



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Yoma, Daf 71 – Daf 80

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
v'l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf 71-----55-----

NATAL ES HADAM MIMI SHEMIMARES BO...

- **Q:** What is a “matzlif”? **A:** R' Yehuda showed, it refers to one giving lashes, who begins higher up and brings each successive lash a little lower.
- A Braisa says, when he sprinkles the blood in the Kodesh Hakodashim, he does not sprinkle it so that it will touch the Aron, rather he sprinkles it towards the Aron, having it fall short of the Aron. When he sprinkles the one sprinkle “above”, he turns his hand over so that the sprinkling action sends the blood up. When he sprinkles the 7 sprinkles “below”, he keeps his hand straight, so that the sprinkling actions sends the blood down.
 - **Q:** How do we know that the blood is not to touch the Aron? **A:** R' Acha bar Yaakov in the name of R' Zeira said, the pasuk regarding the goat says “v'hiza oso ahl (above) hakapores v'lifnei (below) hakapores”. There was no reason to write “lifnei” to teach the 7 below, because we could have learned that from the blood of the par. The reason the pasuk says it is to compare the “above” to the “below”. Just like the sprinklings below are not to touch the Aron, so too the sprinkling above should not touch the Aron.
 - **Q:** Maybe the “above” part of the pasuk regarding the par should be viewed as being extra, because we can learn this out from the “above” requirement of the goat!? Maybe the reason it is written is to compare the “below” to the “above”, that just like the “above” must reach the Aron, the “below” must reach the Aron as well!? **A:** If we use the first method, of darshening the “below” of the goat, we could explain that the extra words of “above” by the par are meant to darshen the drasha of R' Eliezer ben Yaakov (that whenever the Torah says “pnei” it means to the east). However, if we will darshen the “above” of the par as you suggest, the “below” of the goat will remain extra.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding the blood of the goat says “v'hiza oso ahl (above) hakapores v'lifnei (below) hakapores”. It says “oso” for the above, which teaches there is only one sprinkle above. We do not know how many sprinkles are to go below. We learn from the sprinkles below of the par, that he must sprinkle 7 times below by the goat as well.
 - **Q:** The Braisa continues, maybe we should compare the sprinkle below of the goat to the sprinkle above, and say that just as there is only one sprinkle above, there is only one below as well? **A:** The Braisa says, it makes more sense to learn “below” from “below”, rather than below from above.
 - **Q:** The Braisa asks, maybe it makes more sense to learn sprinklings of the goat from the other sprinkling of the goat, rather than to learn it from the sprinklings of the par!? **A:** The pasuk says “v'asah es damo kasher asah l'dam hapar”. This teaches that the sprinklings of both animals should be the same.
 - The Braisa continues, we now know how many sprinklings there are to be from each animal “below”. We also know that the goat gets one sprinkle “above”. We will learn that there is also only one sprinkle above with the par's blood, just like there is one sprinkle above from the goat's blood.
 - **Q:** The Braisa asks, maybe we should learn the above by a par from the below by a par and say that there must be 7 sprinklings above? **A:** The Braisa says, it makes more sense to learn “above” from “above”, rather than above from below.
 - **Q:** The Braisa asks, maybe it makes more sense to learn sprinklings of the par from the other sprinkling of the par, rather than to learn it from the sprinklings of the goat!? **A:** The pasuk says “v'asah es damo kasher asah l'dam hapar”. This teaches that the sprinklings of both animals should be the same.

ACHAS, ACHAS V'ACHAS, ACHAS U'SHTAYIM

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, **R' Meir** says the “achas” for the sprinkle above is always said before the number of sprinkles below. **R' Yehuda** says the number for the sprinkles below is said first. The Gemara says that they do not argue. Each shita follows the way counting was done is their locale.
 - **Q:** All agree that the sprinkle above is counted along with each sprinkle below. Why is this so? **A:** **R' Elazar** says this is done so that he doesn't get mixed up in his count. **R' Yochanan** says, the extra word “yazeh” in the pasuk of “v'lifnei hakapores yazeh”, teaches that the sprinkle above must be counted along with each sprinkle below.
 - **Q:** What is the practical difference between these reasons? **A:** If he did not count, but did not get mixed up either. According to **R' Elazar** that is ok. According to **R' Yochanan** he would have to sprinkle again.

