



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Zevachim, Daf ע"ו – Daf כ"ב

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 ע"ו---76-----

#### MISHNA

- If an asham became mixed up with a shelamim, **R' Shimon** says both of them should be shechted in the north and should be eaten according to the chumra of each of them. The **Chachomim** said to him, he would be increasing the chance that a korbon will be left over as passul (by shortening the allowable time for eating the shelamim) and that is not allowed.
- If pieces of meat of one korbon became mixed with pieces of meat of another korbon, whether it was kodshei kodashim and kodashim kalim, or whether it was things that can be eaten for one day and a night with things that can be eaten for two days and a night, they should be eaten according to the chumra of each of them.

#### GEMARA

- A Braisa was taught in front of **Rav** that said, one may not use money of shmitta produce to buy terumah, because that limits the eating of the terumah (to the time limit allowed for eating shmitta produce).
  - The **Rabanan** said to **Rabbah**, this Braisa cannot follow **R' Shimon**, because he is not concerned with increasing the chance that a korbon will be left over as passul, and would therefore have no problem with limiting the time for the terumah to be eaten. **Rabbah** said, the Braisa may follow **R' Shimon**. **R' Shimon** is only not concerned when it was already mixed – b'dieved, but would not allow one to go ahead and do something that would limit the ability to eat it – l'chatchila.
    - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Mishna says that **R' Shimon** allows the Kohanim to spice the meat of korbanos even with spices of terumah. Now, that limits the allowable time to eat this terumah and shows that **R' Shimon** even allows this to be done l'chatchila!? **A: Rava** said, you can't bring a proof from this case, because terumah of spices is only D'Rabanan.
    - **Q:** A Mishna says that a Kohen may not purchase terumah with money of maaser sheini, but **R' Shimon** allows it. We see that **R' Shimon** allows this l'chatchila even though it limits the eating of the terumah (it now may only be eaten in Yerushalayim)!? To this, **Rava** remained quiet.
    - **R' Yosef** asked **Abaye**, why didn't you ask from another Mishna which says that one may not cook vegetables of shmitta with oil of terumah so that the terumah not risk becoming passul (along with the shmitta), but **R' Shimon** allows it. We see from here that **R' Shimon** allows this even l'chatchila! **Abaye** said, the oil discussed in the Mishna is vegetable oil, and the terumah is therefore only D'Rabanan. The same way he dismissed my proof from the spices of terumah, by saying the terumah is only D'Rabanan, he would have said the same thing on this Mishna. **R' Yosef** said, if the Mishna was discussing terumah D'Rabanan, it would have given the example of terumah of vegetables and oil of shmitta. The fact that it referenced oil of terumah means it was referring to a D'Oraisa! **Abaye** said, had I asked from this Mishna he would have answered the same way he answered when I asked from our Mishna – that the case is where it was already mixed, a case of b'dieved.
      - **Q:** If it was already mixed, why would the **Rabanan** say it may not be cooked? **A:** It is just like our Mishna, where the shelamim and asham were already mixed and still the **Rabanan** say it is assur so as not to cause the asham to become passul quicker. They would hold the same way in this case with the oil of terumah.
        - **Q:** They are machmir in the Mishna because there is a remedy – to allow the animals to graze, get a mum, and buy new korbanos. In the case of the oil there is no remedy. It is more similar to the later case of the Mishna, where pieces of meat of one korbon became mixed with pieces of meat of another korbon,

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

where there is also no remedy, which is why the meat may be eaten within the bounds of the chumros of the two korbanos. Rather, the case of the terumah oil must be where it was not yet mixed, and still **R' Shimon** allows them to be cooked together although it limits the eating of the terumah!? **A: Ravina** said, this case is not like the case of the mixed pieces of meat. In the case of the meat there is absolutely no remedy. In the case of the oil there is a remedy – to squeeze out the oil from the vegetables, and that is why the **Rabanan** don't allow cooking them together.

