

He placed the blood of the goat and took the blood of the bull – הַגִּיחַ דָּם הַשְּׂעִיר וְנָטַל דָּם הַפָּר – When the High Priest switches the bowl of the bull's blood with the one containing the blood of the goat and vice versa, he first places the bowl in his hand on the pedestal and then picks up the other bowl (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 4:2).

The presentations of blood in the Sanctuary – מִתְּנוֹת בְּהִיכָל: The High Priest sprinkles the blood toward the curtain in the same manner he sprinkles it in the Holy of Holies: One sprinkling upward and seven sprinklings downward for both the blood of the bull and that of the goat (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 3:5).

אָמַר לִיָּהּ: תָּדָא כְּרַבְנָן וְתָדָא כְּרַבֵּי יְהוּדָה? אֵימָא: הַגִּיחַ דָּם הַשְּׂעִיר וְנָטַל דָּם הַפָּר.

Rava said to him: This is problematic, as one statement is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, and the other one is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. According to the Rabbis, each of these bowls sat on its own pedestal in the Sanctuary, whereas Rabbi Yehuda maintains that the High Priest must first lift up the container with the blood of the bull and then put down that of the goat. Rather, you should recite the entire order of the service entirely in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis: He placed the blood of the goat on its designated pedestal and took the blood of the bull^h from the second stand.

”וְהִזָּה מִמֶּנּוּ עַל הַפְּרוּכֹת כַּנֶּגֶד אֲרוֹן מִבְּחוּץ.” תַּנּוּ רַבָּנָן: ”וְכֵן יַעֲשֶׂה לְאֵהָל מוֹעֵד” מִה תִּלְמוּד לֹאמֹר? כִּשֶׁם שֶׁמִּזֶּה לִפְנֵי לִפְנֵי – כֵּךְ מִזֶּה בְּהִיכָל.

§ The mishna taught: And the High Priest sprinkled from the blood of the bull on the curtain opposite the Ark from outside the Holy of Holies. The Sages taught: “And he shall make atonement for the sacred place because of the impurities of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions, even all their sins; and so shall he do for the Tent of Meeting that dwells with them in the midst of their impurity” (Leviticus 16:16). What is the meaning when the verse states this? Just as he sprinkles in the innermost sanctum, the Holy of Holies, so he sprinkles in the Sanctuary, the Tent of Meeting, toward the curtain.

מִה לִפְנֵי לִפְנֵי – אַחַת לְמַעַלָּה וְשִׁבְעַת לְמַטָּה מִדָּם הַפָּר, כֵּךְ מִזֶּה בְּהִיכָל וְכִשֶׁם שֶׁלִפְנֵי לִפְנֵי אַחַת לְמַעַלָּה וְשִׁבְעַת לְמַטָּה מִדָּם הַשְּׂעִיר – כֵּךְ מִזֶּה בְּהִיכָל. ”הַשּׂוֹכֵן אִתְּם בְּתוֹךְ טוּמְאָתָם” – אִפְילוּ בְּשַׁעַת שָׁהוּן טוּמְאִים שְׂכִינָה עִמָּהֶם.

Furthermore: Just as in the innermost sanctum he sprinkles once upward and seven times downward from the blood of the bull, so he sprinkles in the Sanctuary. And just as in the innermost sanctum he sprinkles once upward and seven times downward from the blood of the goat, so he sprinkles in the Sanctuary.^h The last part of the verse: “That dwells with them in the midst of their impurity,” teaches that even when the Jewish people are impure, the Divine Presence is with them.

אָמַר לִיָּהּ הַהוּא צְדוּקִי לְרַבֵּי חֲנִינָא:

With regard to this verse, the Gemara relates: A certain Sadducee said to Rabbi Hanina:

Perek V
Daf 57 Amud a

הַשְּׂתָא בְּרֵי טַמְאִים אֲתוּן, דְּכַתִּיב: ”טוּמְאָתָהּ בְּשׂוּלֶיהָ.” אָמַר לִיָּהּ: תָּא חַזִּי מַה כְּתִיב בְּהוּ ”הַשּׂוֹכֵן אִתְּם בְּתוֹךְ טוּמְאָתָם,” אִפְילוּ בּוֹמֵן שָׁהוּן טַמְאִין – שְׂכִינָה שְׂרוּיָה בִּינְיָהוּן.

Now you are certainly impure,ⁿ as it is written about the Jewish people: “Her impurity was in her skirts” (Lamentations 1:9), and the Divine Presence does not dwell upon the Jews when they are impure. Rabbi Hanina said to him: Come and see what is written about the Jewish people: “That dwells with them in the midst of their impurity” (Leviticus 16:16). This indicates that even when they are impure, the Divine Presence dwells among them.

וְכִי דְבַר הַלְּמֹד בְּהִיקָשׁ חוּזַר וּמְלִמֵּד בְּהִיקָשׁ?

The Gemara raises a difficulty with regard to the aforementioned halakha. It was stated above that the comparison to the goat teaches that the High Priest sprinkles the bull's blood once upward; and the seven downward sprinklings of the goat's blood are derived from the rite of the blood of the bull. Subsequently, the order of sprinkling toward the curtain in the Sanctuary is again derived by means of a similar comparison. The Gemara asks: And does a matter derived by juxtaposition, i.e., a halakha not written explicitly in the Torah but learned by means of a comparison, again teach by juxtaposition? There is a general principle that a halakha derived by juxtaposition with regard to offerings cannot subsequently teach another halakha by juxtaposition.ⁿ

הָאִי הִימְנוּ וְדָבָר אַחֵר הוּא, וְלֹא הוּא הִי יִקָּשׁ.

