

28.2.5

20a (דשמע מהאי אתי ושמע מהאי אתי) 21b → (אמר ר' יוחנן קידש ידיו ורגליו)

1. וְרָחַצוּ אֶהָרֶן וּבְנָיו מִמֶּנּוּ אֶת יָדֵיהֶם וְאֶת רַגְלֵיהֶם: שְׁמוֹת ל, יט

I continuation of discussion about קי"ר

- a קי"ר: if he was מקדש י"ר for תרומת הדשן (done at or before dawn), no need for further קי"ר for later in the day
- i question: whose opinion (רבי/ראב"ש) is he adopting?
- 1 אב"י: follows רבי; even though קי"ר is vulnerable to לינה, since לינה is ד"ס, from dawn on isn't considered
  - 2 דבא: follows ראב"ש – ר' יוחנן adopted his position only in context of תחילת עבודה (הדשן), not עבודה סוף
    - (a) challenge: כהן המרים את הדשן – תמיד ב: אב"י: after seeing קי"ר perform (עבודה בלילה)
      - (i) for אב"י: this is fine, as it follows רבי who would otherwise require קי"ר (for those doing עבודה בלילה)
      - (ii) but for דבא: can't be רבי (would require even המרים), can't be ראב"ש (wouldn't require anyone)
        1. answer: these are כהנים who weren't doing עבודה prior to this, hadn't done any קי"ר
- b question posed: does leaving the precincts of the מקדש constitute a היסח הדעת → need new קי"ר?
- i suggestion: לינה may not violate, as he didn't leave, but יציאה may
- 1 or perhaps: since he could return if he chose to, he won't lose focus (היסח הדעת)
  - 2 proposed proof: ruling that if he did קי"ר & then they became טמאות, he must ablute them; but no קי"ר needed
    - (a) but if: they went out, they maintain their sanctified status (→ יציאה is not a cause for new קי"ר)
    - (b) rejection: that is a case where his hands (alone) went beyond the barrier; if his body goes out, perhaps...
  - 3 proposal #2: if someone is not (י"ר) מקודש, he does so with שרת כלי inside
    - (a) if: he uses שרת כלי outside (עזרה) or כלי חול (even) inside, or dipped in a מקוה and did עבודה – פסול
    - (b) implication: from כלי שרת בחוץ פסול → if he used כלי שרת בפנים and went out – still valid
      - (i) rejection: perhaps כלי שרת בחוץ refers to him putting his hands outside to wash, that the parallel (valid) case is his washing inside then putting his hands out – which we've already established is כשר
  - 4 proposal #3 (ר' זב"ד לר"פ): if he goes out of the עזרה; if for a set time, requires טבילה; if spontaneous – קי"ר
    - (a) rejection (ר"פ): case is where he went out to urinate or defecate
      - (i) block: that is already taught explicitly
      - (ii) defense: first the general statement is taught, then explicated
  - 5 proposal #4 (ר' זב"ד): re: פרה אדומה, פרה אדומה בר יוסף, פרה אדומה כהן – ר' חייא בר יוסף, פרה אדומה
    - (a) dissent (יוחנן): can be done outside, even with mundane vessel, even a clay pot
      - (i) block (ר"פ): פרה is unique, in that the entire service is done outside → יציאה doesn't invalidate
        1. question: if so, why require קי"ר at all?
        2. answer: to have it follow the model of עבודת פנים
- c question posed: does טומאה constitute a היסח הדעת?
- i if: we argue that יציאה doesn't constitute a break – perhaps that's because he's still fit
- 1 but: here, he isn't fit to perform עבודה, perhaps it is a היסח הדעת
  - 2 or perhaps: since he will become טהור, he isn't דעת מסיח and is still focused
- ii proposed solution: if he did קי"ר and they became טמאות, he can be מטביל them and no need for another קי"ר
- 1 rejection: we aren't asking about his hands becoming טמאות; rather about his entire body becoming טמא
    - (a) challenge: it should certainly need a new קי"ר, since he would have to wait for הערב שמש and have הטה"ד
    - (b) defense: could be a case where he became טמא just before sunset (הערב שמש is moments away)
- iii proposed solution: ruling (and dispute יוחנן ר' יוסף/ר' יוחנן) re: פרה קי"ר (above)
- 1 and: they would deliberately defile the כהן and make him טב"י to counter the צדוקים
    - (a) implication: טומאה does not constitute a היסח הדעת
    - (b) block: פרה is different, since a טב"י doesn't defile
      - (i) challenge: if so, why have קי"ר?
      - (ii) answer: to replicate עבודת פנים
- d question posed: is it permissible to perform קי"ר in the כיוור (instead of "from" it)
- i lemma1: v. 1 states ממנו – can't be in it
- ii lemma2: perhaps ממנו should not be read so narrowly
- 1 answer (רנב"י): from ברייתא (above, proposal #2), if he dipped in מקוה – invalid → in כיוור – valid
    - (a) rejection: perhaps that was used to teach invalidity of מקוה, סד"א it would be good via ק"ו – קמ"ל