- **R' Yosef** says squeezing is not a remedy. If it is squeezed very hard it will cause the vegetables to be ruined. If it is not squeezed very hard it will still leave oil mixed in with the vegetables of shmitta.
- **Q: Abaye** tried to refute **Rabbah** again from another Braisa. The Braisa says that if a person is a safek metzora, **R' Shimon** says he brings a korbon and a log of oil on the 8<sup>th</sup> day and says, if he is truly a metzora it should be an asham, and if he is not it should be a shelamim. This korbon is then eaten for one day and a night like an asham. We see that **R' Shimon** is not concerned with limiting the allowable time for eating a korbon!? **A:** It may be that he allows that only because this remedies the person from his classification as a metzora, but otherwise would not allow that to be done.
  - **Q:** This process works for the korbon (if it is not an asham it becomes a shelamim), but what is done with the log of oil (if he is truly not a metzora how can it be brought)? **A:** He says, if the oil is not needed, it should be considered as a nedavah.
    - **Q:** If he is not a metzora, there would need to be a kometz taken from the oil and offered on the Mizbe'ach!? **A:** The Kohen does the kemitza.
    - **Q:** If he is a metzora there must be 7 applications with the oil!? **A:** The Kohen does the 7 applications.
    - **Q:** After the kemitza there is less than a full log of oil, so how can the applications then be done if there is not a full log of oil? **A:** After taking the kemitza they bring a little oil and add it to the oil, to complete the log. We find a Mishna that allows this to be done.
    - **Q:** If he is not truly a metzora the kemitza must be burned on the Mizbe'ach!? **A:** The Kohen burns it on the Mizbe'ach.
    - **Q:** If it is burned after the 7 applications are done, it would be a kemitza on which the leftovers are no longer complete, and we don't burn such a kemitza!? If it is burned before the 7 applications it may not be burned, because once part is burned on the Mizbe'ach we are no longer allowed to offer other parts!? **A: R' Yehuda in the name of R' Shimon ben Pazzi** said, the Kohen says, if the person is a metzora the sprinkling is done for him. If he is not, the sprinkling is being offered as fuel for the fire of the Mizbe'ach. We find that **R' Eliezer** of a Braisa allows this.
    - **Q:** If he is truly not a metzora, then the amount of oil that is added after the kemitza is taken, has never had a kemitza taken from it, and should therefore be assur!? **A:** He redeems that oil and removes its kedusha.
    - **Q:** Where does he redeem it? If he redeems it in the Azarah, he has brought chullin into the Azarah, and if he does it outside, he has taken kodashim outside the Azarah!? **A:** He does it inside, and since it becomes chullin on its own when it is already inside the Azarah, it is not a problem.
    - **Q: R' Shimon** said that one may not make a nedavah of oil!? **A:** It may be that he allows that only because this remedies the person from his classification as a metzora, but otherwise would not allow that to be done.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Rechumi in the name of R' Huna bar Tachlifa** said in front of **Ravina**, why doesn't the person say that the asham should be an asham taluy? It must be that the Tanna who argues on **R' Eliezer** is **R' Shimon**, who holds that one may not make a nedavah of an asham taluy. **Ravina** said, the animal brought for an asham is different than the animal brought for an asham taluy, and therefore this cannot be done.

-----Daf 77-----

### MISHNA

- If the limbs of a chatas became mixed with the limbs of an olah, **R' Eliezer** says they should all be put on the fire on the Mizbe'ach and we view the chatas meat as if it were wood (the limbs of a chatas may not be burned on the Mizbe'ach). The **Chachomim** say we leave them overnight (so that they become nossar) and we then burn them off the Mizbe'ach as nossar.

### GEMARA

- **R' Eliezer** darshens the pasuk of "v'ehl haMizbe'ach lo yaalu l'rei'ach nicho'ach" to teach that leftover pieces of a korbon may not be offered as "rei'ach nicho'ach", but it may be offered for the sake of fuel for the fire. The **Rabanan** darshen the word "osam" in the beginning of that pasuk to teach that only "se'or" and "devash" may be offered as fuel for the fire, but other things may not.
  - **R' Eliezer** will say that "osam" teaches that when dealing with "se'or" and "devash" it is even assur to burn them on the ramp, just like on top of the Mizbe'ach. The **Rabanan** say that both things can be learned from this word.
- Our Mishna does not follow the Tanna of a Braisa. The Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** said, **R' Eliezer and the Rabanan** agree that limbs of a chatas that are mixed with limbs of an olah are burned on top of the Mizbe'ach. They also agree that a valid korbon that was mixed with an animal that was involved in sodomy may not be offered. They argue regarding the limbs of a valid olah and the limbs of an olah that has a mum that were mixed together. In that case, **R' Eliezer** says they are all offered and we view the passul limbs as firewood, whereas the **Rabanan** say they are not offered.
  - **Q:** Why is it that when the psul is an animal involved in sodomy **R' Eliezer** says they may not be offered, but when the psul is a mum they may be offered? **A:** **R' Huna** said, **R' Eliezer** is referring to the mum of "dukin sheba'ayin", and he holds like **R' Akiva** who holds that such an animal would not be taken off the Mizbe'ach if it was brought up there. It is only with such a mum that **R' Eliezer** says it may be offered as firewood.
    - **Q:** **R' Akiva** says that for a case of b'dieved, not l'chatchila!? **A:** **R' Pappa** said we are dealing with the limbs that were already on the ramp. In that case **R' Akiva** would say that they may be brought up to the top of the Mizbe'ach, which is why **R' Eliezer** says they may be burned as firewood.
  - **Q:** If that is the case, they would be allowed to be burned even if they were by themselves on the ramp, without having been mixed in with a valid korbon!? **A:** Rather, **R' Eliezer's** view is based on the pasuk of "mum bam", which teaches that it is only when the animals with the mum are by themselves that they are assur, but when they are mixed with others they are mutar to be burned. The **Rabanan** darshen these words to teach that it is only when the mum is present that they may not be offered, but if the mum has healed they may then be offered. **R' Eliezer** says, we can learn both of these things from the words "bam" and "bahem". The **Rabanan** don't darshen this for two drashos.
  - **Q:** Based on this, **R' Eliezer** should allow these limbs to be offered with intent as korbanos, not only as firewood!? **A:** **R' Eliezer** was talking according to the view of the **Rabanan**. He was saying to the **Rabanan**, according to me these limbs can be offered as korbanos. According to you, agree with me that the meat of a korbon with a mum could

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

be offered as firewood, just like the meat of a chatas that was mixed with the meat of an olah. The **Rabanan** disagree and say that the limbs of an animal with a mum are considered to be disgusting and therefore may not be offered at all, whereas the limbs of a chatas are not considered to be disgusting and therefore may be offered as firewood.

### MISHNA

- If the limbs of an olah became mixed with the limbs of an olah that had a mum, **R' Eliezer** says, if the head of one of them was offered, all the heads may be offered. If the legs of one of them were offered, the legs of all of them may be offered. The **Chachomim** say, even if all of them except for one was offered, the remaining one must be taken out and burned outside with the passul korbanos.