YATZA V'HENICHO AHL KAN HAZAHAV SHEBAHEICHAL

- A Braisa in Shekalim says that **R' Yehuda** holds there are no collection boxes in the Beis Hamikdash for obligatory bird korbanos, because we are afraid that the money would get mixed up with money for voluntary bird korbanos. **Abaye** asked, why can't we just label the boxes, which would prevent them from getting mixed up!? **R' Yosef** answered, **R' Yehuda** holds that labeling is not a sufficient safeguard to prevent a mix-up.
 - **R' Yosef** proves this point from our Mishna, where **R' Yehuda** says there was only one stand in the Beis Hamikdash, presumably because he says that having 2 stands may lead to the mixing up of the blood of the par and the goat. Labeling would not have been sufficient.
 - **Q:** **R' Yehuda** says in a Mishna that labeling was sufficient to prevent mixing up the different types of voluntary bird korbanos. We see labeling is sufficient. If so, why does he not allow a collection box for obligatory bird korbanos as well? **A:** **R' Dimi** said, the reason he does not allow that is because he is concerned that the owner of one of the chatas may die, in which case that chatas may not be brought.
 - **Q:** We see from a Mishna that we are not concerned for death in this way!? **A:** He is concerned for the case of when he knowingly dies before the money from the collection box is used. Because the dead man's money may not be used for a chatas, all the money will become passul.
 - **Q:** Why can't we remove money equal to the value that the person put in, and through “breirah” say that this is the money of the man who died, in this way not having to make all the money passul!? **A:** **R' Yehuda** does not hold of the concept of breirah.

-----Daf 56-----

- **Q:** How do we know that **R' Yehuda** doesn't hold of the concept of breirah? It can't be from the Mishna in which he doesn't allow the oral declaration of terumah and ma'aser on wine in a barrel without the immediate physical removal (he can't just leave over some wine in the barrel when he is done and say that it is the terumah and ma'aser that was previously declared), because the reason he doesn't allow that is based on the concern that the barrel may break, not necessarily because he doesn't hold of breirah!? **A:** We see it from the teaching of **Ayo**, who taught that **R' Yehuda** says, one may not set up 2 eiruvei techumin with the thought that he will decide on Shabbos which one he meant to establish at bein hashmashos on Friday night. Clearly this is because he does not hold of the concept of breirah.
- **Q:** Although we have shown that **R' Yehuda** does not hold of breirah, we have shown that he considers writing a sufficient safeguard against mixing things up. If so, why could there only be one stand in the Beis Hamikdash? **A:** Since, on Yom Kippur, the Kohen Gadol is in a very weakened state, we are afraid that the writing would not be a sufficient safeguard, and if there were 2 stands, the blood of the goat and the blood of the par may be mixed up. That must be the reason, because even without labeling, it would seem difficult to mix up the blood of the animals, since the par has so much more blood than the goat, and the bloods are different shades of red.
 - The chazzan where **Rava** davened once said the “Avodah” in Mussaf on Yom Kippur, and said that the Kohen Gadol would place the goat's blood on the second stand in the Heichal. He would pick up the blood of the par and put down the blood of the goat. **Rava** said to him, saying there was a second stand follows the **Rabanan**, but saying that he had to pick up the blood of the par before putting down the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

blood of the goat follows **R' Yehuda!**? Rather, you should say that he first puts down the blood and then takes the other blood.

