The handful placed irregularly – א/vnd יא תוקף תוקף. If the handful of flour was stuck to the sides of the vessel, or if the vessel was turned upside down when the priest took the handful, the flour should not be burned, but if it was burned, it is valid. Since the halakha of these situations was not conclusively determined, they should not be performed in this manner ab initio, but are valid after the fact (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin 125).

The handfuls – א/vnd יא תוקף. The High Priest takes a full handful, neither smoothed over nor overflowing, but full without spilling (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim 4.1).

The blood spilled – בַּקְשָׁת. If the blood of an offering spilled onto the floor from the vessel and was subsequently collected, the offering is valid. Conversely, if it spilled onto the floor from the neck of the animal and was collected into a vessel from there, the offering is disqualified (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin 125).

From the blood of the soul – בְּתוֹכוֹ דִּילְמָא. If some of the blood from the neck of the animal spilled, so that not all of the blood was collected in a vessel, the rite is valid provided that the collected blood was the so-called blood of the soul, not blood squeezed from it after the initial spurt concluded or the blood that bled from the skin. This halakha is in accordance with the baraita cited here. Apparently, the Rambam maintains that although all of the blood must be collected ab initio, this is not an indispensable requirement of the rite (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin 125).

Receiving all of the blood – כָּלָה יַעַשׂ בָּﬠֵינַן. The priest must intend to collect all of the sacrificial animal’s blood in a vessel (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Ma’aseh HaKorbanot 1:25).

Rav Pappa: What is the halakha in a case where he stuck the handful of flour onto the side of the vessel? After the flour of a meal-offering has been separated, it must be placed in a vessel for burning, an action that sanctifies the flour. Rav Pappa inquires as to what the halakha is if the priest places the flour on the sides, instead of underneath the vessel. The Gemara clarifies the two sides of the dilemma: Do we require the handful to be inside the vessel, and that is the case here? Or perhaps we require the handful to be placed properly inside the vessel, and that is not fulfilled in this instance. No answer is found for this question, and the Gemara concludes: Let it stand unresolved.

Mar bar Rav Ashi raised a similar dilemma: What is the halakha if the priest overturned the vessel and stuck the handful to the underside of the vessel? Do we require the handful to be inside the vessel, and that requirement is fulfilled here, as the handful is between the sides of the vessel; or perhaps we require it to be placed properly in the vessel, and that is not the case here? With regard to this question as well, the Gemara states: Let it stand unresolved.

Rav Pappa raised a dilemma: Should the handfuls to which the Sages referred be smoothed over or slightly overflowing? Rabbi Abba said to Rav Ashi: Come and hear an explicit statement in a baraita: The handfuls to which the Sages referred should be neither smoothed over nor overflowing, but full, without any flour spilling out.

We learned in a mishna there, in Zevahim 32a: If the blood of the sacrificial animal spilled on the floor instead of being collected directly into a vessel, and a priest collected it from there into a vessel, it is disqualified, as it was not collected properly. Conversely, if the blood spilled from the vessel onto the floor, after it was collected properly, and a priest collected it and put it back in the vessel, it is valid.

The Gemara asks: From where are these matters derived? As the Sages taught in a halakhic mishnah: “And the anointed priest shall take from the blood of the bull!” (Leviticus 4:5); this means that the priest shall take from the blood of the soul,” i.e., the bull’s blood that flows from the place of slaughter as the animal dies, and not from the blood of the skin, which bleed out when the skin is cut before the slaughter, nor from the blood squeezed from an animal after the initial spurt.

The baraita interprets the phrase “from the blood of the bull,” as though these words were written in a different order: Blood from the bull, i.e., the priest shall receive it directly. For if it should enter your mind that the letter mem, which means “from” in the phrase “from the blood of the bull,” is limiting and indicates that even if the priest received some of the blood, his action is acceptable, didn’t Rav Yehuda say: He who receives the blood must receive all of the blood of the bull, as it is stated: “And all the blood of the bull he shall pour out on the base of the altar” (Leviticus 4:7)? This verse emphasizes that the priest must pour all of the bull’s blood, which is possible only if he has collected all of it.

NOTES

The priest overturned the vessel – בְּדוֹפְנֵיהּ. The simplest understanding of the case is that the priest placed the flour inside the vessel in the proper manner, but the vessel itself was positioned irregularly, upside down. The Me’iri explains that the vessel was turned upside down with the flour placed on the outside, in its concave bottom. The question is whether this space is considered to be equivalent to the inside bottom of the vessel, or whether this is not considered to be a proper placement.

Smoothed or overflowing – כְּדַרוּ. The Gemara already stated that the handful should be taken in the regular manner; but although a handful of a meal-offering is typically a single hand’s worth without much variance, a handful of incense is different. A handful of incense can be a little less than a full hand or it can be overflowing, and both would still be considered the way that people take handfuls. This explains the need for the Gemara’s question (Tosafot Yeshanim, Tosafot Hakriyah).
Rather, learn from this that what is the meaning of the phrase: "From the blood of the bull"? It means that the priest must receive the blood directly from the bull. And this Sage maintains that the Sages subtract and add and interpret homiletically, i.e., one may take a letter from one word, insert it into a second word, and explain the phrase in that manner.

Rav Pappa raised a dilemma based on the above ruling: What is the halakha if the incense from his handfu ls scattered? Is his hand considered like the neck of the animal, and the incense is disqualified? Or perhaps his hand is considered like a vessel used in the Temple service, and if the incense fell from his hand it is not disqualified. No answer was found for this question either, and the Gemara again concludes: Let it stand unresolved.