### GEMARA

- **R' Elazar** said that **R' Eliezer** only allows two heads to be offered together, not one at a time.
  - **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked, the Mishna said that the **Chachomim** say, even if all of them except for one was offered, the remaining one must be taken out and burned outside with the passul korbanos. This suggests that **R' Eliezer** would allow even one limb to be offered on its own!? **A: R' Yirmiya bar Tachlifa** said, when it says "one" it refers to one *pair*.

-----Daf פ"ח-----78-----

### MISHNA

- If blood of a korbon became mixed with water: if the mixture still looks like blood, it is considered to be valid blood (and can be used for zrika).
  - If the blood became mixed with wine, we view the wine as if it were water (if there is enough blood in the mixture that if the wine were water the mixture would look like blood, it is valid).
  - If blood of a korbon became mixed with blood of an animal that is not a korbon or with the blood of a chaya, we view the other blood as if it were water (if there is enough blood in the mixture that if the other blood was water the mixture would look like blood, it is valid). **R' Yehuda** says that blood cannot nullify blood (and therefore if even a drop of korbon blood was mixed into a large amount of blood from an animal that is not a korbon, the mixture is valid to be used for zrika).
  - If the blood became mixed with blood of a passul korbon, the mixture must be poured into the "amah" (the canal that flowed out of the Azarah). If the blood became mixed with blood of the korbon other than the "dam hanefesh" (which is the blood that must be used for the zrika), the mixture must be poured into the "amah". **R' Eliezer** says it is valid. If he did not ask and went and applied the blood to the Mizbe'ach, it is valid.

### GEMARA

- **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the mixture of blood and water is only valid when water fell into blood, but if blood fell into water in small amounts, every drop of blood becomes batul as it falls into the water and the mixture is therefore not valid as blood.
  - **R' Pappa** said, with regard to the mitzvah of "kisuy hadam" (one must cover the blood of a shechted bird or chaya) even if the blood fell into water there would still be a requirement to cover the mixture, because there is no rejection of mitzvos (even if the first drops become batul, when the later drops then join and make the water become the color of blood, it again becomes subject to the mitzvah of kisuy hadam).
- **Reish Lakish** said, if meat of piggul, nossar, and tamei became mixed together (with a kezayis of each in the mixture) and a person ate the mixture, he would be patur from malkus, because it is not possible that one doesn't become batul in the other (and the warning given not to eat the item may be given on the wrong item).

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- We learn 3 things from here: 1) issurin can be mevatel each other, 2) the rule that an assur thing that is a minority of a mixture, but which gives taste into the majority makes the majority thing assur, is only D'Rabanan, and 3) a warning given as a safek is not considered to be a warning.
  - **Q: Rava** asked, a Mishna says, if a dough is made from wheat and rice, then if the dough has the taste of wheat it is chayuv in challah, even if the majority of the mixture is rice. Now, according to what we said it should not be subject to challah, because it is only the minority!? **A:** The Mishna means it is chayuv in challah D'Rabanan.
    - **Q:** The Mishna then says that a person can use this mixture to be yotzeh his chiyuv of matzah on Pesach. This means that even D'Oraisa the taste of the wheat makes it not become batel to the majority of the rice!? **A:** Rather, when the mixture is of two unlike items we follow taste. When they are not different items (which is what **Reish Lakish** is referring to) we look to the majority, not to the taste.
    - **Q:** Even when they are like items, why don't we view them as unlike items and determine if there is enough of the assur item to give a taste into the mutar item? Our Mishna said we use this concept when blood falls into wine, and said that we view the wine (the passul substance) as if it was water!? **A:** The Mishna means that we view the *blood* as if it was water, and it becomes passul if there is a majority of wine.
      - **Q:** If that is what the Mishna meant, it should have said that the blood becomes batel!? Why does it say "we view it as if it was water"? Furthermore, there is a Braisa regarding white wine in a keili that is being toveled in a mikvah in which **R' Yehuda** actually uses this concept of looking at a like-kind item as if it were an item that is not like-kind – he says we view the white wine as if it were red wine!? **A:** It is actually a machlokes among Tanna'im whether we use this concept. In fact, this Braisa just referenced shows this machlokes, because the **T"K** says we don't use this concept (and instead says that we follow simple majority) and **R' Yehuda** says that we do.
        - **Q:** Another Mishna seems to say in one case that we do use this concept (which presumably must follow **R' Yehuda**), and in another case regarding water of parah adumah suggests that we follow a simple majority!? **A: Abaye** said, we could say that in fact **R' Yehuda** does not use this concept. When he does so in the Braisa he is actually referring to the view of his rebbi, **R' Gamliel**. **A2: Rava** said, he may in fact use the concept. The reason he doesn't in the case of the parah adumah water is for a different reason entirely – it is because the case there is a case involving a gezeira D'Rabanan.

