

28.2.8

24a (קמ"ל) → 25a (עומד על ג' כלים)

1. ולקח הפהו מדם החטאת באצבעו ונתן על קרנת מזבח העלה ואת כל דמה ישפך אל יסוד המזבח: ויקרא ד, לד  
 2. ולקחת מדם הפר ונתתה על קרנת המזבח באצבעך ואת כל הדם תשפך אל יסוד המזבח: שמות כט, יב  
 3. וטבל הפהו את אצבעו הימנית מן השמן אשר על כפו השמאלית והזה מן השמן באצבעו שבע פעמים לפני ה': ויקרא יד, טז  
 4. והקרב והקרעים ירחץ במים והקריב הפהו את הכל והקטיר המזבחה עלה הוא אשה ריח ניחח לה': ויקרא א, יג  
 5. לא תאפה חמץ חלקם נתתי אתה מאשי קדש קדשים הוא פחטאת וכאשם: ויקרא 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 כלי שרת::floor of עזרה (both sanctified)
- i just as: there can be no חציצה between him and the כלי שרת
- 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 בריתא – 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 אמי'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 אמי's question (version 2- רבה בר זוטי): 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
- II Analysis of dispute ר"ש about קבלה בשמאול (ר"ש validates)
- a בריתא v. 1, both ולקח ונתן associated with אצבעו → both קבלה and זריקה (ונתן) must be with right
- i dissent: ר"ש - only states באצבעו in context of ונתן → 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 (רבא): 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 (בריה 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 נתניה only L אצבע with נתניה; פסול is קבלה only L אצבע, anywhere it says קבלה with אצבע, only L אצבע"ש
- a. example of גתניה באצבע v. 2; a word applies back, but only one – and not לאחריי at all
- III ר' יוחנן (quoted by רבב"ח): wherever it states אצבע and כהונה – must be R-only
- a assumption: require both, as in v. 1, and we infer from מצורע (v. 3 – where כהן and אצבע are there, with explicit ימנית)
- i challenge: אצבע only states כהן (no אצבע); yet מנחות א:ב rules that it is invalid
- ii rather (רבא): require either אצבע or כהן
- 1 challenge (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 (ר"ש), why write כהן at all?
2. answer: that they must be בכיהונן (i.e. כהונה)
- (iii) challenge: ר"ש doesn't dispute that זרה"ד, which only states כהן, requires ימין (he doesn't dispute משנה)
- (iv) answer: he does disagree (בריתא)

- (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' יוחנן's 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. *אשם* is compared to חטאת and to אשם:
    - 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 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 חוטא as well.