

29.1.6

7b (ואיבעית אימא מנחה לגבי דם כיבש דמיא) → 8b (אמר רבא פשיטא לי)

1. ולקח אִזּוּב וְטָבַל בְּמִים אִישׁ טְהוֹר וְהֵזָה עַל הָאֵהָל וְעַל כָּל הַכֵּלִים וְעַל הַנֶּפֶשׁוֹת אֲשֶׁר הִיוּ שָׁם וְעַל הַנֶּגַע בְּעֶצֶם אוֹ בְּחֶלֶל אוֹ בְּמַת אוֹ בְּבֶקֶר: במדבר יט, יח

2. וְטָבַל הַפָּהוּן אֶת אֲצָבָעוֹ בְּדָם וְהֵזָה מִן הַדָּם שֶׁבַע פְּעָמִים לִפְנֵי ה' אֶת פְּרֻכַת הַקֹּדֶשׁ: ויקרא ד, ו

3. וְשָׂרַף אֶת הַפָּרָה לְעֵינָיו אֶת עֵרָה וְאֶת בְּשָׂרָה וְאֶת דָּמָה עַל פְּרֹשֶׁה יִשְׂרָף: במדבר יט, ה

4. כְּפֹרֵי זֶהָב שְׁלֹשִׁים כֶּפֶרֶי כֶּסֶף מְשֻׁנִּים אַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת וְעֶשְׂרֵה כָּלִים אַחֲרֵים אֱלֹף: עזרא א, י

5. זֶה קָרְבַּן אֶהְרֹן וּבְנָיו אֲשֶׁר יִקְרִיבוּ לָהּ בְּיוֹם הַמִּשְׁחָ אֲתוֹ עֲשִׂירַת הָאֵפָה סֶלֶת מִנֶּחֱחָ תְּמִיד מִחֲצִיתָהּ בַּבֶּקֶר וּמִחֲצִיתָהּ בַּעֲרֹב: ויקרא ג, יג

6. וְהִלַּחֵן הַמִּשְׁיחַ תַּחְתּוּי מִבְּנָיו יַעֲשֶׂה אֹתָהּ חֶק עוֹלָם לָהּ כְּלִיל תִּקְטָר: ויקרא ו, טו

7. וְסִמָּךְ יָדוֹ עַל רֹאשׁ קָרְבָּנוֹ וְשִׁחֲטוּ וְפָתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וְזָרְקוּ בְּנֵי אֶהְרֹן הַפְּהָנִים אֶת הַדָּם עַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ סָבִיב: ויקרא ג, ב

8. וְקָרְבָּנוֹ קִצְרֵת כֶּסֶף אַחַת שְׁלֹשִׁים וַיִּמָּאֵה מִשְׁקָלָהּ מִזֶּרֶק אֶחָד כֶּסֶף שִׁבְעִים שֶׁקֶל בְּשֶׁקֶל הַקֹּדֶשׁ שְׁנֵייהֶם מִלֵּאִים סֶלֶת בְּלוּלָה בְּשֶׁמֶן לְמִנְחָה: במדבר ז, יג

I Continuation of discussion re: קמיצה and a “sitting כלי”