### -----Daf 79-----

- **Rava** said, the **Rabanan** have said that sometimes the status of a mixture is based on its taste, the **Rabanan** have said that sometimes the status of a mixture is based on majority, and the **Rabanan** have said that sometimes the status of a mixture is based on its appearance. The rule is as follows: when the mixture is of two items that are not of like-kind, we follow taste; when the mixture is of two items of like-kind, we follow the majority; and when it is something that is dependent on appearance rather than taste (e.g. a mikvah) we follow the appearance.
- The Gemara earlier quoted the view of **Reish Lakish** which said, if meat of piggul, nossar, and tamei became mixed together and a person ate the mixture, he would be patur from malkus, because it is not possible that one doesn't become batul in the other. The Gemara now says that this view argues with the view of **R' Elazar** who says that just as one mitzvah cannot be mevatel another mitzvah, so too one issur cannot be mevatel another issur.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Who holds the view that a mitzvah cannot be mevatel another mitzvah? **A:** It is the view of **Hillel** in a Braisa, where it says that he would eat his Pesach, matzah and marror all together in a sandwich (which shows that he holds that one mitzvah is not mevatel another mitzvah).
- A Braisa says, if there is a piece of earthenware that was used as a toilet by a zav or zavah (and it therefore absorbed their urine, which is tamei), if it is washed once or twice it remains tamei. If it is washed a third time it becomes tahor. If it was not washed with water, but was instead washed with a tahor person's urine, it remains tamei even if done 10 times (like-kind items are not mevatel each other). **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** says even if a tahor person's urine is used to wash it, it becomes tahor after the third washing.
  - The **T"K** is the view of **R' Yehuda**, who says that items of like-kind are not mevatel each other.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that the saliva of a niddah (which is tamei) that is in flax that she spun and then dried (saliva is only tamei when moist), and the flax was then washed many times in water, **R' Yehuda** says it makes the saliva moist and the saliva is therefore tamei again. Now, why doesn't he say that after 3 washings it becomes tahor? **A: R' Pappa** said, saliva goes very deep into the flax, and that is why it remains even after many washings.

### NISAREV B'DAM HAPESULIN YISHAFEICH LA'AMAH

- **Q:** What is the basis of the machlokes? **A: R' Zvid** said, they argue on whether we make gezeiros in the Mikdash. The **T"K** holds that we do, and therefore the blood must be spilled out even if the passul blood was not mevatel the valid blood. **R' Eliezer** holds that we do not, and therefore it only must be spilled out if there was enough passul blood to be mevatel the valid blood. **A2: R' Pappa** said, that all say that we do make gezeiros in the Mikdash. The machlokes is whether it is common for the blood other than the lifeblood to be more than the lifeblood. The **T"K** holds it is common and therefore we have to be goizer, and **R' Eliezer** holds it is not common and therefore we do not have to be goizer.
  - **Q:** According to **R' Pappa** (who says that they only argue in the case of the lifeblood mixing with the other blood of the animal) it makes sense why the Mishna says "yishafeich la'amah" after discussing the mixture with passul blood and after the discussing the mixture with other than lifeblood. However, according to **R' Zvid** why wasn't this combined into one statement? This remains a KASHYEH.

### MISHNA

- If the blood of a korbon without a mum mixed with the blood of a korbon that had a mum, the blood must be poured into the amah.
- If a cup of blood became mixed with other cups of blood (one was of a valid korbon and the other was not), **R' Eliezer** said, if one cup was offered, all the remaining cups may be offered. The **Chachomim** said, even if all the cups except for one were offered, the remaining one must be poured into the amah.
- If blood that should be offered below the red line became mixed in blood that should be offered above the line, **R' Eliezer** said the mixture should be offered above the line, and we view the blood that should be offered below as if it were water, and we then should offer the blood below the line. The **Chachomim** say the blood should be poured into the amah, but if he did not ask and offered the blood above the line, the blood that should have been offered above is valid.
- If blood that is required to be offered with one application became mixed with other bloods that are required to be offered with one application, the whole mixture should be applied with one application. If blood that is required to be offered with four applications became mixed with other bloods that are required to be offered with four applications, the whole mixture should be applied with four applications. If blood that is required to be offered with four applications became mixed with other bloods that are required to be offered with one application, **R' Eliezer** says the whole mixture should be applied with four applications, and **R' Yehoshua** says the whole mixture should be applied with one application.
  - **R' Eliezer** said, if he doesn't offer with four applications he will violate the issur to subtract something from the Torah ("baal tigrā"). **R' Yehoshua** said, by making four applications he is oiver on "baal tosef" for the bloods that should have only gotten one application! **R' Eliezer** said, we would only say baal tosef when the bloods requiring one application were by themselves, not where they are mixed with other blood requiring four. **R' Yehoshua** said, we would only say baal tigrā when the bloods requiring

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

four applications were by themselves, not where they are mixed with other blood requiring one! **R' Yehoshua** said further, by doing something extra you are actively oiver on baal tosef. Where you don't do all that you were supposed to, even if you are oiver on baal tigma, it would not be something you did actively.