-----Daf 7]---57-----

V'HIZA MIMENU AHL HAPAROCHES K'NEGED ARON M'BACHUTZ

- A Braisa explains, the pasuk says “v'chein yaseh l'ohel moed”. This teaches that just as the blood of the par and goat are sprinkled once above and 7 times below in the Kodesh Hakodashim, they are sprinkled in the same way in the Heichal as well. The pasuk continues “hashochein itam b'soch tum'osam”. This teaches that the Shechina is with the Yidden even when they are tamei.
 - **Q:** How can we learn that we must sprinkle in the Heichal from a hekesh from the sprinkling in the Kodesh Hakodashim? The sprinkling of the Kodesh Hakodashim itself is learned from a hekesh (the number of times to sprinkle), and something learned from a hekesh cannot teach further through a hekesh!? **A:** The sprinkling in the Kodesh Hakodashim is learned partly from a pasuk and partly from a hekesh. This is not considered to be a hekesh, and can therefore be used to teach further through a hekesh.
 - **Q:** There is a shita that holds that this is still considered to be learned out from a hekesh. If so, how can it teach further via a hekesh? **A:** The first hekesh is about the blood itself, whereas the second hekesh is regarding the placement of the sprinklings. Since it is not the same concept being taught, this may be done. **A2:** Parts of this are taught through direct pesukim, and therefore allow any parts taught by a hekesh as well.
- A Braisa says, when he sprinkles in the Heichal, he sprinkles *toward* the paroches, but does not make the blood touch the paroches. **R' Elazar the son of R' Yose** said, I have seen the paroches in Rome, and saw many drops of par and goat blood from the Yom Kippur Avodah.
 - **Q:** Maybe what he saw was blood from a par helam davar or from the se'irei avoda zarah!? **A:** He saw that the blood followed a pattern of being sprinkled one above and 7 below.
 - A Braisa says that the blood of the par helam davar should also be sprinkled toward the paroches without touching the paroches, but if it does touch the paroches, it is still valid. **R' Elazar the son of R' Yose** said, I saw the paroches in Rome and saw many drops of blood on it from the par helam davar and the se'irei avoda zarah.
 - **Q:** Maybe what he saw was the blood from the Yom Kippur Avodah!? **A:** He saw there was no pattern, so the drops could not have been from the Yom Kippur Avoda.
- **Q:** What should be done if the blood of the par and the goat get mixed together before they are sprinkled? **A:** **Rava** said, one set of sprinklings should be done, and it is considered as if the blood of the par and the blood of the goat were each validly sprinkled.
 - **Q:** **R' Yirmiya** said that cannot be valid, because that would mean that the “above” sprinkling of the goat will have been done before the “below” sprinkling of the par, and we learn from a pasuk that that is not allowed!? **A:** Rather, **R' Yirmiya** said, he sprinkles a full set of 1 and 7 with intention for the par and then another full set of 1 and 7 with intention for the goat.
- **Q:** What happens if the blood of the animals got mixed together after the 1 sprinkling above of the par, but before the 7 below? **A:** **R' Pappa** thought to say that he should immediately sprinkle one set of 7 times with intent for the par and goat (together) and then does one more sprinkle above for the goat. **Rava** said, this clearly cannot be done, because we cannot sprinkle the 7 below for the goat before sprinkling the 1 above for the goat. Rather, he should sprinkle 7 below with intent for the par, and then do another full set of 1 and 7 with intent for the goat.
- **Q:** What happens if the cups of blood are confused (but not mixed together)? **A:** He does a set of 1 and 7 with the blood of one cup, does it again with the blood of the second cup, and does it once again from the blood of the first cup. In this way, he is certain that the blood of the goat was sprinkled after the blood of the par.
- **Q:** If part of each blood went into a third cup (so that there is now a cup of par blood, a cup of goat blood, and a cup of mixed blood), clearly he should use the pure blood for the sprinklings. However, what is the halacha with the mixed cup? Is it considered like any leftover blood and must therefore be poured at the base of the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Mizbe'ach, or is it considered rejected, and would therefore be poured into the stream of water that flows through the Azarah? **A: R' Pappa** said, since he may not use the mixed cup for sprinkling, it is surely considered to be rejected blood. **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** said, since this blood was not actively rejected, it is not considered to be rejected, and should be poured at the base of the Mizbe'ach.

EIRAH DAM HAPAR L'TOCH DAM HASA'IR

- Our Mishna follows the shita that the two bloods are mixed together before being applied to the corners of the Mizbe'ach. This is a matter of machlokes between **R' Yoshiya** and **R' Yonason**: one says it is mixed and one says it is not.
 - We can bring a proof that **R' Yoshiya** is the one who says it must be mixed, because he says regarding a different topic, that when a pasuk connects two things with a “vuv”, it means “together”. Therefore, when the pasuk regarding the blood says “v'lakach m'dam hapar u'midam hasa'ir”, it means that both should be mixed together.
 - It could be that **R' Yonason** would agree that the blood must be mixed, because the pasuk says the blood should be placed on the corners of the Mizbe'ach “**achas** bashana”, which teaches that they should be mixed as one.
 - There is a Braisa which clearly says, **R' Yoshiya** says the bloods are mixed together before being applied to the corners of the Mizbe'ach, and **R' Yonason** says they are not mixed before doing so. The Braisa explains, that **R' Yoshiya** says the word “achas” teaches that there is only one set of application of the blood to the Mizbe'ach, so it must be that the blood of the 2 animals are combined for this process. **R' Yonason** holds that “achas” teaches that there is only one application for each animal, but the blood of each animal is done separately.