The Gemara answers that the first juxtaposition was not a proper inference by verbal analogy, as this halakha that the High Priest must sprinkle once upward and seven times downward is derived both from that juxtaposition and something else as well. Since the basic requirement that he must sprinkle upward and downward for the bull and the goat is stated explicitly in both cases, and the comparison was necessary only to teach the precise number of sprinklings, this inference is not considered a juxtaposition to the extent that one cannot derive further comparisons from it.

NOTES

הַשְּׂתָא בְּרֵי טַמְאִים – אֲתוּן: The Sadducee was referring to the period after the destruction of the Temple. His proof is from the verse: “Her impurity was in her skirts” (Lamentations 1:9), which alludes to the end of the Temple, i.e., in these final days (Rabbeinu Elyakim).

A derivation from what has already been derived in the halakhot of offerings – לְמַד וּמְלִמֵּד בְּקִדְשִׁים: With regard to all issues related to Torah law, when a halakha has been derived by means one of the exegetical principles, the resulting idea is treated as though it were written explicitly in the text. That halakha can subsequently serve as a source for other derivations. However, in the case of sacrificial matters, it is stated in tractate Zevahim that halakhot that have been derived by an exegetical principle cannot themselves serve as the source for other halakhot. Instead, each halakha requires a separate derivation. This principle is apparently based on the fact that the halakhot of offerings are not governed by logic but are divine decrees, and therefore there is a limit to the extent to which one can derive novel halakhot that are not stated explicitly in the text. The Gemara in Zevahim does concede that certain exegetical principles do yield conclusions from which one may derive new halakhot. The Sages debate which of the principles operate in this manner.

Is derived all at once – בַּחֲדָא וְיִמְנָא גַּמְר: Rabbeinu Hananel explains that since the verse explicitly compares the rite outside the curtain to the rite inside, it is appropriate to transfer all details of the inside performance to the outside sprinkling, irrespective of their manner of derivation.

I saw the curtain – אֲנִי רָאִיתִיהָ: Some commentaries ask why the statement of Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Yosei, is not considered an absolute proof, as the other Sages would certainly not question the veracity of his testimony. One suggestion is that they considered his report insufficient proof because the High Priest might have inadvertently sprinkled blood directly on the curtain (Ritva).

That they were performed not in their order – דְּעֵבִידֵי – שְׁלֵא כְּסֻדְרָן: There is a difference between the manner in which the blood is sprinkled on Yom Kippur and the rite of the blood of the goats for a sin of idolatry. When the High Priest sprinkles the blood on Yom Kippur he stands close to the curtain. By contrast, the blood of the goats for a sin of idolatry is sprinkled toward the curtain from behind the golden incense altar, at a distance of more than twenty cubits. This is why the Yom Kippur sprinkling could be performed in an orderly pattern, but that of the goats for a sin of idolatry could not (*Me'in*).

הַנִּחָא לְמָאן דְּאָמַר "לֹא הָיָה הִיקָשׁ",
אֲלֵא לְמָאן דְּאָמַר הָיָה הִיקָשׁ – מֵאֵי
אֵיבָא לְמִימַר?

מְקוֹמוֹת הוּא דְּגַמְרֵי מִהֲדָדֵי.

אֵי בְעִית אֵימָא: חוּץ מִבְּפָנֵי בַּחֲדָא
וְיִמְנָא גַּמְר.

תְּנָא: כְּשֶׁהוּא מְזַה, אֵינוּ מְזַה עַל
הַפְּרוֹכֶת אֲלֵא כְּנֶגֶד הַפְּרוֹכֶת. אָמַר
רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר בְּרַבִּי יוֹסֵי: אֲנִי רָאִיתִיהָ
בְּרוֹמָי, וְהָיוּ עָלֶיהָ כְּמָה טִיפֵי דְמִים
שֶׁל פֶּר וְשִׁעוֹר שֶׁל יוֹם הַכַּפּוּרִים.

וְדִילְמָא דְּפֶר הָעֵלִם דְּבַר שֶׁל צְבוּר
וְשִׁעוֹרֵי עֲבוּדָה זָרָה הוּוּ?

דְּחֻזָּא דְּעֵבִידֵי כְּסֻדְרָן. וּתְנֵן נְמִי גַבִּי
פֶּר הָעֵלִם דְּבַר שֶׁל צְבוּר כִּי הָאֵי
גּוֹנָא: כְּשֶׁהוּא מְזַה – לֹא הָיָה נוֹגְעִין
בְּפְרוֹכֶת, וְאִם נִגְעוּ – נִגְעוּ.

אָמַר רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר בְּרַבִּי יוֹסֵי: אֲנִי
רָאִיתִיהָ בְּרוֹמָי, וְהָיוּ עָלֶיהָ כְּמָה
טִיפֵי דְמִים שֶׁל פֶּר הָעֵלִם דְּבַר שֶׁל
צְבוּר וְשִׁעוֹרֵי עֲבוּדָה זָרָה. וְדִילְמָא
דְּפֶר וְשִׁעוֹרֵי שֶׁל יוֹם הַכַּפּוּרִים נִגְהוּ?
דְּחֻזָּנְהוּ דְּעֵבִידֵי שְׁלֵא כְּסֻדְרָן.