-----Daf ד--80-----

### GEMARA

- **R' Elazar** said, **R' Eliezer** only allowed the remaining cups of blood to be offered when they are offered two cups at a time, but not one at a time.
  - **Q: R' Dimi** asked, the Mishna said that the **Chachomim** said, even if all the cups except for one were offered, the remaining one must be poured into the amah. This means that **R' Eliezer** (who argues with them) holds that even that last cup alone could be offered!? **A: R' Yaakov** said to **R' Yirmiya**, when the Mishna says "except one" it means "except one pair".
  - **Q:** The previous Mishna taught this same machlokes between **R' Eliezer** and the **Chachomim** regarding limbs of a korbon and of a baal mum that became mixed. Why did it need to teach it again regarding the cups of blood that became mixed up? **A:** If we would only have the case of the limbs we would say that it is only in that case that **R' Eliezer** says the limbs can be offered, because the kapparah was already achieved when the blood was offered on the Mizbe'ach, but in our Mishna, where it is the blood itself that is mixed up, and therefore there has not yet been a kapparah, maybe he would agree with the **Rabanan** that it should not be offered. If we would only have our Mishna we would say that it is only in this case that the **Rabanan** say that nothing should be offered, because the blood itself is the issue, but in the case where the blood was properly offered and it is the limbs that were mixed up, maybe they would agree with **R' Eliezer** that they should be offered.
- A Mishna says, if there was a keili of chatas water (water containing the parah adumah ashes) into which then fell a minute amount of regular water (which is passul to be used for the chatas water), **R' Eliezer** says that a tamei person who needs to be sprinkled with this water should be sprinkled upon twice, but the **Chachomim** say the water is passul to be used for sprinkling.
  - **Q:** According to the **Rabanan** it makes sense that they hold it is passul, because they hold that "yeish bilah" (when things become mixed we assume they are fully mixed together throughout), and they hold that the sprinkling requires a minimum amount of chatas water (which this mixture does not have, because there is some passul water throughout the mixture and therefore every sprinkling is not made of 100% chatas water), and they also hold that we cannot combine sprinklings (therefore, doing a second sprinkling does not accomplish to reach the minimum amount required for a sprinkling). However, what does **R' Eliezer** hold? If he holds that we don't say "yeish bilah", then even if he sprinkles twice we must be concerned that both sprinklings were made entirely of passul water. Therefore, it must be that he holds yeish bilah. Now, if he holds that a sprinkling does not need a minimum amount of chatas water, then even one sprinkling should be enough!? Rather, he must hold that it does require a minimum amount. If he holds that two sprinkling cannot combine for the minimum required amount, then why does it help to sprinkle a second time? Even if he holds that they do combine, who says that in two sprinklings he will have the minimum required amount!? **A: Reish Lakish** said, **R' Eliezer** holds yeish bilah, and he holds that the sprinkling requires a minimum amount. The reason why two sprinklings will work is because the case is that one measure of regular water was mixed into one measure of chatas water. Therefore, between the two sprinklings there will definitely be the minimum required amount. **A2: Rava** said, **R' Eliezer** holds yeish bilah, and he holds that the sprinkling does not require a minimum amount. In truth, one sprinkling should therefore suffice. However, the **Rabanan** were goizer that he make a second sprinkling so that one not benefit from the passul water. **A3: R' Ashi** said, the Mishna says that only a minute amount of passul water was mixed in. **R' Eliezer** holds "ein bilah", but since such a minute amount was mixed in, if he does a second sprinkling he is certain to have sprinkled the chatas water as well.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A Braisa says, **Rebbi** says, according to **R' Eliezer** any amount of sprinkling can make a person tahor because there is no minimum amount required, and the water can even be chatas water mixed with passul water. Now, this refutes **Reish Lakish** who said that **R' Eliezer** holds there is a required minimum amount!? **Q2:** Another Braisa says, if bloods that should be applied above the line became mixed with bloods that should be applied below the line, **R' Eliezer** says the mixture should be applied above and we view the blood that should be applied below as if it water, and he then applies the blood below the line and this lower application also counts. Now, if **R' Ashi** is correct that **R' Eliezer** holds that ein bilah, how could the blood applied above the line count? Maybe all the blood that was taken for that application was really of the korban that was to be offered below the line!? **A:** We can answer for **R' Ashi** that the case is where the majority of the mixture is made of blood that should be offered above the line. He then applies above the line enough blood that it equals all the blood that was to be offered below the line plus some more blood (so there is definitely “upper blood” in that application).

  - **Q:** The Braisa said that the lower application counts as well!? **A:** The Braisa means that the lower applications counts for the purpose of the leftover blood of the upper korban being offered to the bottom of the Mizbe'ach.
- **Q:** The Braisa (quoted to refute **R' Ashi**) then says, if the Kohen didn't ask and just applied the blood below the line, **R' Eliezer** says he should then apply the blood above the line and then again below the line, and the application below counts. Now, if **R' Eliezer** holds ein bilah, why should any of the applications be effective? **A:** Here too, we can answer for **R' Ashi** that the case is where the majority of the mixture is made of blood that should be offered above the line. He then applies above the line enough blood that it equals all the blood that was to be offered below the line plus some more blood (so there is definitely “upper blood” in that application).

  - **Q:** The Braisa said that the lower application counts as well!? **A:** The Braisa means that the lower application counts for the purpose of the leftover blood of the upper korban being offered to the bottom of the Mizbe'ach.
- **Q:** The next part of the Braisa says, if the Kohen didn't ask and just applied the blood above the line, the **Rabanan** and **R' Eliezer** would agree that he should then apply the blood below the line, and both applications are effective. Now, if **R' Eliezer** holds ein bilah, why should any of the applications be effective? **A:** Here too, we can answer for **R' Ashi** that the case is where the majority of the mixture is made of blood that should be offered above the line. He then applies above the line enough blood that it equals all the blood that was to be offered below the line, plus some more blood (so there is definitely “upper blood” in that application).