-----Daf פ]---58-----

NOSSAN ES HAMALEI BAREIKAN...

- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked **R' Chisda**, if a Kohen caught the blood in a keili that was inside of another keili, is that considered to be a chatzitza (he is not directly holding the keili) or is it not a chatzitza because it is a like-kind keili? **A: R' Chisda** said, our Mishna says that the Kohen Gadol places the full keili in the empty one, so apparently it is not a chatzitza.
 - **Q:** That is not what the Mishna means! The Mishna means that he pours the mixed blood into the now empty keili. This is done to make sure that it is mixed well.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that if a Kohen does the Avodah while standing on the foot of another Kohen, it is passul. We see that even a like-kind keili is considered to be a chatzitza! **A:** It may be that the case of the foot is different because it cannot be considered “batul” to remain there.
 - **Q:** Others say, that **Rami bar Chama** asked, although a keili within a keili would not be a chatzitza, the question is whether it is considered to be a properly done Avodah if done in this way. **A:** The Gemara brings a Braisa that brings the pasuk of “es kol klei (plural) hashareis (singular)”, which suggests that even 2 keilim may be used for the one Avodah.
- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked **R' Chisda**, if the blood is caught in a keili that is lined with the material that grows around a palm tree, do we say that since it is porous it is not considered to be a chatzitza, or is it nonetheless considered to be a chatzitza? **A:** A Mishna says that if a sponge (which is porous) is in the keili that is holding the water to be used for the parah adumah, it is not considered to be a chatzitza between the water and the keili.
 - It may be that the case of the sponge is different, because water is very thin and therefore easily flows through the sponge.
 - Others say that **R' Chisda** answered that in the case of blood the palm tree material will not be a chatzitza, but with regard to a kometz being placed into a keili lined with this material, it will be considered a chatzitza (because flour will not flow through).

MISHNA

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The pasuk says that the Kohen Gadol “goes out to the Mizbe’ach that is before Hashem”. This refers to the Golden Mizbe’ach (inside the Heichal). The Kohen Gadol applies the mixed blood in a downward motion onto each corner. He begins with the northeast corner, then to the northwest, then the southwest, and ends at the southeast (which is where the blood of a typical Chatas brought on the outside Mizbe’ach begins to be offered). **R’ Eliezer** says, the Kohen Gadol did not walk around the Mizbe’ach. He applied to all the corners while standing in one place. He says that the blood was applied to all the corners via an upward motion, except for the corner directly in front of where he was standing, which got applied via a downward motion.
- Following the above, he would sprinkle the blood 7 times on the “taharo” (the top) of the Mizbe’ach. The remaining blood would be poured on the western base of the outside Mizbe’ach. Leftover blood from an offering of the outside Mizbe’ach would be poured on the southern base of that Mizbe’ach. Both of these eventually led to the stream that ran through the Azarah, which would flow into the “Nachal Kidron”. There, it was sold to gardeners to use as fertilizer. Use before payment was not permitted and would be subject to the me’ilah penalty.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “v’yatza ehl haMizbe’ach”. This teaches that the previous Avodah, of sprinkling onto the paroches, is done while the Kohen Gadol is between the paroches and the Mizbe’ach (hence, “v’yatza”). This is unlike the korbos a Kohen Gadol brings for doing certain aveiros, which although is also sprinkled towards the paroches, is sprinkled while standing between the Mizbe’ach and the entrance to the Heichal.
 - Another Braisa also says that for this other korbos the Kohen Gadol must be standing between the Mizbe’ach and the opening of the Heichal, because the pasuk there refers to the Mizbe’ach as “lifnei Hashem”. The Braisa learns that only the Mizbe’ach should be before Hashem, but the Kohen Gadol should not.

HISCHIL MICHATEI V’YORED...

