

28.2.5

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

1. וְרָחַצוּ אֶהָרֶן וּבְנֵיו מִמְנוּ אֶת יְדֵיהֶם 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: תמיד ב:א – כהנים, after seeing המרים את הדשן, כהן המרים את הדשן, perform קי"ר
      - (i) for אב"י: this is fine, as it follows רבי who would otherwise require קי"ר (for those doing בלילה עבודה)
      - (ii) but for דבא: can't be רבי (would require even כהן 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 a שרת כלי outside (עזרה) or כלי חול (even) inside, or dipped in a מקוה and did עבודה – פסול
    - (b) implication: from פסול בחוץ כלי → if he used a שרת בפנים כלי and went out – still valid
      - (i) rejection: perhaps שרת בחוץ כלי 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 ל"פ): if he goes out of the עזרה; if for a set time, requires טבילה; if spontaneous – קי"ר
    - (a) rejection (ל"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 חייא בר יוסף, פרה אדומה כהן – ר' חייא בר יוסף, פרה אדומה כהן must do קי"ר inside
      - (a) dissent (יוחנן): can be done outside, even with mundane vessel, even a clay pot
        - (i) block (ל"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 a 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 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 ר' 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 nighttime'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 ר' יוסף
    - (b) *answer*: they disagree if there is a גזרה here;
      - (i) דחב"י: waters are invalidated at dawn
      - (ii) ר' 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 ר'אב"ש; ours is רבי
          - a. *but*: to אב"י, who attributes the ruling re: רבי תרוה"ד; רבי, both can't be
          - b. *explanation*: why in this case is it sunk all night and here it isn't?
          - c. *answer*: they raise it up (for קי"ר תרוה"ד) 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 מצות שיקוע (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