  - **Q:** The Braisa said that both applications – including the lower application, counts as well!? **A:** The Braisa does not say that they both agree that both applications would count. The part of the Braisa that says that they both count will follow the view of the **Rabanan** who say yeish bilah.
- **Q:** Our Mishna said, if blood requiring one application was mixed with other blood requiring one application, we only need to make one application from the mixture. Now, if **R' Eliezer** holds ein bilah, how can one application suffice? Maybe the one application is from only one of the bloods in the mixture!? **A:** The case is that the amount for one application from one korban and the amount for one application from another korban became mixed. The Mishna means that he must do one application for each korban. Therefore, we can be certain that the bloods of both korbanos were offered.
- **Q:** The Mishna then said, if blood requiring 4 applications (or 2 that are like 4) became mixed in other blood with the same requirement, the mixture should be applied to all 4 sides. Now, if **R' Eliezer** holds ein bilah, how can one application suffice? **A:** Here too, the case is that the amount for 4 applications from one korban and the amount for 4 applications from another korban became mixed. The Mishna means that he must do 4 applications for each korban. Therefore, we can be certain that the bloods of both korbanos were offered.



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The Mishna then said, if blood requiring 4 applications (or 2 that are like 4) became mixed in other blood requiring a single application, the mixture should be applied to all 4 sides. Now, if **R' Eliezer** holds ein bilah, how can we be sure that the blood used was of more than just one korban? You can't answer like we did previously that there was exactly enough blood for the applications, because if that was the case, how could **R' Yehoshua** have said that there would be "baal tosef"? There is no extra blood with which to make an extra application!? **A:** Rather, **Rabbah** said, that **R' Eliezer and the Rabanan** don't argue when the bloods are mixed into the same keili. They only argue when cups of blood of different korbanos became mixed up. **R' Eliezer** holds that he would take some blood from each cup and apply it above, and the blood from the cup that should be applied below is viewed as if it were water. The **Rabanan** don't hold of the concept that we can view it as if it were water. Therefore the machlokes has nothing to do with whether we say yeish bilah.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** says that **R' Eliezer and the Rabanan** argue in a case of where blood of a valid korban and blood of a baal mum became mixed, whether they were in separate cups that became mixed up or whether the bloods actually mixed into one keili. We see that **R' Eliezer** rules as he does even when the bloods are actually mixed together!? **A:** **R' Yehuda** holds they argue in both cases, but the Tanna of our Mishna and the earlier Braisa hold that they only argue when the cups were mixed up, but not when the bloods were mixed into a single cup.

### -----Daf נד---81-----

- **Abaye** said, the machlokes between **R' Eliezer and the Rabanan** is only where the initial blood of a chatas and an olah became mixed (the chatas blood must be applied above and the olah blood must be applied below, and they argue whether the mixture may be applied above and then below). However, if the leftover blood of a chatas became mixed with blood of an olah, all would agree that the blood may be applied below, since both of these bloods must be applied below. **R' Yosef** said, **R' Yehuda** has said that the leftover chatas blood must be poured onto the base, whereas the olah blood must be applied to the wall of the Mizbe'ach, and therefore the **Rabanan** would say that even in this case the blood should be poured out into the amah and not applied.
  - **R' Shimon** said the same as **Abaye**, and **R' Yochanan** (or **R' Elazar**) said like **R' Yosef**.
  - **Q:** **R' Huna bar Yehuda** asked, a Braisa says, the pasuk regarding bechor says "kodesh heim", which teaches that if the blood of a bechor is mixed with the blood of other korbanos, it can still be offered. Presumably this even refers to where the initial blood of a bechor became mixed with the leftover blood of an olah, and we see that the lower part of the Mizbe'ach (where the bechor is offered) is considered to be the place where the leftover bloods are supposed to be applied as well!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to the *initial* blood of an olah that became mixed with the initial blood of a bechor. The pasuk is teaching us that korbanos are not mevatel each other (even if the blood of one is more than the blood of another).
    - **Q:** We already learn this concept from the pasuk of "v'lakach midam hapar umidam hasa'ih"!? **A:** It is a machlokes among Tanna'im as to where we learn this from.
  - **Q:** **Rava** asked, a Braisa learns from the extra two words "dam" in the pasuk that if the blood of an olah and bechor became mixed, the blood is still offered. Presumably this even refers to where the initial blood of a bechor became mixed with the leftover blood of an olah, and we see that the lower part of the Mizbe'ach (where the bechor is offered) is considered to be the place where the leftover bloods are supposed to be applied as well!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to the *initial* blood of an olah that became mixed with the initial blood of a bechor. The pasuk is teaching us that korbanos are not mevatel each other (even if the blood of one is more than the blood of another).
    - **Q:** We already learn this concept from the pasuk of "v'lakach midam hapar umidam hasa'ih"!? **A:** It is a machlokes among Tanna'im as to where we learn this from.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The others did not want to learn from the pasuk of “v’lakach”, because they hold that the pasuk does not refer to mixing the bloods of the animals. The others did not want to learn from the extra words of “dam” because they feel that those words are not meant to teach a drasha. The others did not want to learn from “kodesh heim”, because they darshen that to teach that the bechor is offered but the temurah of a bechor is not offered, which is something that the other Tanna learns from another pasuk.
- **Q:** The Braisa quoted earlier said, if the Kohen didn’t ask and just applied the blood above the line, the **Rabanan and R’ Eliezer** would agree that he should then apply the blood below the line, and both applications are effective. Presumably this refers to where a chatas and an olah were mixed together, and since it was offered above, only the leftover of the chatas and the initial blood of the olah remains, and the fact that all agree that it should be offered below proves that the lower part of the Mizbe’ach (where the olah is offered) is considered to be the place where the leftover bloods are supposed to be applied as well!? **A: R’ Yitzchak bar Yosef** said, in EY they said that the case is where the blood of an outer chatas and the leftover blood of an inner chatas became mixed. Therefore, after the application above the line, all that remains is the leftover bloods of two chatas. That is why he can simply apply them both below.
  - **Q: Abaye** asked, why not answer that the blood of an outer chatas became mixed with the leftover blood of another outer chatas – why do you need to say it was an inner chatas? **A:** It could be he was teaching that even according to the view that it is essential that the leftover blood of an inner chatas be poured, it will be valid even though some of this leftover blood was missing (because it was first offered above).
  - **Q: Rava Tosfa’ah** asked **Ravina**, we explained that the Braisa is discussing a case where there was more upper blood than lower blood and the Kohen applied blood above in the amount of all the lower blood plus a little bit. If so, it may be that there is no olah blood remaining and the application below is therefore done only for the leftover chatas blood!? Why do we need to say that the Braisa refers to the chatas mixed with another chatas? **A: Ravina** said, that was said only according to the initial understanding that **R’ Eliezer** holds ein bilah.