- e *dispute* *יוחנן ר' יוסף/ר' ח' ר' יוחנן* status of *מי כיוור* at evening, morning
- i *דחב"י* *מי כיוור* are invalidated for *עבודת מתירין* (e.g. *זריקה*) at same time as *מתירין* (i.e. *שקיעת החמה*)
- 1 (*explanation*): waters that were in the *כיוור* before *שקיעה* cannot be used to wash for *עבודת המתירין*; but if *כיוור* is pushed below into cistern at *שקיעה*, and waters are no longer in *כיוור*, valid)
  - 2 *and*: for *אברים*, at same time as *אברים* are invalidated (next morning)
- ii *ר"ח*: even for *מתירין*, waters are only invalidated next morning
- iii *ד' יוחנן*: once the *כיוור* has been sunk, it cannot be brought up
- 1 *we assume*: this means it can't be brought up all night if sunk before *שקיעת החמה*
  - 2 *challenge*: *ר' יוחנן* ruled (above) that if the *כיוור* wasn't sunk down before *שק"ח*, it may be used for that night-time's *עבודה*, but not in morning
  - 3 *answer*: "not brought up" in our ruling means – only for *עבודת היום*, but *עבודת הלילה* – may be brought
    - (a) *challenge*: if so, he fully agrees with *יוסף בר יוחנן*
    - (b) *answer*: they disagree if there is a *גזרה* here;
      - (i) *דחב"י*: waters are invalidated at dawn
      - (ii) *ד' יוחנן*: waters aren't invalidated at all, but there is a *גזרה* to regard them as invalid in order to ensure that they sink the *כיוור* into the cistern at night in order to avoid doing it after *עמוד השחר*
      - (iii) *challenge*: *ר' יוחנן* ruled that if he washed for *תרומת הדשן*, no need to wash again
        1. (*implication*): *ר' יוחנן* cannot hold that the *כיוור* was sunk all night
        2. *answer*: according to *רבא*, who attributes that ruling to the approach of *רבאב"ש*; ours is *רבי*
          - a. *but*: to *אב"י*, who attributes the ruling re: *רבי תרוה"ד*; both can't be *רבי*
          - b. *explanation*: why in this case is it sunk all night and here it isn't?
          - c. *answer*: they raise it up (for *תרוה"ד קי"ר*) and re-sink it
            - i. *challenge*: why, then, does *ר' יוחנן* rule that *למחר אינו מקדש* (not *פסולים*)
            - ii. *answer*: he means that there is no need (*ק"ר לא נפסל בלינה*)
            - iii. *challenge*: this now equates *ר' יוחנן* with *ר"ח*
            - iv. *answer*: they disagree about *שיקוע מצות* (is there a *מצוה* to sink the *כיוור*) – *ר"י*: there is
- (c) *challenge*: *תמיד ג'א* – the other *כהנים* wouldn't see the *כהן* involved in *תרומת הדשן* or hear his voice, until they would hear the sound of the wood mechanism fashioned by *בן קטין* for the *כיוור*, and they would then declare that its time for *קי"ר* from the *כיוור*
- (i) *we assume*: they would hear it being brought up (hence, it was sunk all night and not raised up)
  - (ii) *rejection*: this was the sound of lowering
    1. *challenge*: the mechanism made no sound when being lowered
    2. *answer*: they would use a wheel to lower it
    3. *alternate version*: they would use its wheel to lower it and the *כהנים* would come for *קי"ר*
      - a. *challenge*: but they also had *גביני* declaring it was time
      - b. *answer*: they had two "alarms" ; if they heard this one (the mechanism) they would come, if they heard the other (*גביני*) they would come