The Gemara continues to question this explanation: **It works out well according to the one who said that a juxtaposition that is also inferred from something else is not considered a juxtaposition in this regard; but according to the one who says that this too is called a juxtaposition, what can be said?**

The Gemara answers: **It is the locations that are derived from one another.** The *halakha* of the blood of the bull was not derived from that of the goat, nor the *halakha* of sprinkling the bull's blood outside the curtain from that of sprinkling the bull's blood inside. Instead, the first comparison equates the sprinkling of the bull's blood and the goat's blood, while the second comparison equates the locations, i.e., he sprinkles outside the curtain in the same manner that he sprinkles inside. Consequently, the two juxtapositions are not connected to each other, which means that there is no problem of a *halakha* derived by juxtaposition itself teaching by juxtaposition.

If you wish, say instead a different resolution: The sprinkling **outside is derived from the sprinkling inside all at once**,^N i.e., the juxtaposition includes not only the blood of the bull and the goat, but also the manners of sprinkling the blood inside and outside. There are not two comparisons here, one derived from the other, but a single, complex juxtaposition.

S A Sage taught: **When the High Priest sprinkles the blood, he does not actually sprinkle on the curtain but opposite the curtain.** Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Yosei,^P said: **I saw the curtain^N in Rome.** After a miracle was performed on his behalf and he healed the daughter of the Roman emperor, Rabbi Elazar was permitted to view the ruler's treasures and take whatever he wanted. He saw the Temple vessels that the Romans captured, including the curtain. Rabbi Elazar continued: **And on the curtain were several drops of blood from the bull and the goat of Yom Kippur.** This shows that the blood was actually sprinkled on the curtain.

The Gemara questions this conclusion: **But how can Rabbi Elazar be sure that these drops of blood were from the bull and goat of Yom Kippur? Perhaps they were from the bull for an unwitting communal sin or the goats for a sin of idolatry, both of whose blood is also sprinkled on the curtain.**

The Gemara explains **that he saw that these sprinklings of blood were performed in their order**, one drop after another, a sequence that is followed only in the Yom Kippur service. **And we also learned in a mishna about a case like this with regard to the bull for an unwitting communal sin: When he sprinkles, the blood would not touch the curtain, but if it did touch, it touched**, and this did not invalidate the service.

Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Yosei, said: **I saw the curtain in Rome, and there were several drops of blood on it from the bull for an unwitting communal sin and the goats for a sin of idolatry.** The Gemara asks: **But how could he identify the source of the blood; perhaps they were from the bull and goat of Yom Kippur?** The Gemara answers: **He saw that they were performed not in their order^N** and inferred that they must be sprinklings from communal sin-offerings, which are not presented in a sequence.

PERSONALITIES

Rabbi Elazar son of Rabbi Yosei – רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר בְּרַבִּי יוֹסֵי: Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Yosei, was a member of the tannaitic generation that preceded the final editing of the Mishna. He was the son of the *tanna* Rabbi Yosei ben Halafta and was apparently considered the greatest scholar of his father's five sons. Together with Rabbi Shimon bar Yoḥai, he once traveled to Rome to try to obtain the

annulment of a decree against the Jews. Due to a miracle, they were able to save the life of the emperor's daughter. As a sign of gratitude, they were allowed to view the leader's treasures. Naturally, Rabbi Elazar was most interested in the Temple artifacts, and he was later able to report details of some of them, e.g., the curtain and the frontplate, to the other Sages.

נְתַעְרְבוּ לוֹ דָּמִים בְּדָמִים, אָמַר רַבָּא: נוֹתֵן אַחַת לַמַּעֲלָה וְשִׁבְעַת לַמַּטָּה, וְעוֹלָה לֹא לְכָאן וְלְכָאן.

אָמְרוּהָ קַמֵּיהָ דְרַבֵּי יִרְמְיָהּ. אָמַר: בְּבִלְאֵי טַפְשָׁאֵי! מִשּׁוּם דְּדִיּוּרֵי בְּאַרְעָא דְחִשְׁבָּא אָמְרֵי שְׂמַעְתָּא דְמַחְשָׁקָן! הָא קָא יְהִיב לַמַּעֲלָה דְשַׁעִיר, מִקְמֵי מַטָּה דְפֶר, וְהַתּוֹרָה אָמְרָה: "וְכִלְהּ מִכְפָּר אֶת הַקֹּדֶשׁ": כִּלְהּ דָּם הַפֶּר, וְאַחַר כֵּן כִּלְהּ דָּם הַשַּׁעִיר.

אֶלָּא אָמַר רַבֵּי יִרְמְיָהּ: נוֹתֵן אַחַת לַמַּעֲלָה וְשִׁבְעַת לַמַּטָּה לְשֵׁם הַפֶּר, וְחֹזֵר וְנוֹתֵן אַחַת לַמַּעֲלָה וְשִׁבְעַת לַמַּטָּה לְשֵׁם הַשַּׁעִיר.

נְתַעְרְבוּ לוֹ דָּמִים בְּדָמִים בְּמַתְנֵי הָאֲחֵרוֹנוֹת, סָבַר רַב פַּפָּא קַמֵּיהָ דְרַבָּא לְמִימַר: נוֹתֵן שִׁבְעַת לַמַּטָּה לְשֵׁם פֶּר וְלְשֵׁם שַׁעִיר, וְחֹזֵר וְנוֹתֵן אַחַת לַמַּעֲלָה לְשֵׁם שַׁעִיר.