- A Braisa says, **R’ Akiva** says that the order of the blood applications was southeast, southwest, northwest, and then northeast (because he held that the entrance to the Kodosh Hakodashim was in the south, which is why he began sprinkling in the south because that was the side he encountered when leaving the Kodosh Hakodashim). **R’ Yose Haglili** says that the order was as stated in our Mishna, beginning at the northeast and ending at the southeast (because he held that the entrance to the Kodosh Hakodashim was in the north, which is why he began sprinkling in the north, because that was the side he encountered when leaving the Kodosh Hakodashim).
 - **Q:** Both shittos agree that he did not offer the blood on the first corner that he encountered (i.e. the west), rather he would walk to the east and begin there. Why? **A: Shmuel** explained, the pasuk says “v’yatza ehl haMizbe’ach”, which means he must walk the length of the Mizbe’ach before applying the blood.
 - **Q:** Why does **R’ Akiva** say that he applies the blood around the Mizbe’ach by making left turns? Does he not hold of the statement of **Rami bar Yechezkel** which said that all turns made during the Avodah were to be made to the right? **A:** He agrees with **Rami bar Yechezkel**, but that statement was made for turns outside the Heichal, and **R’ Akiva** says that we do not apply it for inside the Heichal as well.
 - **Q:** Even if **R’ Akiva** doesn’t learn that the turns *must* be to the right, why does he insist that the turns be to the left? **A:** In truth he should apply the blood to the first corner he encounters (the southwest corner), because of the rule that we are not to pass over a mitzvah. The pasuk teaches that he must pass that corner and apply to the southeast corner first. Therefore, once the southeast corner is done, he must go back to the corner that should have been first and was skipped over, even though it requires that a left turn be made. **A2: R’ Akiva** holds that the Kohen stood in one place when he applied this blood to the corners, therefore it need not follow the rule to make right turns, because he is not walking. **R’ Yose Haglili** holds that he walked around, which is why right turns must be made. **A3:** All agree that he stood in one place, but they argue whether we learn the “turns” made by his hand from the turns when he walks. **R’ Akiva** says we do not and **R’ Yose** says that we do.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** How can we say that **R' Yose** says the Kohen Gadol stays in one place? The **T"K** of our Mishna must be **R' Yose Haglili** (based on the order of the applications), and the **T"K** holds that the Kohen Gadol walked around the Mizbe'ach (as is evident from the fact that **R' Eliezer** argues that point with him)!? **A:** It must be like the previous answer said, that **R' Yose** holds that the Kohen Gadol actually walked around the Mizbe'ach.

-----Daf **ו**]---59-----

R' ELIEZER OMER BIMKOMO HAYA OMEID U'MECHATEI

- Our Mishna follows **R' Yehuda's** version of **R' Eliezer** (that he would apply the blood to the corners in an upward motion except for the corner directly in front of him, which he would apply in a downward motion, so that he should not get blood on his clothing). However, **R' Meir** says that **R' Eliezer** says all corners were applied in a downward motion except the corner diagonally across from where he was standing, which was applied in an upward motion).

HIZA MIMENU AHL TAHARO SHEL MIZBE'ACH

- **Q:** What part of the Mizbe'ach is referred to as "taharo"? **A: Rabba bar R' Shilah** said, it means the midpoint of the height of the Mizbe'ach (on the side wall).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that when he sprinkles the blood on the Mizbe'ach, it should not be done on the ashes or the coals. Rather, he should clear a place and sprinkle there. We see he didn't sprinkle on the wall!? **A:** Rather, **Rabba bar Shila** said, "taharo" refers to the top of the Mizbe'ach.
- A Braisa says, **Chananya** says the blood was sprinkled on the north of the Mizbe'ach (he holds the entrance to the Kodsh Hakodashim was in the south, which means the corner applications ended on the corner in the north), and **R' Yose** says it was sprinkled on the south of the Mizbe'ach (he holds the entrance to the Kodsh Hakodashim was in the north, which means the corner applications ended on the corner in the south).
 - All agree that wherever the corner applications were completed is where the blood was sprinkled onto the top of the Mizbe'ach. This is based on the pasuk that says "v'tiharo v'kidsho", which teaches that the place where the corner applications are completed should be the place where it is sprinkled onto the top of the Mizbe'ach.

SHIYAREI HADAM HAYA SHOFECH AHL YISOD MARAVI SHEL MIZBE'ACH HACHITZON

- It is poured at the western base, because the pasuk teaches that it should be poured on the base that is near the entrance to the Mikdash, and that is the part of the base that he encounters first when he approaches the Mizbe'ach after leaving the Heichal.

V'SHEL MIZBE'ACH HACHITZON HAYA SHOFECH AHL YESOD DEROMIS

- A Braisa says, we learn that he should pour the blood at the part of the base that he first encounters when coming down the ramp of the Mizbe'ach (we learn this from the Yom Kippur Avodah, which itself was learned from the pasuk, as explained above). The part of the base that he first encounters is the southern base.
- A Braisa says, **R' Yishmael** says the Chatas of Yom Kippur and the Chatas of all year long have their leftover blood spilled on the western base. **R' Shimon ben Yochai** says they are both spilled on the southern base.
 - **Q: R' Yishmael's** view is understandable, because since the Torah doesn't say where the Chatas of all year should be poured, he says we learn from Yom Kippur that it should be poured on the western base. However, what is **R' Shimon ben Yochai's** reasoning? **A: R' Ashi** explains, he holds that the entrance to the Heichal was south of the Mizbe'ach. Therefore, when leaving the Heichal, the first base he would encounter would be the base on the south side.

