

HALAKHA

The handful placed irregularly – קומץ שלא כדרכו – 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* 1:25).

The handfuls – מלא הפניו – 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 – נשפך הדם – 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* 1:25).

From the blood of the soul – מדם הנפש – 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 the blood must be collected *ab initio*, this is not an indispensable requirement of the rite (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 1:26).

Receiving all of the blood – קבלת כל הדם – The priest must intend to collect all of the sacrificial animal's blood in a vessel (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 4:8).

רב פפא: דבקהיה לקומץ בדופניה דמנא מאי? תוך כלי בעינן – והא איבא, או דילמא הנחה בתוכו בתקנו בעינן – והא ליבא? תיקו.

בעי מר בר רב אשי: אפכיה למנא, ודבקהיה לקומץ בארעיתה דמנא, מהו? הנחה בתוכו בעינן – והא איבא, או דילמא: הנחה בתקנו בעינן – וליבא? תיקו.

בעי רב פפא: מלא הפניו שאמרו מחוקות או גדושות? אמר ליה רבי אבא לרב אשי, תא שמע: מלא הפניו שאמרו לא מחוקות ולא גדושות אלא טפופות.

הנן התם: נשפך הדם על הרצפה ואספו – פסול, מן הכלי על הרצפה ואספו – כשר.

מנא הני מילי? תנו רבנן: "ולקח מדם הפר" – מדם הנפש ולא מדם העור, ולא מדם התמצית.

"מדם הפר" – דם מהפר יקבלנו. דאי סלקא דעתך "מדם הפר" "מדם" ואפילו מקצת דם, והאמר רב יהודה: המקבל צריך שיקבל את כל דמו של פר שנאמר "ואת כל דם הפר ישפוך אל יסוד מזבח".

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 vesselⁿ 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?^h 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?**ⁿ **Rabbi Abba said to Rav Ashi: Come and hear an explicit statement in a *baraita*: The handfuls^h 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^h 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 midrash: "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,^h 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 bleeds 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^h 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 – אפכיה למנא – 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 – מחוקות או גדושות – 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 HaRosh*).

The incense scattered – נתפזר הקטורת: Incense that scattered from the hands of the High Priest and was then collected should not be burned, but if it was burned, it is valid, as the Gemara did not rule definitively on this issue (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 5:25).

Thought with regard to handfuls of incense – מחשבה בקפינה: The taking of the handful of incense is a rite of the Temple and is invalidated by inappropriate thoughts, e.g., the intention to burn it after its appropriate time or in an improper place (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 5:27).

אלא שמע מינה: מאי "מדם הפר" – "דם מהפר" יקבלנו, וקסבר: גורעין ומוסיפין ודורשין.

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,^N i.e., one may take a letter from one word, insert it into a second word, and explain the phrase in that manner.

בעי רב פפא: נתפזר הקטורת ממלוא חפניו, מהו? ידו כצואר בהמה דמי – ופסולה, או דילמא: ככלי שרת דמי – ולא פסולה? תיקו.

§ Rav Pappa raised a dilemma based on the above ruling: What is the halakha if the incense from his handfuls scattered?^H 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.

בעי רב פפא: חישב בחפינת קטורת מהו? מי אמרין: יליף מלא' מלא' ממנחה, מה התם – מהניא בה מחשבה, או לא?

§ 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?^{NH}

אמר ליה רב שימי בר אשי לרב פפא, תא שמע: הוסיף רבי עקיבא (הקומץ) והקטורת והלבונה והגחלים שאם נגע טבול יום במקצתן – פסל את בולן.

Rav Shimi bar Ashi said to Rav Pappa: Come and hear a resolution to your dilemma: Rabbi Akiva added the handful of fine flour and the incense, and the frankincense, and the coals that are collected in a vessel, to the ruling of the Sages that if one who immersed himself during the day touched part of them,^N 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.

קא סלקא דעתך: מדפסל טבול יום – פסלה נמי לינה! ומדלינה פסלה – פסלה נמי מחשבה.

The Gemara explains: It enters your mind that from the fact that one who immersed himself during the day disqualifies these items by touch, therefore leaving them after their permitted time likewise disqualifies them; and from the fact that leaving them after their time disqualifies them, therefore thought likewise disqualifies them. Consequently, as incense is similar to flour with regard to ritual impurity, it is also disqualified by the priest's improper thought.

