



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) A mixture of Chatas water and regular water (cont.)

In defense of the last challenge to R' Ashi's interpretation of R' Eliezer, Rava asserts that when bloods mix in a single utensil all opinions agree that it is blended and the disagreement applies when separate cups of blood from different offerings become intermingled.

The assertion that there is no disagreement when the bloods are intermingled in a single cup is unsuccessfully challenged.

2) Leftover Chattas blood that mixes with Olah blood

Abaye asserts that when remnant chattas blood mixes with olah blood all opinions agree that the blood is applied below the red line.

R' Yosef cites R' Yehudah who disagrees with this assertion.

Another pair of Amoraim is cited who dispute the same point.

The assertion that remnants are poured on the base of the Altar is challenged.

The Gemara's conclusion is that this issue is subject to debate.

Rava presents another challenge about the location of where the remnants are poured.

It is noted that there is a disagreement regarding the source that olah offerings do not nullify one another.

The basis of the disagreement about the source that olah offerings do not nullify one another is explained.

Another attempt is made to prove that the leftover chattas blood is poured where the blood of the olah is to be applied.

R' Yitzchok bar Yosef refutes this proof.

(Continued on page 2)

Distinctive INSIGHT

Mixed bloods for inside the Sanctuary and in the courtyard
 וניפלוג נמי ר' אליעזר בהא? היכא ליעביד? ניתיב בחוץ והדר ניתיב בפנים, כשם שמצוה להקדים עליונים לתחתונים כך מצוה להקדים פנים לחוץ

In a previous Mishnah (79b) the case of a mixture of bloods was presented. Blood from an offering which was to be placed on the lower part of the Altar was mixed with blood from an offering whose blood was to be placed on the upper part of the Altar. R' Eliezer ruled that the mixture should be applied to the upper part of the Altar, and the portion of the mixture of blood which did not belong there will be considered as water. Chachamim disagree and say that there is no satisfactory solution to deal with this entire mixture, and it should be disposed of in the canal which ran through the courtyard.

In our Mishnah, we again have an example of bloods from different offerings which become mixed. Here, blood of an offering which is to be applied to the inner Altar is mixed with blood from an offering which is to be applied on the outer Altar. The Mishnah states that the blood is to be disposed of. There is a dispute between R' Akiva and Chachamim what is to be done if the kohen did not ask, and he applied the blood on the two Altars, but all agree that if the kohen does ask, we instruct him to dispose of the blood. The Gemara opens its remarks by asking why R' Eliezer does not issue his dissenting opinion in regard to this second case and say that the blood should be applied to the inner Altar, and the blood for the outer Altar should be viewed as being water, as he did in reference to the previous Mishnah and its illustration of a mixture.

The Gemara notes that if the mixture contains blood of a chattas or an asham, bringing the blood in to the Sanctuary would disqualify it, and it would no longer be possible later to apply that part of the blood to the outer Altar. While it is true that if the mixture is a combination of other offerings, other than chattas or asham, the mixture could be applied to the inner Altar and then to the outer Altar. Yet, R' Eliezer did not present his dissenting view in this second Mishnah because he does not argue with Chachamim in cases where chattas and asham are involved.

Sfas Emes asks why R' Eliezer says to spill out the blood in a case of chattas or asham. At least part of the blood could be salvaged by first sprinkling the blood inside the Sanctuary, and then spilling out the rest which has become ruined. He therefore learns that the Gemara's question is that if there is no chattas involved, R' Eliezer should allow the inner application first, followed by the outer applications. Where chattas is involved, we understand that the inner blood, which must be first, cannot be done, as this ruins the chattas blood. The Gemara realizes that this intricate solution is too detailed for the Mishnah to list. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. According to Rava, what is the point of dispute between R' Eliezer and Rabanan?

2. Where exactly are korban remnants to be poured out?

3. What percentage of the blood remnants must be poured on the base of the Altar?

4. What is the point of dispute between R' Akiva and Chachamim?

HALACHAH Highlight

Bris milah for a child born bein hashemashos of Erev Shabbos

הניתנין בפנים שנתערבו בניתנין בחוץ וכו'

If blood that is applied inside becomes intermingled with blood that is applied outside etc.