### MISHNA

- If blood that must be applied inside the Heichal became mixed with blood that must be applied outside the Heichal, the mixture should be poured into the amah. If the Kohen instead took the mixture and applied it outside and then again inside, it is valid. If he first applied it inside and then outside, **R’ Akiva** says it would be passul and the **Chachomim** say it would be valid (except if it was a chatas). For **R’ Akiva** says, all bloods that were brought into the Heichal for kapparah become passul, but the **Chachomim** say this is only true for a chatas. **R’ Eliezer** says it is also true for an asham, based on the hekesh of “kachatas ka’asham”.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** Why doesn’t **R’ Eliezer** argue regarding the mixing of inside and outside bloods and say that they also don’t have to be poured into the amah? **A:** He can’t say to first apply outside and then inside, because just as it is a mitzvah to first apply a korban that needs above the line and then a korban that needs below, it is similarly a mitzvah to first offer a korban that needs to be offered inside and then to offer the korban that needs to be offered outside. He also can’t categorically say that the blood should first be offered inside and then outside, because he holds that a chatas and an asham would be passul in this situation. Therefore, he did not argue in the Mishna.

-----Daf כב---82-----

### SHEHAYA R’ AKIVA OMER...

- **R’ Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, the view of **R’ Akiva** (that any outside korban whose blood was brought into the Heichal becomes passul, which is based on a pasuk that says that a *chatas* that is supposed to be

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

brought outside and whose blood is then brought inside becomes passul) can be explained with a mashal. If a talmid mixes wine for his rebbi with hot water, and the rebbi then asks the talmid to again mix some wine for him with hot water, that must come to include that the rebbi means that it can even be mixed with cold water, because if he only meant hot water, since that is what was done until now, he didn't have to say anything about the water at all. The fact that he did, meant that he was including cold water as well. The same is with this pasuk. The pasuk is discussing a chatas. The pasuk therefore did not have to mention "chatas", since that is what is being discussed. The fact that it did mention chatas comes to teach that this halacha applies to all korbanos.

- **Q: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** asked, right next to this pasuk is the halacha that the keilim used for the korbanos – all types of korbanos – must be purged and rinsed from the korbon. Now, if this halacha regarding the blood going into the Heichal was to apply to all korbanos, the pasuk should not have said "chatas" and we would know to apply it to all korbanos. The fact that the pasuk says "chatas" suggests that it is to *only* apply to chatas and not to the other korbanos!? If anything, the mashal should be to a talmid who diluted wine for his rebbi using hot and cold water, and the rebbi then said to him – dilute more for me using *only* hot water!? **A:** Rather, **R' Akiva's** view is found in a Braisa and is based on the pasuk "v'chol chatas". Had the pasuk only said "chatas" it would apply only to a chatas. Had it said "kol chatas" it would teach to include other kodshei kodashim. Now that it says "v'chol chatas" it comes to include kodshei kalim as well. **R' Yose Haglili** argues in the Braisa and says that "chatas" would only teach regarding a female chatas, "kol chatas" would teach regarding the chatas of the tzibbur, and "v'chol chatas" teaches regarding a male chatas.
  - **Q: R' Yose Haglili** used this pasuk for a different drasha in a Braisa!? **A:** In our Braisa he is talking according to the view of **R' Akiva**, and saying how the pasuk should be darshened.

### MISHNA

- With regard to a chatas whose blood was caught into two separate keilim, if one of the keilim was taken outside the Azarah, the one that remains inside is still valid. If one of the keilim was brought inside the Heichal, **R' Yose Haglili** says that the one that remained outside is still valid, but the **Chachomim** say it is passul. **R' Yose Haglili** said, if regarding taking it out of the Azarah, where even an intent will make it passul, they did not say that the one that remained in the proper place becomes passul, then with regard to taking it into the Heichal, where an intent would not make it passul, certainly the one that remained in the proper place should not become passul!?
  - If the blood was brought into the Heichal with intent to offer it as a kapparah, **R' Eliezer** says that even if it was not actually offered it becomes passul. **R' Shimon** says it does not become passul unless it is actually offered inside the Heichal. **R' Yehuda** says if it was brought in b'shogeg it is valid.
- All passul bloods that are offered on the Mizbe'ach are not made effective by the tzitz, except for tamei blood, because the tzitz makes valid for acceptance blood that is tamei, but does not do so for blood that was taken out of the Azarah (or any other psul).