בעי רב פפא: § Rav Pappa raised another dilemma:

NOTES

גורעין – The Sages subtract and add and interpret homiletically – ומוסיפין ודורשין: The early commentaries stress that the Sages did not change the actual text of the Torah. Rather, the words are combined and divided in a manner different from the way in which they are traditionally read. This exegetical technique is similar to the technique of Rabbi Eliezer, son of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, in which words and letters are combined in a form different from that in which they normally appear. The Ramban, in the introduction to his Commentary on the Torah, provides an analysis of this issue from a different perspective and offers a comprehensive explanation of its rationale.

Disqualifications of consecrated objects – פסולי קדשים – Consecrated objects are subject to certain disqualifications that do not apply to other prohibited items. For example, consecrated objects are more susceptible to ritual impurity than *teruma* in that even light impurity of the third degree invalidates them. Another example is a consecrated object that was left over longer than its designated time, a neglect that disqualifies it. Similarly, disqualifying thoughts occur when the officiating priest intends to use the offering or another consecrated item in inappropriate times

or places. The thought alone disqualifies the offering. Several discussions in the Gemara address the relationship between these different forms of disqualification.

One who immersed himself during the day touched part of them – נגע טבול יום במקצתן – One who immersed himself during the day [*tevul yom*] is an individual who has immersed and is waiting for the sun to set before he is fully purified. This person remains ritually impure to the second degree, which means that any *teruma* that he touches becomes invalid, while sacred items are rendered ritually impure. The level of impurity of the *tevul yom* is sufficient to render food impure but not vessels, and even the food he touches does not render other food impure upon contact. A unique standard exists with regard to a *tevul yom* in that if he touches consecrated items positioned in a single vessel they become impure, even if the vessel itself is not rendered impure and the various components cannot render each other impure. It is a rabbinical decree that his touch should render all of these consecrated items impure, as the vessel combines all the objects it contains for the purposes of ritual impurity.

HALAKHA

הישוב בחתיית גחלים מהו? מכשירי מצוה – כמצוה דמו, או לא? תיקו.
If he thought during the raking of the coals – הישוב בחתיית גחלים: 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 Yom HaKippurim* 5:27 and *Kesef Mishne* and *Lehem Mishne* there).

הרגל של ימין בשמאל – 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 Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 6:11).

NOTES

Carrying the blood – הולכה: There are four 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 *tanna'im* 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 – תניתיה: 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.

הישוב בחתיית גחלים מהו? מכשירי מצוה – כמצוה דמו, או לא? תיקו.

בעי מיניה מרב ששית: הולכה בשמאל מהו? אמר להו רב ששית, תניתיה: נטל את המחתה בימיו ואת הכף בשמאלו.

ונשטו להו מהא דתנן: הרגל של ימין בשמאל, ובית עזרה לחוץ!

אי מהתם, הוה אמינא: הני מילי – הולכה דלא מעבבא כפרה, אכל הולכה דמעבבא כפרה – לא, קמשמע לן.

What is the *halakha* if he thought invalidating thoughts during the raking of the coals?^h 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.

S The Sages raised a dilemma before Rav Sheshet: What is the *halakha* with regard to carrying the bloodⁿ in one's left hand? Is this action valid, or is carrying, 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;ⁿ 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,^h 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.

HALAKHA

Those who are unfit to serve – הפסולים בעבודה: A non-priest, a mourner on the first day of mourning, a drunk priest, and a blemished priest are all unfit for the rites of receiving the blood, carrying the blood, and sprinkling it. Likewise, these rites are invalidated if performed by a priest while sitting or with his left hand (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Biat HaMikdash* 9:15).

מיתבי: זר, ואונן שיבור, ובעל מום, בקבלה ובהולכה ובזריקה – פסול. וכן יושב, וכן שמאל – פסול! תיבתא.

והא רב ששית הוא דאיתבה, דאמר ליה רב ששית לאמוריה דרב חסדא: בעי מיניה מרב חסדא: הולכה בזר מהו? – אמר ליה: כשירה, ומקרא מסייעני: "וישחטו הפסח וזרקו ויהינם מידם והלוים מפשיטים".

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,^h 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" (II Chronicles 35:11). 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.