EILU V'EILU MISARVIN B'AMAH V'YOTZIN...

- A Braisa says, **R' Meir and R' Shimon** say that blood is subject to me'ilah, but the **Chachomim** say it is not.
 - The machlokes is only regarding me'ilah **D'Rabanan**. However, all agree that there is no me'ila on blood **D'Oraisa**. How do we know this? **A: Ulla** said, the pasuk regarding the korbon blood says "lachem". This teaches it is yours, and there is no me'ilah. **A2: The Yeshiva of R' Shimon** taught, the pasuk says "l'chaper". The blood was given for a kappara, not for me'ilah. **A3: R' Yochanan** said, "hu", which

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

teaches that the blood has the same status before the kapparah as it has after the kapparah (no me'ilah).

- **Q:** Maybe we should compare the blood after the kappara to the blood before the kapparah and say that me'ilah does apply? **A:** That can't be, because we never find something that already had its mitzvah done, that is still subject to me'ilah.
 - **Q:** Terumas Hadeshen is subject to me'ilah even after the mitzvah is done!? **A:** Terumas Hadeshen and the bigdei kehunah are 2 pesukim that teach that me'ilah applies even after the mitzvah is done. When 2 pesukim teach the same thing, we can't use that to teach elsewhere.
 - **Q:** That answer works according to the **Rabanan** who say that the pasuk by bigdei kehuna teaches that me'ilah applies after the mitzvah is done. However, according to **R' Dosa**, who uses the pasuk for a different drasha, why can't we learn from terumas hadeshen that me'ilah applies even after a mitzvah is done? **A:** The pasuk regarding eglah arufah also teaches that me'ilah applies there after the mitzvah is done, so there are still 2 pesukim that teach this concept, which means that it should not be applied elsewhere.
 - **Q:** There is a shita that says that we can apply something taught by 2 pesukim to other places as well. According to him, why can't we say that me'ilah applies after the mitzvah is done? **A:** The pesukim of terumas hadeshen and eglah arufah have exclusionary words ("samo" and "ha'arufah"), which teach that this is not to be applied elsewhere.
- **Q:** Why do we need 3 pesukim to exclude the blood from me'ilah? **A:** One pasuk excludes the blood from the halachos of nossar, one excludes it from the halachos of me'ilah, and one excludes it from the halachos of tumah (if a tamei person eats the blood he would not be chayuv for eating tamei kodashim).
 - A pasuk is not needed to exclude the blood from piggul, because piggul only applies to a part of the korbos that becomes mutar through some other process (e.g. the meat becomes mutar through the zerika of the blood). Blood is itself the permitting process, and is therefore not subject to piggul.