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says that **R' Yose Haglili** proves his point with a kal v'chomer – if in a place where intent makes it passul – outside the Azarah – still the blood brought outside will not make the blood that is left inside passul, then a place where intent does not make it passul – inside the Heichal – certainly the blood brought inside should not make the blood left in the Azarah passul. The **Rabanan** said to him, the pasuk says "asher yuvah midamah", which suggests that if even part of the blood was brought inside the Heichal the entire korbon becomes passul. **R' Yose Haglili** said to them, based on this we should make a kal v'chomer to teach that if the blood going into the Heichal makes the entire korbon passul, then when the blood leaves the Azarah it should certainly make the entire korbon passul!? The **Rabanan** said to him, "asher yuvah" teaches that only the blood that is brought into the Heichal makes the whole korbon passul, but blood that is taken out of the Azarah will not make the whole korbon passul (when there is other blood to offer).
  - **Q:** We should use the kal v'chomer to say that an intent to offer the blood inside the Heichal should make the korbon passul – if an intent to offer it out of the Azarah makes the korbon passul, even though if it is brought out of the Azarah it doesn't make the blood left inside passul, then an intent to offer it in

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

the Heichal, where bringing the blood into the Heichal does make it passul, should certainly make the korbon passul!? **A:** The pasuk of “bayom hashlishi” teaches that only intent for outside the Azarah makes it passul.

- **Q:** We should use the kal v’chomer to teach that intent to offer the blood outside the Azarah does not make the korbon passul!? **A:** The pasuk says “shlishi” which teaches regarding beyond its time intent, and says “piggul” which teaches regarding beyond its place intent.
- A Braisa says, korbon meat that goes outside its allowable area becomes passul. If it goes inside the Heichal it is valid. Now, we would have said based on the kal v’chomer (as taught above) that when meat is brought into the Heichal it should certainly become passul. The pasuk therefore says “midamah”, that it is only when blood is brought into the Heichal that it becomes passul, but meat brought into the Heichal does not become passul. We would then think to use the kal v’chomer to teach that if when meat is brought into the Heichal it remains valid, then when it leaves the Azarah it should also remain valid!? The pasuk therefore says “ubasar basadeh treifah lo socheilu”, which teaches that when the meat is brought outside of its permitted area it becomes passul.
- A Braisa says, when the pasuk says “pnimah” it teaches that blood of a chatas becomes passul when it is brought into the Kodshei HaKodashim. The words “ehl haKodesh pnima” teaches that it becomes passul even when it is brought into the Heichal.
  - **Q:** Why not just write “kodesh” and we would know that if it is passul when brought into the Heichal it is certainly passul when brought into the Kodesh HaKodashim? **A:** **Rava** said, if we only had the word “kodesh” we would say that refers to the Kodesh HaKodashim. It is only because we have the word “pnima” that we can then say that “kodesh” refers to the Heichal. We find this concept in a Braisa regarding a Jewish slave of a Kohen not being allowed to eat terumah. The Braisa says that the pasuk teaches that if a Kohen owns a Jewish slave who is to go out free at 6 years, the slave may not eat terumah, and a Jewish slave who will be remaining until Yovel may also not eat terumah. The Braisa asks that the pasuk should only teach regarding the slave who is to be there until Yovel and we will then know that the slave who is only there for 6 years may surely not eat as terumah as well? The Braisa answers that if we would only have one teaching we would assume that it is teaching regarding the 6 year slave (which is a smaller chidush). Therefore, we need two teachings so that we know to apply this teaching to a Yovel slave as well.
    - **Q:** **Abaye** asked, the case of the slaves are two different people, and although we could have learned it from a kal v’chomer the Torah decided to write it out anyway. However, in the case of the Kodesh HaKodashim we don’t need a pasuk, because it can only get there by going through the Heichal, and once it enters the Heichal it is passul!? **A:** Rather, **Abaye** said that the pasuk is needed for a case where the blood bypassed the Heichal by being brought in on the rooftops. In that case we need to be taught that it becomes passul when it enters the Kodesh Hakodashim, and even though that could be learned from a kal v’chomer, the Torah went ahead and wrote it out specifically anyway.
      - **Q:** **Rava** asked, the pasuk uses verbiage of “bringing” which suggests that it only becomes passul when it enters through a normal entrance!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said that anything that the Kohen intended to bring into the Kodesh HaKodashim would not become passul by entering the Heichal.
- **Q:** **Rava** asked, what is the halacha regarding the blood of the par helam, or of the goat brought for the sin of avoda zarah (these bloods are offered in the Heichal), that is brought into the Kodesh HaKodashim? Do we say that since they do not become passul in the Heichal they do not become passul in the Kodesh HaKodashim either, or do we say that they still do? If we say that they still become passul, what about the par and sa’ihr of Yom Kippur, which is offered inside the Kodesh HaKodashim, and is then brought out to the Heichal, and he then took it (improperly) back into the Kodesh HaKodashim? Do we say that it does not become passul, because that is still called its proper place, or do we say that since it should not have been brought back it still becomes passul? If we say that it still becomes passul, what if the blood was sprinkled on the paroches, was then applied to the inside Mizbe’ach, and was then walked back deeper into the Heichal towards the paroches? Is that all

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

called within the Heichal and is therefore valid, or do we say that further out in the Heichal and closer in are different places and the blood is therefore considered to have gone back in and becomes passul? **TEIKU**.