אָמַר לֵיהּ רַבָּא: עַד הַשְּׂתָא קְרוּ לָן טַפְשָׁאֵי, וְהַשְּׂתָא טַפְשָׁאֵי דְטַפְשָׁאֵי, דְקָא מְגַמְרִינָן לָהּ וְלֹא גְמִירֵי. וְהָא קָא יְהִיב מַטָּה דְשַׁעִיר מִקְמֵי מַעֲלָה דְשַׁעִיר, וְהַתּוֹרָה אָמְרָה: תֵּן לַמַּעֲלָה וְאַחַר כֵּן לַמַּטָּה!

The Gemara asks a question: What should the High Priest do if the blood of the bull became mixed with the blood of the goat⁴ before he finished all the sprinklings? Rava said: He should present from the mixture once upward and seven times downward, and that counts toward both this one and that one, as he has sprinkled from both of them.

They said this answer before Rabbi Yirmeya in Eretz Yisrael, whereupon he said: Foolish Babylonians!⁵ Because they live in a dark, low land, they speak darkened halakhot, devoid of logic. If this solution is followed, when the High Priest sprinkles the mixture of bull and goat blood, he thereby presents the upward sprinklings of the goat before he sprinkles the downward presentations of the bull; and the Torah said: "And when he has finished atoning⁶ for the sacred place" (Leviticus 16:20), which teaches: He finishes the blood of the bull by sprinkling upward and downward, and only afterward he finishes the blood of the goat.

Rather, Rabbi Yirmeya said that the High Priest proceeds as follows: He presents once upward and seven times downward for the purpose of sprinkling the blood of the bull,⁷ as the blood of the bull is in this mixture. And he again presents once upward and seven times downward for the purpose of sprinkling the blood of the goat. Although the blood is mixed together and by sprinkling for the purpose of the bull's blood he also sprinkles some of the goat's blood, since he has only the bull's blood in mind it is as though he did not sprinkle the blood of the goat at all.

The Gemara asks another question: What should the High Priest do if the blood of the bull became mixed with the blood of the goat during the final presentations that he performs in the Sanctuary? Rav Pappa, who was sitting before Rava, thought⁸ to say: He presents seven times downward for the purpose of the bull and for the purpose of the goat, and he again presents once upward for the purpose of the goat.

Rava said to him: Until now they called us Babylonians merely foolish, and now they will call us the foolish of the foolish, as they will say that we teach them and yet they do not learn. In response to your statement one could simply repeat Rabbi Yirmeya's previous argument: But he presents downward sprinklings for the goat before the upward sprinklings for the goat, and the Torah said: Present upward and then downward.

HALAKHA

The blood of the bull became mixed with the blood of the goat – נְתַעְרְבוּ לוֹ דָּמִים בְּדָמִים: If the blood of the bull became mixed with that of the goat before the High Priest finished the sprinklings, he sprinkles upward once and downward seven times for the purpose of the bull. He then sprinkles upward once and downward seven times for the purpose of the goat. If the blood

became mixed during the last sprinkling, he sprinkles downward once for the purpose of the bull, and subsequently sprinkles upward once and downward seven times for the purpose of the goat. The halakha is accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yirmeya (see Kesef Mishne; Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim 5:10).

NOTES

Foolish Babylonians – בְּבִלְאֵי טַפְשָׁאֵי: Some Sages in Eretz Yisrael adopted an attitude of scorn toward the scholarship of their Babylonian counterparts. They generally felt that the community in Eretz Yisrael possessed the authoritative tradition, while the Babylonian Jews' lack of expertise in halakha meant that their ideas were often unfounded. The Rambam writes in a responsum that this was true only in a specific period when governmental decrees in Babylonia prevented proper learning, leading to a corruption of the tradition. Later generations of Babylonians, however, are credited with a higher level of scholarship than those of Eretz Yisrael (Ritva).

And when he has finished atoning – וְכִלְהּ מִכְפָּר: Some commentaries omit this citation, as they maintain that the principal argument is derived from the term "statute" (Leviticus 16:34), which

is written in connection with the sprinkling. This word teaches that the order of sprinkling may not be changed (Tosafot Yeshanim).

He presents...for the purpose of the bull – נוֹתֵן...לְשֵׁם הַפֶּר: Although the goat's blood is mixed with that of the bull, as he does not intend to sprinkle the blood of the goat it is considered like water, which does not invalidate the bull's blood (Tosefot Rid).

Rav Pappa...thought – קָבַר רַב פַּפָּא: Some commentaries suggest that Rav Pappa had not heard Rabbi Yirmeya's criticism (Ritva). Others suggest that he had indeed heard of Rabbi Yirmeya's response, but he nevertheless thought that since in this case the two acts of sprinkling are performed with the same blood, he is not considered to have sprinkled the later blood in his first act of sprinkling (Sifah Yitzhak).

NOTES

The cups became mixed – נִתְעָרְבוּ לוֹ בֹּסוֹת – **בְּבֹסוֹת**: If, as the Gemara earlier noted, the blood of a bull and that of a goat look different, how could they be confused with each other? Some commentaries suggest that an elderly High Priest might not be able to discern such a subtle difference between shades of blood (*Me'iri*). Others claim that the weakness of the High Priest from fasting might lead to confusion with regard to matters of this kind (*Bah*).

Rejected – דְּחִיּוּן: The concept of rejection is relevant to various mitzvot. It refers to an item not currently fit for the use of a mitzva due to a blemish or some other factor. In most circumstances, the object in question was originally fit but was subsequently altered in some way. Certain authorities maintain that the rejection of an item changes its status inherently, so that even if the cause for the rejection is later removed, the item remains rejected.

