

28.2.8

24a → 25a (קמ"ל) (עומד ע"ג כלים)

1. וְלָקַח הַפֶּה מִדָּם הַחֲטָאתָ בְּאַצְבָּעוֹ וְנָתַן עַל קֶרְנֵת מִזְבֵּחַ הָעֹלָה וְאֵת כָּל דָּמָה יִשְׁפֹּךְ אֶל יִסּוֹד הַמִּזְבֵּחַ: וַיִּקְרָא ד, לז
 2. וְלָקַח מִדָּם הַפֶּה וְנָתַתָּה עַל קֶרְנֵת הַמִּזְבֵּחַ בְּאַצְבָּעְךָ וְאֵת כָּל הַדָּם תִּשְׁפֹּךְ אֶל יִסּוֹד הַמִּזְבֵּחַ: שְׁמוֹת כט, יב
 3. וְסָבַל הַפֶּה אֶת אֲצָבָעוֹ הַיְמָנִית מִן הַשָּׁמֶן אֲשֶׁר עַל כַּף הַשְּׂמֹאלִית וְהָזָה מִן הַשָּׁמֶן בְּאַצְבָּעוֹ שִׁבְעַת פְּעָמִים לִפְנֵי ה': וַיִּקְרָא יד, טז
 4. וְהִקְרִיב וְהִקְרִיעַ: יְרַחֵץ בְּמֵיִם וְהִקְרִיב הַפֶּה אֶת הַכֹּל וְהִקְטִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ עֹלָה הוּא אִשָּׁה רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ לָהּ: וַיִּקְרָא א, יג
 5. לֹא תִאָּפֶה חֲמֵץ חֶלְקִים נִתְּתִי אֹתָהּ מֵאִשִּׁי קֹדֶשׁ קֹדָשִׁים הוּא פִּחְשָׁתָּה וְכֹאשֶׁם: וַיִּקְרָא ו, י

I Analysis of פסול #10 – standing on top of כלים, on an animal or on a fellow's feet

- a source: תדבר"י – analogy of עזרה floor of שרת: כלים (both sanctified)
 i just as: there can be no חציצה between him and the שרת כל
 ii similarly: there can be no חציצה between him (read: his feet) and the floor of the עזרה
 iii justification: if we only taught כלים סד"א since they aren't living; if we only listed בהמה, since it isn't human... קמ"ל
 b עבודה – if he had one leg on a rock or vessel & the other leg on the floor and did עבודה
 i ruling: if he could stand on the leg on the floor (i.e. if rock/vessel were removed); if so, עבודתו כשרה, if not, פסולה
 c חוצץ 's question (version 1): if a tile was loose and he stood on it; if he didn't intend to re-affix it, certainly חוצץ
 i but: if he intended to affix, do we consider it already in place (→ כשרה) or since it's not presently fixed – פסולה
 d 's question (version 2- רבה בר זוטא): if a tile was removed and he stood in that divot – valid עבודה or not?
 i question: did דוד sanctify the רצפה or all the way down to the depths?
 1 challenge: if that's the question, ask about a case where the entire רצפה was removed
 2 rather: all agree that the sanctity holds to the depths; question is is this considered דרך שירות תיקו –

II Analysis of dispute ר"ש validates) קבלה בשמאול ת"ק/ר"ש about

- a both זריקה and קבלה → אצבעו נתן and ולקח v. 1, both זריקתא
 i dissent: ר"ש – only states באצבעו in context of נתן → קבלה בשמאול is valid
 1 question: ר"ש; if he accepts the גז"ש that identifies every אצבע as "R", should apply to both; if not, to neither
 (a) answer1 (רבה יהודה): he doesn't accept גז"ש; all he says is that since it doesn't say ימין in re: קבלה, L is valid
 (i) challenge (רבה): then he should allow זרה"ד with L
 1. additionally: he does accept גז"ש – he explicitly states that every "יד" and "אצבע" is right (only)
 (b) answer2 (רבה): he does accept גז"ש – what he means is that it doesn't state "יד", rather "אצבע" – which cannot be used for קבלה → must not require ימין
 (i) challenge (רבה דר' אשי לרבינא): he could hold the מזרק with his finger and do קבלה
 (c) answer3 (אב"י): dispute is whether word (באצבעו) can be applied backwards (ת"ק) or only לפניו (ר"ש)
 (i) note (אב"י): ר"ש disagrees with his father and ת"ק:
 1. פסול is נתינה only L with אצבע; פסול is קבלה only L with אצבע, anywhere it says קבלה with אצבע, only L is פסול
 a. example of נתינה באצבע v. 2; a word applies back, but only one – and not לאחריו at all

III ר' יוחנן (quoted by רבב"ח): wherever it states אצבע and כהן – must be R-only

- a assumption: require both, as in v. 1, and we infer from מצורע (v. 3 – where אצבע and כהן are there, with explicit ימנית)
 i challenge: כהן only states קמיצה (no אצבע); yet אב"י rules that it is invalid
 ii rather (רבה): require either אצבע or כהן
 1 challenger (אב"י): taking אברים to ramp (v. 4), states כהן, yet he brings them with left hand
 2 answer: כהן or אצבע are enough for those עבודות that are indispensable for כפרה following lead of מצורע
 (a) challenge: קבלה is indispensable for כפרה, only says כהן and ר"ש permits (in our משנה) if done with שמאול
 (b) answer: ר"ש requires both כהן and אצבע
 (i) challenge: ר"ש himself states that "יד" and "אצבע" always mean "R"
 (ii) answer: ר"ש holds that "כהן" requires "אצבע/יד", but "אצבע/יד" doesn't require "כהן"
 1. question: then (to ר"ש), why write כהן at all?
 2. answer: that they must be בכיהונן (i.e. כהונה)
 (iii) challenge: ר"ש doesn't dispute ד"ד זרה, which only states כהן, requires ימין (he doesn't dispute משנה)
 (iv) answer: he does disagree (ברייתא)

- (c) *challenge*: רבא's observation that רגל ואוזן יד, from מצורע (all R) are used for גז"ש to רציעה, חליצה, קמיצה
- (i) *explanation*: no need for יד::יד, יוחנן, ר' rule should lead to that on its own
- (ii) *answer*: one is needed to teach that קמיצה is with R; other for קידוש קומץ (in כלי שרת) done with R
- (d) *question*: according to ר"ש, who (perhaps) doesn't require קומץ at all (מנחות ג:ד) – why the need for יד::יד?
- (i) *and even*: for those אמוראים who maintain that he does require it – he validates if done with L (יד::יד?)
- (ii) *and*: cannot be for the קמיצה itself (since he rejects יוחנן, ר', as we've seen), since he learns that from v. 5:
1. *answer*: needed for קמיצה of מנחת חוטא
 - a. *if*: he chooses to do it without a כלי, uses R like חטאת
 - b. *and if*: he chooses to do it with כלי, uses L like אשם
 2. *answer*: needed for קמיצה of מנחת חוטא
 - a. *since*: ר"ש explains that a מנחת חוטא doesn't have oil or frankincense, so that it shouldn't be "beautiful", he may hold that קמיצה בימין is valid
 - b. *therefore*: יד::יד extends requirement of קמיצה בימין to מנחת חוטא as well.