- a סידור בזיכין from a “sitting כלי” is valid; per סילוק בזיכין and קידוש מנחה in a “sitting כלי” is valid – per סידור בזיכין
 - i Query: is קמיצה into a “sitting כלי” valid?
 - 1 Lemma1: do we infer from מנחה – valid
 - 2 Lemma2: do we infer from דם – invalid (כהן כלי לקבלת דם must be held by דם)
 - ii Answer: we infer from דם (→invalid)
 - 1 Challenge: רבא (vs. ר"י) ruled that קומץ in 2 כלים is valid, unlike דם
 - (a) Answer: רבא changed his mind and agreed that we infer from דם
- b Tangent: source for דם being invalid if received in multiple כלים
 - i Per: ר' חלפתא בן שאול, who ruled that re: פרה אדומה such an amount is קידוש לא
 - 1 Question: can we apply this to דם as well?
 - (a) Lemma1: it may be a (הלמ"מ) and we cannot use that as a model
 - (b) Lemma2: that ruling is based on v. 2 – וטבל במים, parallel to v. 3 – וטבל בדם
 - 2 Answer: ruling that it is also invalid re: דם
 - ii בריתא (quoted by רבא) explaining v. 2:
 - a. וטבל → must dip, and not sweep (along sides of כלי for דם)
 - b. בדם → must have enough דם for טבילה from the beginning (excluding שיריים from his fingers)
 - c. מן הדם → the דם mentioned (and not שיריים – per ר"א who invalidates use of באצבע)
 - i. Justification: without דם, סד"א that וטבל has no שעור; without וטבל, סד"א he could “sweep” to get דם
 - d. Challenge to ר"א (עמרם) quoted by רב, his teacher – בריתא states that if he was performing חטאת מי חטאת and it sprayed from his hand – טעון כיבוס; if he had completed הזאות – no requirement
 - i. Assumption: before he finished, requires כיבוס; if he finished – doesn't require
 - ii. Rejection: means – if it had already left his hand, requires; if had already left his hand – no need
 - iii. Challenge (אב"י): once he finishes דם, הזאות, wipes hand on פרה (v. 3) → if he didn't finish, he doesn't
 - 1. Meaning: שיריים are valid – contra ר"א
 - 2. Rejection: inference - before finishing all 7 הזאות, wipes finger on rim of מזרק (per v. 4)
 - e. Challenge (to notion that ר"א infers from דם): dispute ר' יוחנן/ר"א whether ר' חביתי כ"ג can be brought in halves
 - i. ר"א: it may be – and he doesn't infer from דם (which isn't קדוש if received in 2 כוסות)
 - ii. Proposal: ר"א doesn't infer from one עבודה to another
 - 1. Rejected: he infers that קמיצה may be done in היכל from בזיכין
 - 2. Defense: he allows inference of מנחה from מנחה, but not מנחה from דם
 - 3. Challenge: he doesn't infer מנחה from מנחה; per his allowance to burn חם הפנים if בזיכים broke apart before the סדור was removed, as long as the time had come
 - a. Explanation: he doesn't infer from regular מנחה (can't be offered if קמיצה broke apart before the סדור was removed, as long as the time had come)
 - 4. Defense: since this קומץ is pre-set (in בזיך), considered “after קומץ”
 - 5. And: ר"א must hold like מ"ד that if the שיריים are lost after קמיצה, can burn the קומץ

II Analysis of dispute ר"י/ר"א about sanctifying ½ עשרון of כ"ג (above)

- a ר"י's source – v. 5 – called מנחה, then divide it up
- b Challenge (to ר"ל): clear ruling to bring full עשרון, then divide it
 - i Defense: that is for the ideal מצוה, but not indispensable
 - ii Block: this offering is referred to as a חק (v. 6) → every detail is indispensable
 - iii Rather: that ruling means that he must bring a full עשרון from his house, doesn't address issue of חצי עשרון

- c *Challenge*: ר' יוחנן's ruling in case of committing to an עשרון, but bringing a half and intending to add
- i הקדש דב invalid
 - ii הקדש ד' יוחנן valid
 - 1 *Explanation*: if ר"י holds that $\frac{1}{2}$ עשרון isn't קדוש, should invalidate here as well
 - 2 *Proposal*: perhaps ר"י doesn't infer one מנחה from another
 - 3 *Rejection*: ר"י rules that if שלמים were slaughtered in היכל, that is valid – per v. 7:
 - (a) *Reasoning*: if פתח א"מ is valid, certainly inside מועד is valid
 - (b) *Defense*: he holds that intent to add is different, per v. 8:
 - (i) מלאים implies complete – but ר' יוסי adds that that is only if he didn't intent to add
- d *Question*: what would רב's position be re: חביתי כ"ג?
- i *If*: he holds like ר"א (valid if done in halves) – then he should infer from that and allow להוסיף
 - 1 *Proposal*: perhaps רב doesn't infer from one עבודה to the other –
 - 2 *Rejection*: רב rules that a מנחה which is sanctified without שמן, without לבונה or without either is valid
 - (a) *Without שמן*: since לחם הפנים are valid
 - (b) *Without לבונה*: since מנחת נסכים don't have לבונה
 - (c) *Without either*: since מנחת חוטא has neither
 - ii *Rather*: he must accept ר' יוחנן's position about חביתי כ"ג – invalid if brought in halves
- e *Revisiting רב's ruling*: additionally, he rules that שמן alone and לבונה alone are קדוש
- i לוג שמן של מצורע שמן
 - ii לחם הפנים from לבונה brought with לבונה
 - iii *Dissent*: ר' חנינא doesn't allow for modular קידוש – all required ingredients must be there
 - 1 *Challenges*: to ר' חנינא's approach, that all ingredients must be in כלי
 - (a) *עשרון*: why did they anoint the עשרון-measure
 - (i) *Answer*: for מנחת חוטא
 - (b) *לוג*: why is the לוג-measure there
 - (i) *Answer*: for לוג שמן של מצורע
 - iv *Note*: רב agrees with ר' חנינא: ט: זבחים - גלי הלח - vessels used for measuring liquids only sanctify liquids
 - 1 *שמואל*: only applies to measuring vessels; but מזרקות are מקדש even dry (flour) per v. 4
 - 2 *challenge*: a מנחה has liquid (oil) in it
 - (a) *answer*: reference is to the dry parts (even they are מתקדש)
 - (b) *alternatively*: מנחה (even with oil) is considered "dry" relative to דם (pure liquid)