ג slaughtering פר between ומזבח
- (a) *and*: ראב"ש holds that that is צפון (expanding on ב"ר יהודה's definition)
- (b) *challenge*: רבי holds that that is also צפון – and more (i.e. משנה could be רבי → בלינה)
- (i) *answer*: if the משנה were authored by רבי, it would have identified his greater area as the place
- (ii) *block*: it was done במזבח ולמזבח to be sensitive to כה"ג's physical weakness
- (iii) *therefore*: same answer explains why it could be רבי – could've been done over a wider area but was done as close as possible to allow for כה"ג's weakness