



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o'h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o'h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Bloods Mixed up

Rava explains that all the cases of blood mixed together are not ones where the bloods physically mixed *together*, but rather where the vessels containing the blood of the sacrifices got mixed *up*. In all these cases, Rabbi Eliezer says we can view the blood applied in the wrong place as water, while the Sages say we cannot.

The *Gemara* asks: And they do not argue in a case where the bloods physically mixed *together*, but it was taught in a *Baraisa*: Rabbi Yehudah said: Rabbi Eliezer and the Sages had no disagreement regarding the blood of a *chatas* which was mixed with the blood of an *olah* - for they both agree that it must be offered up; and they had no disagreement regarding the blood of a valid offering which became intermingled with the blood of a *rovea* (an animal which sodomized a person) or with a *nirva* (an animal that was sodomized by a person) – for they both agree that it must not be offered. Regarding what case do they disagree? It is about the blood of an unblemished *olah* which became intermingled with the blood of a blemished one - there Rabbi Eliezer maintains that it must be offered up, whether it was mixed together in one vessel or mixed in separate vessels; while the Sages say that they must not be offered up.

The *Gemara* answers: Rabbi Yehudah does teach that Rabbi Eliezer argues whether it was mixed together in one vessel or mixed in separate vessels; whereas the Rabbis (of

our *Mishna*) maintain that the dispute is only regarding a case where the vessels were mixed up.

Abaye said: They learned this argument only in the case where the beginning blood of the *chatas* and the *olah* became intermingled (*for the blood of the chatas is applied above the red line, and the blood of the olah is applied below it*), but as to a case where the end blood of the *chatas* (the remainder) and the beginning of the *olah*, all agree that the place of the *olah* is the place of the remnants (*for both of those bloods are applied below the red line; the olah on the altar, the remnants of the chatas on the base of the altar*).

Rav Yosef said to him: Rabbi Yehudah said that the remnants require the top of the base of the altar (*whereas the olah requires the side of the altar; therefore, they cannot be applied on the same place*).

And Rabbi Shimon said similarly: They learned this argument only in the case where the beginning blood of the *chatas* and the *olah* became intermingled, but as to a case where the end blood of the *chatas* and the beginning of the *olah*, all agree that the place of the *olah* is the place of the remnants.

Rabbi Yochanan said, and others say that it was Rabbi Elazar: There is still an argument (*even in that case*).



Rav Huna bar Yehudah objected from the following *Baraisa*: They are holy (referring to a *bechor*). This teaches us that if the blood of a *bechor* was mixed with the blood of other sacrifices, it may be offered. Now, is it not referring to the end blood (*the remnants*) of an *olah* (*which is spilled on the base*) and the beginning of a *bechor* (*which is applied on the lower end of the altar*); and this proves that the place of the *olah* is the place of the remnants!?

The *Gemara* answers: No; it is referring to a case where the beginning blood of the *olah* became mixed up with the beginning blood of a *bechor* (*which both bloods are to be applied below the red line*). And what is the novelty of this ruling? That sacrifices do not nullify one another (*even if there is more of one than the other*).

But that is derived from the verse: He shall take from the blood of the bull and from the blood of the he-goat?

The *Gemara* notes that some *Tannaim* derive this principle from this text, and others derive it from another text.

Rava asked from the following *Baraisa*: And Aaron's sons shall bring the blood, and throw the blood. Why does the Torah repeat the word 'blood'? For one might have said that I only know about an *olah* which was mixed up with its *temurah* (or an unconsecrated animal) for even if they were mixed up while they were alive, they may be offered (*and that is why their blood is offered as well*). How do I know to include a *todah* and a *shelamim*? The *todah* and *shelamim* are included because they can be brought as a vow or a donated offering just like an *olah*. From where do I know to include an *asham*? An *asham* is included because it requires four applications, just like an *olah*. From where do I know to include a *bechor*, *ma'aser* and *pesach* offering? It is because it says, *blood, blood*.

Now, is it not referring to the end blood (*the remnants*) of an *olah* (*which is spilled on the base*) and the beginning of a *bechor* (*which is applied on the lower end of the altar*); and this proves that the place of the *olah* is the place of the remnants!?