Sha'agas Aryeh¹ asks a question according to those who maintain that if a boy was circumcised before the eighth day the mitzvah is ex post facto fulfilled. When a child is born during bein hashemashos of Erev Shabbos we should not wait until Sunday to do the circumcision; rather the child should be circumcised on Friday. If the period of bein hashemashos is halachically Friday than the child will be circumcised l'chatchila on the eighth day and even if bein hashemashos is part of Shabbos and the circumcision was performed on the seventh day the circumcision is still valid. Why should we wait until Sunday when the mitzvah will certainly not be fulfilled l'chatchila when it could be done on Friday and possibly be done l'chatchila?

Avnei Nezer² develops a principle from our Gemara that one may not fulfill a mitzvah in a **בדיעבד** manner if the reason it will not be fulfilled in the l'chatchila manner is due to ignorance. The Mishnah discusses a case where blood of an outer chattas becomes intermingled with blood of an inner chatas and the halacha is that the blood is poured into the canal. The Gemara explains that the blood can't be first applied outside since there is a mitzvah to apply it inside first since an inner chattas is more sanctified. It is also not an option to apply the blood inside first since the blood that is to be applied outside

(Overview...continued from page 1)

This refutation is unsuccessfully challenged.

3) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses additional cases of mixtures of blood.

4) Clarifying R' Eliezer's view

The Gemara wonders why R' Eliezer doesn't disagree in the case of inner bloods that mix together with outer bloods. ■

becomes invalidated when brought inside. The rule that something that is more sacred takes priority over something less sacred does not apply when the time to do the less sacred mitzvah is limited. In such a case it is prioritized ahead of that which is more sacred. As such, we should apply the blood outside first, even though it is less sacred since the blood may not be used once it is brought inside. The reason this is not an option is that the reason the blood of the outer chattas is seen as a mitzvah with a limited time frame is due to our ignorance about which blood is supposed to be applied inside and which blood is supposed to be applied outside. When it is ignorance that leads one to do something **בדיעבד** it is better not to do it altogether. The same principle applies to circumcision. It is not permitted to circumcise the child on Erev Shabbos since bein hashemashos may be considered night and the ideal time to circumcise is Shabbos. According to the principle that has been established we may not actively push aside fulfillment of a mitzvah in a l'chatchila manner in order to fulfill it only **בדיעבד** if the cause is ignorance. For that reason it is better to do nothing and perform the circumcision on Sunday. ■

1. מובא דבריו באבני נזר דלקמן.

2. שו"ת אבני נזר יו"ד סי' ש"יח אות י'. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Inner and Outer Avodah

"מצוה להקדים פנים לחוץ..."

The Alter of Kelm, zt"l, recounted, "I once went to visit Rabbi Doctor Carlbach, an upright person, who was educated in university.

"I asked him, 'How did you have the strength of character not to be influenced by the sinners there?'"

"Rabbi Carlbach's reply was simple but very revealing. 'When we were in university, we had a very wise and upright rav who we would ask any questions that were presented to us. He immediately

ly answered all questions that came up in a clear and compelling manner.

'One time we asked a very strong question he did not wish to answer immediately. 'I cannot give you the answer to that question yet, since you are not yet able to understand it properly. In another year or perhaps more, you will have the ability to comprehend the answer to this question.'

"Rabbi Carlbach explained why the religious students accepted this unusual response without reservation. 'We felt as though he had already dealt with the question. After all, we knew that our rav is a very wise man who had always had a decisive reply. If he said we were not yet ready, but he would respond in time,

why not believe him?'"

"The same is true regarding our Torah. Although one must toil to understand, when he is confronted with a seemingly unanswerable question, he must accept that this is due to his limitations, not because the Torah is lacking chas v'shalom..."¹

On today's daf we find that the proper mitzvah is to first bring the inner offerings, then the outer. This is the lesson of the Alter's story. First one must be in order in his inner state; he must have absolute clarity about his emunah. Only then is he suited to deal with the chitzonius and tackle the realm of questions and apparent contradictions. ■

1. בית קלם, אמונה, עי קל"ג-קל"ד ■