HALAKHA

The cups became mixed – נִתְעָרְבוּ לוֹ בֹּסוֹת – **בְּבֹסוֹת**: If the cups became mixed to the point that the High Priest does not know which of them contains blood from the bull and which from the goat, he sprinkles blood from one of them upward once and downward seven times. He then does the same from the other cup, before repeating the rite again with the first container, so that he performs it a total of three times (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 5:11).

Part of the blood became mixed – מִקְצַת דָּמִים – **נִתְעָרְבוּ**: If some of the blood became mixed, and it is unknown which is the bull's blood and which is the goat's, the High Priest sprinkles from the cups that were not mixed while he pours the rest into the drain canal, in accordance with the opinion of Rav Pappa (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 5:12).

אָלָא אָמַר רַבָּא: נוֹתֵן שֶׁבַע לְמַטָּה לְשֵׁם פֶּר, וְחוֹזֵר וְנוֹתֵן אֶחָת לְמַעְלָה וְשֶׁבַע לְמַטָּה לְשֵׁם שְׁעִיר.

נִתְעָרְבוּ לוֹ בֹּסוֹת בְּבֹסוֹת – נוֹתֵן, וְחוֹזֵר וְנוֹתֵן,

וְחוֹזֵר וְנוֹתֵן שְׁלֹשָׁה פְּעָמִים.

מִקְצַת דָּמִים נִתְעָרְבוּ לוֹ, וּמִקְצַת דָּמִים לֹא נִתְעָרְבוּ [לוֹ], פְּשִׁיטָא. בִּי יְהִיב – מוֹדְאִין יְהִיב.

מִיָּהוּ, הֵנָּךְ שִׁירִים הוּוּ וְלִיסוּד אֲזִלִי, אוֹ דִילְמָא דְּחִיּוּן הוּוּ וְאֲזִלִי לְאִמָּה?

אָמַר רַב פַּפָּא: אֲפִילוּ לְמֵאן דְּאָמַר בּוֹס אֶחָד עוֹשֶׂה חֲבִירוֹ שִׁירִים – הֵנִי מִיְלֵי הֵיכָא דְּאִי בְּעֵי לְמִיתֵב מְצֵי יְהִיב, אֲבָל הָאִי דְּאִי בְּעֵי לְמִיתֵב לֹא מְצֵי יְהִיב – לֹא.

אָמַר לֵיהּ רַב הוּנָא בְּרִיה דְּרַב יְהוֹשֻׁעַ לְרַב פַּפָּא: אֲדַרְבֵּהּ, אֲפִילוּ לְמֵאן דְּאָמַר בּוֹס אֶחָד עוֹשֶׂה חֲבִירוֹ דְּחִי – הֵנִי מִיְלֵי דְּדַחֲיָה בְּיָדִים, אֲבָל הֵיכָא דְּלֹא דְּחִיָּה בְּיָדִים – לֹא.

דִּתְנֵינָא: לְמַעְלָה הוּא אֹמֵר "וְאֵת דְּמוֹ יִשְׁפֹּךְ" וְלְמַטָּה הוּא אֹמֵר "וְאֵת כָּל דְּמָה יִשְׁפֹּךְ."

Rather, Rava said: He presents downward seven times for the purpose of the bull, and he again presents upward once and downward seven times for the purpose of the goat.

The Gemara asks another question: What if the cups became mixed,^{NH} i.e., if the bowl containing the blood of the bull was confused with that of the blood of the goat? The Gemara explains: He presents blood from one cup by sprinkling upward once and downward seven times, and he again presents a second set of sprinklings from the second cup.

And he again presents another set of sprinklings, again from the first cup, which amounts to a total of **three times**. In this manner, he fulfills the obligation no matter which cup was which. If the first cup was that of the bull's blood and the second was that of the goat, he fulfilled his obligation with the first and second sprinklings. If the first cup contained the blood of the goat, he performed the sprinkling of the goat's blood before that of the bull, which means his first set of sprinklings are discounted. Consequently, when he sprinkled from the second cup, which contains the bull's blood, and a third time from the cup of the goat's blood, he fulfilled his obligation with the second and third sets of sprinklings.

The Gemara asks yet another question: If only **part of the blood became mixed^H** together and **part of the blood did not become mixed**, e.g., if some of the blood spilled and became mixed in a third vessel, the solution is **obvious: When he presents, he presents from the blood of certain identity**.

However, one could still ask a question with regard to this case: What is the status of the mixed blood in the **other** vessel or vessels? **Are they considered the remainder of the blood, and the remainder of the blood goes to the base of the altar like the remainder of all blood of sin-offerings? Or perhaps this mixture of blood is rejected,^N** as the blood from this vessel was not used for the first sprinklings, and therefore the two types of blood are spilled and go to the canal beneath the altar, which rinses all the dirt from the courtyard into the Kidron River.

Rav Pappa said: Even according to the one who says that **one cup renders its counterpart a remainder**, i.e., if a one collected blood in two cups, the blood in the second cup is considered the remainder of the first cup, **this applies** only in a case **where he could present** blood from the second cup if he wanted to, i.e., if both cups were filled with blood from the offering. **However**, in this case, as the blood in this vessel could **not be presented** even if he wanted to, it does **not** become a remainder, and it is therefore certainly rejected.

Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, said to Rav Pappa: **On the contrary**, even according to the one who says that when blood is collected in two cups **one cup renders the blood of its counterpart rejected**, that applies only when he rejects the second cup with his own hands, i.e., by means of a direct act. **However**, in a case **where he does not reject it with his own hands**, as no act of rejection was performed but rather the blood became a remainder by itself, the blood is **not** rejected.

As it was taught in a *baraita*: In the verse above, it says: "And the priest shall take of the blood of the sin-offering with his finger, and put it upon the corners of the altar of the burnt-offering, and he shall pour its blood out at the base of the altar of burnt-offering" (Leviticus 4:25). **And in the verse below it says:** "And the priest shall take of its blood with his finger, and put it upon the corners of the altar of burnt-offering, and he shall pour all its blood out at the base of the altar" (Leviticus 4:30). The second verse adds the word "all."

A sin-offering whose blood was collected in several cups – חֲטָאת שְׁקִיבֵל דְּמָה בְּכַמָּה כּוֹסוֹת: If the blood of a sin-offering was collected in four cups and a priest sprinkled blood from each cup, the remainder of the blood in the four cups is spilled on the base of the altar. However, if he sprinkled blood from one cup alone, the remainder of that cup is spilled on the base while that of the other cups is poured into the drain canal. This *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of the first *tanna* (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 2:21).

He mixes before placing on the corners – מְעַרְבֵין לְקַרְנוֹת: The blood of the bull and the goat are sprinkled on the corners of the altar after they have been mixed together (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 4:2).

NOTES

He poured the blood of the bull into the blood of the goat – יַעֲרֶה דָם הַפָּר לְתוֹךְ דָּם הַשְּׂעִיר: Since there is more blood from a bull than from a goat, and the blood of a bull is heavier, the two mix better when the bull's blood is poured into the that of the goat (*Tosafot Yeshanim*).

As it was stated, Rabbi Yoshiya, etc. – דְּאֵיתֵמר רַבִּי יֵאֵשִׁיָּהּ: The early commentaries debate the appropriateness of the phrase: It was stated, in this context, as this expression is generally used to introduce a debate between *amora'im*, whereas Rabbi Yoshiya and Rabbi Yonatan are in fact *tanna'im*. Various answers have been offered to this problem. According to *Tosafot Yeshanim*, since these two Sages lived at the end of the tannaitic period, just before the start of the amoraic period, the Gemara did not insist on employing the term: It was taught in a *baraita* (see also *Mikhtav LeHizkiyahu*). Another suggestion is that this debate was not recorded in any *baraita* but was transmitted orally until it was written down by the *amora'im* (Ritva). A third perspective is that the phenomenon of a debate being introduced without a clear attribution for each of the opinions, i.e., when the Gemara simply states: One said... and one said, which is the case here, is a feature of amoraic, not tannaitic, texts (*Yad Malakhi*).

The dispute between Rabbi Yoshiya and Rabbi Yonatan – מַחְלוּקַת רַבִּי יֵאֵשִׁיָּהּ וְרַבִּי יוֹנָתָן: This dispute concerns the correct interpretation of verses that mention two items. Does the Torah mean that the pair of items should always feature as one, unless it explicitly separates them; or are the two matters separate, barring an expression that unites them? This distinction makes little difference with regard to practical *halakha*, but several textual analyses are dependent on this question.

מִמֵּיִן לְחֲטָאת שְׁקִיבֵל דְּמָה בְּאַרְבַּע כּוֹסוֹת וְנָתַן מִזָּה אַחַת וּמִזָּה אַחַת שְׂכוּלֵן נְשַׁפְּכִין לְיִסּוּד – תְּלַמּוּד לֹאֵמַר: "וְיָאֵת כָּל דְּמָה יִשְׁפּוֹךְ."

The *baraita* explains: From where is it derived with regard to a sin-offering that if one collected its blood in four cups and presented blood from each of them by sprinkling once from this cup and once from that cup until he has sprinkled four times, once from each cup, that the leftover blood in all the cups is poured out as remainders on the base of the altar? The verse states: "And he shall pour all its blood."

יְכוּל אֶפְיֵלוּ נָתַן אַרְבַּע מִתְּנוֹת מֵאַחַת מֵהֵן – תְּלַמּוּד לֹאֵמַר: "וְיָאֵת דְּמוֹ יִשְׁפּוֹךְ" – הֵהוּא נְשַׁפְּךְ לְיִסּוּד, וְהוּן נְשַׁפְּכִין לְאַמָּה. רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר בְּרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן אֹמַר: מִמֵּיִן לְחֲטָאת שְׁקִיבֵל דְּמָה בְּאַרְבַּע כּוֹסוֹת וְנָתַן אַרְבַּע מִתְּנוֹת מֵאַחַד מֵהֵן שְׂכוּלֵן נְשַׁפְּכִין לְיִסּוּד – תְּלַמּוּד לֹאֵמַר: "וְיָאֵת כָּל דְּמָה יִשְׁפּוֹךְ."

One might have thought that even if he presented four presentations from one of them, all the rest should be spilled on the base of the altar as remainder; therefore, the verse states: "And he shall pour its blood." This indicates that not all the blood, but only that blood in the bowl from which blood was sprinkled on the altar, is poured on the base as a remainder, and the rest of the cups of blood are poured into the canal. Rabbi Eliezer, son of Rabbi Shimon, says: From where is it derived with regard to a sin-offering that if one collected its blood in four cups^d and presented four presentations from one of them, that they are all poured at the base of the altar? The verse states: "And he shall pour all its blood."

וְלַרְבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר בְּרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן, הָאֵת בְּתֵיב: "וְיָאֵת דְּמוֹ יִשְׁפּוֹךְ"! אָמַר רַב אֲשִׁי: לְמַעוֹטֵי שִׁירִים שְׁבַצְאוּר בְּהַמָּה.

The Gemara asks: And according to the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, son of Rabbi Shimon, isn't it also written: "And he shall pour its blood"? How does he explain this difference between the verses? Rav Ashi said: When the Torah states "its blood," it comes to exclude the remainders that are in the throat of the animal. If more blood comes out of the throat after the collection of the blood, that blood is certainly not poured on the base of the altar but is swept into the canal of the Temple.

"יַעֲרֶה דָם הַפָּר לְתוֹךְ דָּם הַשְּׂעִיר." תִּנְן כִּמְאֵן דְּאָמַר מְעַרְבֵין לְקַרְנוֹת. דְּאֵיתֵמר, רַבִּי יֵאֵשִׁיָּהּ וְרַבִּי יוֹנָתָן. חַד אָמַר: מְעַרְבֵין, וְחַד אָמַר: אֵין מְעַרְבֵין.

The mishna states that after the High Priest sprinkled the blood toward the curtain he poured the blood of the bull into the blood of the goat.ⁿ The Gemara comments: We learned this mishna in accordance with the opinion of the one who said that the High Priest mixes the two types of blood before placing them on the corners^h of the inner altar, and he does not present each one separately. As it was stated: The later *tanna'im*, Rabbi Yoshiya^{np} and Rabbi Yonatan,^p debated this issue. One of them said: The High Priest mixes the blood for the purpose of placing the blood on the altar's corners, and one of them said: He does not mix the blood.ⁿ

תַּסְתַּיִים דְּרַבִּי יֵאֵשִׁיָּהּ הוּא דְּאָמַר מְעַרְבֵין דְּאָמַר: אֵף עַל גַּב דְּלָא בְּתֵיב "וְיַחְדָּיו" – כִּמְאֵן דְּבְתֵיב "וְיַחְדָּיו" דְּמִי.

The Gemara comments: Conclude that Rabbi Yoshiya was the *tanna* who said that the High Priest mixes the blood. In general, he maintains that whenever a verse mentions two matters, although the term: Together, is not written explicitly, it is considered as though the term: Together, is indeed written. In other words, two items that appear in the same verse are treated as combined unless expressly stated otherwise. By contrast, Rabbi Yonatan maintains that even if two matters are mentioned together they are treated separately unless the verse uses the term: Together. In this case, the verse states: "And he shall take of the blood of the bull and of the blood of the goat" (Leviticus 16:18). Therefore, Rabbi Yoshiya rules that the High Priest must place the two sets of blood together.

PERSONALITIES

Rabbi Yoshiya – רַבִּי יֵאֵשִׁיָּהּ: Rabbi Yoshiya, who is also called Rabbi Yoshiya Rabba, the Great, lived during the last generation of the *tanna'im*. According to tradition, he emigrated from the city of Hotzal in Babylonia to learn Torah in Eretz Yisrael, mainly from Rabbi Yishmael, until he developed into one of the outstanding personalities of his teacher's academy. At some point, possibly after the death of Rabbi Yishmael, he returned to Babylonia where he was appointed head of the Sages of Hotzal. He was succeeded by his son, Rabbi Ahi. Rabbi Yoshiya is attributed with numerous halakhic and aggadic statements, with many presented in the form of debates with his colleague

Rabbi Yonatan. These appear mostly in the *Mekhilta*, which is from the school of Rabbi Yishmael.

Rabbi Yonatan – רַבִּי יוֹנָתָן: A native of Eretz Yisrael, Rabbi Yonatan was a member of the last generation of *tanna'im*. His full name was Rabbi Natan, or Yonatan, ben Yosef. He studied under Rabbi Yishmael and was responsible for spreading his teacher's methods of study. Nevertheless, he apparently also learned in Rabbi Akiva's school. Most of his recorded statements are found in the Talmud and the *Mekhilta* of the school of Rabbi Yishmael, and they are presented as disputes with his colleague Rabbi Yoshiya.

אֶפְלוּ תִמְא רַבִּי יוֹנָתָן הוּא, שְׂאֵנִי
הָכָא דְכָתִיב 'אַחַת'.

The Gemara rejects this contention. Even if you say that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of **Rabbi Yonatan**, it remains possible to explain its ruling, since **it is different here, as it is written "once"** (Exodus 30:10), which indicates that there must be one act of sprinkling and not two. Consequently, the High Priest must mix the blood to ensure that there is only one presentation.

תִּנְיָא דְלָא בְּשִׁנוּיָא: 'וְלִקַּח מִדָּם הַפָּר
וּמִדָּם הַשְּׂעִיר' – שְׂיֵהִיו מְעוֹרְבִין,
דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי יֹאשִׁיָּהּ.

The Gemara comments: **It was taught in a *baraita* contrary to our response**, but in accordance with the initial assumption: "And he shall go out to the altar that is before the Lord, and make atonement for it; **and he shall take of the blood of the bull and of the blood of the goat, and put it on the corners of the altar round about**" (Leviticus 16:18). This verse teaches **that the blood of the bull and the goat should be mixed**. This is **the statement of Rabbi Yoshiya**.