The *Gemara* answers: No; it is referring to a case where the beginning blood of the *olah* became mixed up with the beginning blood of a *bechor* (*which both bloods are to be applied below the red line*). And what is the novelty of this ruling? That sacrifices do not nullify one another (*even if there is more of one than the other*).

But that is derived from the verse: He shall take from the blood of the bull and from the blood of the he-goat?

The *Gemara* notes that some *Tannaim* derive this principle from this text, and others derive it from another text.

Some *Tannaim* learn this principle from the verse: *and he shall take from the blood of the bull and from the blood of the goat*. [This is referring to the Yom Kippur service; the blood from these animals are mixed together and applied on the inner altar. Although there is more blood of the bull, it does not nullify the blood of the goat.] The other *Tannaim* do not derive it from there because they hold that the blood is not mingled for the sprinkling on the horns of the inner Altar (*but rather, they are applied separately*). The others do not derive it from the repetition of the word 'blood,' because they do not consider this repetition to be of any significance. The others use the verse, 'they are holy' to teach that 'they' (*the bechor*) are offered, but their *temurah* is not offered. And the other one derives it from the verse: Whether it is of oxen or of the flock, it is Hashem's. It (the initial *bechor*) is offered, but its *temurah* is not offered.



The *Gemara* asks from a *Baraisa* mentioned above (*regarding a case where a mixture of chatas blood, which is to be applied at the top of the altar became mixed with blood which was to be applied at the bottom*): If the Kohen, without asking, already applied it on top, and then inquired what he should do next, both Rabbi Eliezer and the Sages agree that he should apply the rest below, and both applications count. Now, are we not referring to a case where the blood of a *chatas* were mixed with that of an *olah*, in which case as soon as he sprinkles above, the blood of the *chatas* becomes remnants, and yet he teaches that they both agree that he must go back and sprinkle it below, which proves that the place of the *olah* is the place of the remnants!?

The *Gemara* deflects this: When Rav Yitzchak bar Yosef came, he said: In the West they said that the case we are discussing here is where the blood of an outer *chatas* was mixed with the remnants of an inner *chatas* (*where they both can now be applied below the line*).

Abaye said to him: Why did the master not say a case where it was mixed with remnants (*of another outer chatas*)?

The *Gemara* answers: Perhaps he wished to inform us that even according to the view that the remnants are indispensable, yet if some of it is lacking (*like in this case, where some was applied to the altar above the line*), it does not matter.

Rava Tosfa'ah said to Ravina: But we have explained that as meaning that the greater part was upper [blood], and he sprinkles above as much as there was of the lower [blood] plus a little more? — That was only, he replied, on the hypothesis first stated that [the Mishnah treats of where the blood itself] was mingled, and in accordance with the thesis that there is no even distribution. But in

our final conclusion [we hold that] they disagree where the goblets were mixed up. (81a1 – 81b3)

Mishnah

If blood that requires sprinkling inside became mixed up with that which requires sprinkling outside - it must be poured out into the canal. If he sprinkled outside and then sprinkled inside, it is valid. If he applied it inside and then outside, Rabbi Akiva rules that it is invalid, but the Sages rule that it's valid, for Rabbi Akiva used to say: Any blood that was brought into the Sanctuary to make atonement is invalid. But the Sages say: Only the *chatas*. Rabbi Eliezer said: Also the *asham*, for it is written: *As the chatas so is the asham*. (81b3)

DAILY MASHAL

“Do not add to the word which I command you and do not subtract from it.” The sequence of these commands is enigmatic. One would think that the admonition against subtraction should precede the one against adding to the Torah. First, we should be taught not to remove anything from the Torah that Hashem has given us. Then, we should be exhorted against attempting to be more pious than the Creator by adding mitzvos to His Torah. HARav David Feinstein, ZT”L, explains that the command against subtracting from the Torah is actually an explanation of why we are not permitted to add to the Torah. Whenever one attempts to add to the Torah, he is really subtracting from it, because, in effect, he is disputing the Torah's completeness. He indicates that it needs more. By taking the liberty to add, one is detracting from the Torah's perfection.