-----Daf 60-----

MISHNA

- Any of the Avodos of Yom Kippur that are done out of order, are invalid. Therefore, if the blood of the goat is offered before the blood of the par, the Kohen Gadol must offer the blood of the goat again after that of the par, to make it valid.
- If the blood of the animals spilled before he could complete the offerings inside the Kodosh Hakodashim, he must shecht another animal, and begin the Avodah inside the Kodosh Hakodashim again.
 - The same would hold true if he spilled the blood before completing the sprinklings on the paroches. He would have to shecht a new animal and start again from the paroches sprinklings.
 - The same would hold true if the blood would spill before completing the Avodah on the inside Mizbe'ach. He would have to shecht a new animal and start again from the Avodah on the Mizbe'ach.
 - **R' Elazar and R' Shimon** say that he would begin from the place that he was up to when the blood spilled.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, any Yom Kippur Avodah done out of order is not valid. **R' Yehuda** says, that is only regarding Avodos done in the white clothing inside the Kodosh Hakodashim. However, Avodos done in the white clothing outside of the Kodosh Hakodashim are not invalid if done out of order. **R' Nechemia** says, order is essential for any Avodah that must be done in the white clothing. It is only not essential for the Avodos done in the golden clothing.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yochanan** explained, the word “chukas” in the pasuk “v’huysa zos lachem l’chukas olam...achas bashana” teaches that order is essential for whatever this pasuk is referring to. **R' Yehuda** says this refers to the Avodos that are done in the *place* that is used once a year (i.e. inside the Kodesh Hakodashim). **R' Nechemia** says this refers to the Avodos that are done in the *special clothing* (the white clothing) once a year.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Yehuda**, does the pasuk say “the place”? **A:** **R' Yehuda** will say, the pasuk uses the exclusionary words of “zos” and “achas”. One teaches that order is not essential for Avodos done in the white clothing outside of the Kodesh Hakodashim, and one teaches that order is not essential for Avodos done in the golden clothing.
 - **R' Nechemia** will say that one teaches that order is not essential for Avodos done in the golden clothing, and one teaches that the pouring of the leftover blood is not an essential Avodah.
 - **R' Yehuda** says, the pasuk does not differentiate the pouring of the leftovers from the other Avodos. Therefore, if one holds that the other Avodos are essential, the pouring of the leftovers will be as well, and if the rest are not essential, neither is the pouring.
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Yochanan** says that **R' Nechemia** says that the pouring of the leftover blood *is* essential, so how could we answer for **R' Yochanan** that he says that it is not!? **A:** This remains a Kashyeh.
- **R' Chanina** said, if the Kohen Gadol did the chafinah of the ketores before shechting the par, the chafina is not valid.
 - **Q:** Presumably, this does not follow **R' Yehuda**, because he says that order is only essential for Avodos done in the white clothing while in the Kodesh Hakodashim!? **A:** It may be that **R' Yehuda** would agree with this, because he may consider anything that is being prepared for use in the Kodesh Hakodashim as having the status of an Avodah done inside the Kodesh Hakodashim.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna said, if the blood spills before completion of the sprinklings inside the Kodesh Hakodashim, he must shecht a new animal and begin the inside sprinklings again. Now, if **R' Yehuda** holds as you have suggested, that the chafinah is considered an Avodah of the Kodesh Hakodashim, to which order is essential, then after the new shechita the Kohen Gadol should need to do another chafinah and the entire ketores process as well!? **A:** The Mishna is not discussing the ketores, however, it may be that it must be brought again.
- **Ulla** said, if the goat is shechted before the blood applications of the par, it is not valid.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna says, if he offers the blood of the goat first, he must offer the par blood and then follow it with the goat blood. The Mishna does not say that a new animal must be brought and shechted!? **A:** This part of the Mishna is discussing the blood application in the Heichal. However, if the goat’s blood was applied before the par in the Kodesh Hakodashim (which would mean that it was shechted before the offering of the par’s blood), he would certainly have to shecht another goat.

-----Daf נ"ו---61-----

V'CHEIN BAHEICHAL V'CHEIN BAMIZBE'ACH...