Rav Pappa raised another dilemma: What is the halakha if the High Priest thought a disqualifying thought during the taking of the handful of the incense, e.g., if he intended to burn it after its appropriate time? Does this thought invalidate the rite or not? Do we say that this halakha is derived by means of a verbal analogy of “handfuls” and “handfuls,” from the case of a meal-offering, as follows: Just as there, with regard to the meal-offering, thought is effective to invalidate it, so too here, with regard to taking a handful of incense, thought is effective to invalidate it? Or should the two cases not be compared?

Rav Papp a raised another dilemma:

The Gemara explains: It enters your mind that from the fact that one who immersed himself during the day touched part of them, he disqualifies all of them. Due to the respect in which sacred objects are held, these objects are treated as one solid unit. This is so despite the fact that its parts are not really attached to each other but are separate small segments and therefore, logically, one who immersed himself during the day should disqualify only those parts of the item with which he came into direct contact.

Rav Pappa raised another dilemma:...
Those who are unfit to serve – הזרקה. If the priest had inappropriate thoughts while raking the coals for the incense, the rite is disqualified, as actions facilitating an offering are considered like the offering itself (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yam Hakippurim 5:27 and Nefesh Mishne and Lehem Mishne there).

The right leg in his left hand – הלול. When the parts of the daily offering are carried to the ramp, the right leg is carried in the priest’s left hand, with the place of the slaughter facing the priest (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Motsed Hakorbanot 6:1).

Notes

Carrying the blood – כגון. There are five rites that must be performed by priests after the slaughtering of an offering, an act that can be done by anyone: Receiving the blood of the animal, carrying the blood in a bowl to the altar, sprinkling the blood on the altar, and burning the animal’s fats and sacrificial parts on the altar. Carrying the blood differs in certain aspects from the other three tasks. For example, as Rashi states, the other three rites are commanded explicitly in the Torah, which states that they must be done by priests, whereas the act of carrying is not mentioned clearly in the text as a distinct rite. Furthermore, the tanan’ìm point out that whereas the other three acts are indispensable to the sequence of the service, carrying the blood may be omitted, as the animal can be slaughtered next to the altar and the blood sprinkled immediately after its collection in a bowl, without it being carried at all. For this reason, some authorities state that not all of the halakhot of the four rites apply to carrying.

We learned it – ויהיה. This phrase, which Rav Sheshet uses often, has a precise meaning: The question that you pose is answered by a well-known mishna and can be resolved by analyzing that mishna.

What is the halakha if he thought invalidating thoughts during the raking of the coals? Does this thought invalidate the incense? The Gemara elaborates: The question here is whether actions that facilitate the performance of a mitzva are considered like the mitzva itself. If so, merely raking the coals, which facilitates the mitzva of the incense, is like burning the incense itself; therefore, an improper thought would disqualify the incense. Or perhaps actions that facilitate the performance of a mitzva are not considered part of the mitzva itself. No answer was found for this question either, and the Gemara once again concludes: Let it stand unresolved.

The Sages raised a dilemma before Rav Sheshet: What is the halakha with regard to carrying the blood in one’s left hand? Is this action valid, or is it valid, like receiving and sprinkling the blood, an act that must be performed with the right hand? Rav Sheshet said to them: We already learned it, there is an answer to this question from the mishna: He took the coal pan in his right hand and the spoon in his left hand. This proves that although the spoon is carried in the left hand to the place of the service, the rite is valid.

The Gemara asks: And let us resolve this dilemma for them from that which we learned in a mishna: The priest who is privileged to carry the head and the leg of the daily offering to the ramp carried the right leg in his left hand, with its entire hide facing outward and the place of the slaughter on the neck facing the priest. This mishna also proves that carrying with the left hand is acceptable.

The Gemara rejects this contention: If the proof is from there, I would have said: That applies only to a type of carrying that does not invalidate atonement, as even if the limbs are not carried up to the altar, atonement is nevertheless achieved through the sprinkling of the blood. The rite is valid even if the limbs of the daily offering are not burned at all. However, with regard to the type of carrying that does invalidate atonement, e.g., carrying the blood to the altar, no, perhaps it must be done specifically with the right hand. Rav Sheshet therefore teaches us from the mishna that although carrying the spoon is necessary for the mitzva, the rite is nevertheless valid if it is carried in the left hand.

The Gemara raises an objection from a baraita: With regard to receiving, carrying, or sprinkling blood, if a non-priest, a mourner on his first day of mourning, a drunk priest, and a blemished priest, performed the rite, it is disqualified. And likewise if the priest was sitting, and likewise if he performed one of these rites with his left hand, it is disqualified. This statement contradicts the ruling of Rav Sheshet. The Gemara concludes: This is indeed a conclusive refutation, and Rav Sheshet’s opinion is rejected.

The Gemara asks: But wasn’t Rav Sheshet the one who objected on the basis of this very baraita? As Rav Sheshet said to the interpreter of Rav Hisda: Raise the following dilemma before Rav Hisda: What is the halakha with regard to carrying the blood performed by a non-priest? He said to him: It is valid, and a verse supports me: “And they slaughtered the Paschal offering and the priests sprinkled with their hand, and the Levites flayed” (11 Chronicles 5:31). This verse indicates that the priests took the blood from the hands of the Levites, from which it can be inferred that the Levites carried the blood from the place of slaughtering to the place of sprinkling.