Perek V
Daf 58 Amud a

NOTES

Once a year – אחת בשנה: Since Rabbi Yoshiya maintains that the blood of the two animals is sprinkled together, what does he learn from the word "once"? His answer is that other *halakhot* are derived from this term, as explained in tractate *Shevuot* (*Tosafot Yeshanim*).

Placed one bowl inside a second bowl – הניח מוקד בתוך מוקד: Some commentaries add that the High Priest must nullify the outer vessel in favor of the inner one, as the Gemara's comment that one cannot nullify another person's foot indicates that nullification is required (*Me'iri*). *Tosafot* note that there is another issue involved here, namely the question of whether or not this is an appropriate manner of collecting blood. This question is also discussed in relation to a different issue in tractate *Sukka*, although it is possible that there is a difference between the *halakhot* of offerings and other mitzvot in this regard.

HALAKHA

Placed one bowl inside a second bowl – הניח מוקד בתוך מוקד: If a priest put one bowl inside another bowl and collected the blood that way, it is valid, as one type of an object does not interpose for another object of the same type (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 1:21).

רַבִּי יוֹנָתָן אָמַר: מִזֶּה בְּפָנַי עֲצָמוּ,
וּמִזֶּה בְּפָנַי עֲצָמוּ. אָמַר לוֹ רַבִּי יֹאשִׁיָּהּ:
וְהֲלֵא כִּבֵּר נֹאמֵר "אַחַת"!

Rabbi Yonatan says: He presents from this one, the bull's blood, by itself, and he presents from that one, the goat's blood, by itself and does not mix them. **Rabbi Yoshiya said to him: But wasn't it already stated:** "And Aaron shall make atonement upon its corners once a year;^N with the blood of the sin-offering of atonement" (Exodus 30:10), which indicates that the High Priest does not present twice?

אָמַר לוֹ רַבִּי יוֹנָתָן: וְהֲלֵא כִּבֵּר נֹאמֵר
"מִדָּם הַפָּר וּמִדָּם הַשְּׂעִיר". אִם בֵּן
לְמֵה נֹאמֵר "אַחַת" – לוֹמַר לְךָ אַחַת
וְלֹא שְׁתֵּים מִדָּם הַפָּר, אַחַת וְלֹא
שְׁתֵּים מִדָּם הַשְּׂעִיר.

Rabbi Yonatan said to him: But wasn't it already stated: "Of the blood of the bull and of the blood of the goat" (Leviticus 16:18), which teaches that each set of sprinklings must be performed by itself? **If so, why is "once" stated?** This verse comes to tell you that he must perform the rite **once and not perform two sets of sprinklings from the blood of the bull**; and likewise he must perform the rite **once and not perform two sets of sprinklings from the blood of the goat**. From the blood of each of the animals, the High Priest presents only one set of sprinklings. This shows that Rabbi Yoshiya and Rabbi Yonatan indeed disagree with regard to this issue.

תִּנְיָא אִידְךָ: 'וְלִקַּח מִדָּם הַפָּר וּמִדָּם
הַשְּׂעִיר' – שְׂיֵהִיו מְעוֹרְבִין זֶה בְּזֶה.
אֲתָהּ אָמַר שְׂיֵהִיו מְעוֹרְבִין זֶה בְּזֶה
אוֹ אֵינוֹ אֵלָּא מִזֶּה בְּפָנַי עֲצָמוּ וּמִזֶּה
בְּפָנַי עֲצָמוּ? תִּלְמוּד לֹאמַר: 'אַחַת'.
וּסְתַמָּא כְּרַבִּי יֹאשִׁיָּהּ.

It was taught in another *baraita*: "And he shall take of the blood of the bull and of the blood of the goat" (Leviticus 16:18). This verse teaches **that the blood of the bull and the goat should be mixed together**. Do you say that they should be mixed together, or perhaps that is not the case; rather, he presents from this blood by itself and from that by itself? Therefore, **the verse states: "Once."** The Gemara comments: **And this unattributed *baraita* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yoshiya**, who said the two sets of blood are mixed, as stated in the mishna.

"נָתַן אֶת הַמְּלֵא בְּרִיקָן" וכו'. בְּעַא
מִינֵיהּ רַמִּי בַר חֲמָא מֵרַב חֲסָדָא:
הֲנִיחַ מוֹרֵק בְּתוֹךְ מוֹרֵק, וְקָבַל בּוֹ
אֶת הַדָּם, מֵהוּ? מִיֵּן בְּמִינוֹ חוּצָץ, אוֹ
אֵינוֹ חוּצָץ?

S It was taught in the mishna that after the High Priest poured the bull's blood into the goat's blood, **he placed the blood from the full bowl into the empty bowl**, to mix the blood well. **Rami bar Hama raised a dilemma before Rav Hisha:** **What is the *halakha* if he placed one bowl inside a second bowl^{NH} and collected the blood in the inner bowl?** Does one type of object mingled with another of its own type interpose, which would mean that the priest has not collected the blood himself, as the outer bowl interposed between him and the vessel? **Or perhaps an object of one type does not interpose for another object of the same type, and therefore the two bowls are considered one object.**

אָמַר לֵיהּ, תִּנְיָתוּהָ: נָתַן אֶת הַמְּלֵא
בְּרִיקָן. מֵאֵי לָאוּ – הוֹשִׁיב מוֹרֵק מְלֵא
לְתוֹךְ מוֹרֵק רִיקָן?

Rav Hisha said to him: We have already learned the answer to this question in the mishna: **He placed the blood from the full bowl into the empty bowl. What, is it not correct to infer from this statement that he inserted the full bowl into the empty bowl?**