- A Braisa darshens the pesukim that discuss the kapparah brought about by the Yom Kippur Avodah. “V’chiper es mikdash hakodesh” refers to a kapparah for tumah in the Kodesh Hakodashim; “Ohel Moed” refers to the Heichal; “Mizbe’ach” refers to the Mizbe’ach”; “Yichaper” refers to the Azaros. “HaKohanim” refers to the Kohanim; “Am Hakahal” refers to the Yisraelim; “Yichaper” refers to the Levi’im. The pasuk puts all these people together to teach that all received a kapparah through the goat that is sent to the Azazel for all other aveiros. This is the view of **R' Yehuda**. **R' Shimon** says that the par brings kapparah for the Kohanim and the goats bring a kapparah for the rest of the Yidden.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says (based on the first pasuk quoted in the last Braisa), that each set of blood applications is a stand-alone set, so that if the blood were to spill before the completion of any set, new blood would be brought and only that set needs be repeated. **R' Elazar and R' Shimon** say that he picks up with the new blood from where he left off before spilling the old blood. All agree, that once the applications on the Mizbe'ach are completed, if the blood were to spill, he need not bring new blood to pour on the base of the outside Mizbe'ach.
 - **R' Yochanan** explained that both shitos darshen the same pasuk – “Midam chatas hakipurim achas bashanah”. The **T”K** says that this means that there may only be one chatas per sprinkling segment (the entire segment must come from the blood of one animal), and **R' Elazar and R' Shimon** say it means that no sprinkling may be repeated (which is why he picks up the sprinkling process at the place he was up to when the blood spilled).
 - We find that **R' Meir** (the **T”K** in the above Braisa) and **R' Elazar and R' Shimon** have this same machlokes with regard to the oil of a metzora's tahara process (sprinkling towards the Heichal, placing the oil on the metzora's thumbs, placing oil on the metzora's head) that spilled at some point in the process. **R' Meir** says he must bring more oil and repeat the segment that was being done, and **R' Elazar and R' Shimon** say that the process is picked up with the new oil at the place in the segment that he was up to before the oil spilled. However, all would agree that if the oil spilled after the application to the thumbs, that he need not bring more oil to place on his head (that segment is not essential).
 - The segment of placing oil on the head is not essential, because the pasuk refers to the oil for that segment as the “remainder of the remainder”.
 - **R' Yochanan** said, if the Asham required to be brought by the metzora is shechted by the Kohen not for sake of an Asham (in which case the metzora cannot fulfill his obligation with it), according to **R' Meir** who says the earlier Avodos of the segment are totally disregarded if something goes wrong, he can bring a new Asham, because the previous shechita is totally disregarded. However, according to **R' Elazar and R' Shimon**, what was previously done in the segment is never fully disregarded. Therefore, in this case he may *not* bring another Asham, because the previous shechita is not disregarded and the pasuk teaches that he may not bring two Ashamos.
 - **Q: R' Chisda** asked, the pasuk regarding the Asham says “oso”, which teaches that only one Asham may be brought, even according to **R' Meir**? **A: KASHYEH.**
 - There is a Braisa that says like **R' Yochanan**. The Braisa says, if the Asham is brought not for its sake, or if the blood was not placed on the thumbs, it should be brought on the Mizbe'ach as a korbon, but the metzora needs another Asham to fulfil his obligation.
 - **R' Chisda** says the Braisa means that he has to bring another Asham, but he cannot do so, and therefore he is stuck without a tahara.
 - **Q:** Would a Braisa say that something must be brought, but mean that since it cannot be brought the person is stuck? **A:** We find that a Braisa brings a machlokes regarding a bald metzora (part of the metzora's tahara process is that his hair must be shaved with a razor). **B”S** say he must be shaved with a razor and **B”H** say he need not be shaved. **R' Avina** explained that **B”S** say he must be shaved, but since he cannot (he has no hair), he is stuck. **R' Pedas** argues and explains that **B”S** means they pass the razor over him even though he has no hair, and that acts as the shaving of his tahara process.
 - A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding the Asham says “v'lakach midam ha'asham”. We would think the blood should be taken in a keili. The pasuk therefore says “v'nossan”, which teaches that just as the placing of the blood is done with the hand of the Kohen, so too the taking of the blood is done with the hand of the Kohen. We would think that the blood to be offered on the Mizbe'ach should also be taken in the Kohen's hand. The pasuk therefore says “ka'chatas ha'asham hu”, to teach that just like a chatas needs a keili, so does the ashram. The result is that 2 Kohanim are needed to catch the blood of this ashram. One catches in his hand and applies it to the metzora, and the other catches in a keili and brings that to the Mizbe'ach.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, **R' Elazar and R' Shimon** say, if (because the blood spilled) there ends up being multiple animals for the par and goat of Yom Kippur, each of these animals must be taken out to be burned at the Beis Hadeshen, and make tamei the clothing of the Kohanim who carry them (as is the case when there is only one par and goat that was used). The **Chachomim** say, only the final par and goat used need to be so burned and would make the clothing tamei.
 - Based on the fact that any additional goat to be shechted would need an additional goat to be part of the new gorel, there may be a number of goats that are designated to be sent to the Azazel. **Rava** asked **R' Nachman**, are all these goats sent to the Azazel? He said, do you think we would send a whole herd of animals to the Azazel? **Rava** asked, do we ever find that the whole herd is to be burned (and yet we have said above that they are all burned)!? **R' Nachman** said, by the goat to be sent to the Azazel, the pasuk says “oso”, which means that there should be only one.
 - **R' Papi in the name of Rava** said, when there end up being multiple goats, the first goat would be sent to the Azazel. **R' Simi in the name of Rava** said that the last goat is sent.
 - **Q: R' Simi** holds that the one with which the Avodah was completed is sent. What does **R' Papi** hold? **A:** He holds like **R' Yose**, that the ideal mitzvah is to be performed with the first. We find that **R' Yose** says this when one lost his Pesach and designated a second, but then found the first. He says that if they are of equal quality, he should use the first one.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HOTZI'U LO!!!