

17 Tammuz 5778
June 30, 2018



Zevachim Daf 78

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

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

Mishna

If the blood (*which was in the service vessel – prior to its sprinkling on the altar*) was mixed with water (*which fell in*), if it retains the appearance of blood, it is valid. If it was mixed with wine, we regard it as though it were water (*and we determine if the blood would have been recognizable in that amount of water – then it would be valid*). If it was mixed with the blood of a domesticated animal (*an unconsecrated one*) or a wild beast, we regard it as though it were water. Rabbi Yehudah says: Blood does not nullify blood. [*Accordingly, if a small amount of blood from a sacrifice fell into regular blood from an animal, it can still be sprinkled on the altar.*] If blood from a sacrifice was mixed with blood that is unfit for a sacrifice (*such as that of an animal that sodomized a person*), it should be spilled into the stream in the Courtyard (*that led to Nachal Kidron*). Rabbi Eliezer says: The blood is valid for sprinkling. If he did not ask what to do and sprinkled it, it is even valid after the fact, according to the *Tanna Kamma*. (77b – 78a)

Drop by Drop

Rabbi Chiya bar Abba says in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: This (*first case of the*) *Mishna* (*on 77b*) only discussed water that fell into blood. However, if blood fell into water, each first drop that fell into the water

became nullified (*and therefore the blood ends up becoming nullified by the water*).

Rav Pappa says: In this same case (*blood falling into water*) there would still be an obligation to cover the blood (*of an undomesticated beast or a slaughtered bird; a mitzvah known as kisuy hadam*), as mitzvos are not pushed aside (*and as long as it appears like blood, there is a mitzvah to cover it*). (78a)

Prohibitions Nullifying Each Other

Rish Lakish says: If someone mixed together *piggul*, *nossar*, and *tamei* pieces of sacrificial meat (*a k’zayis of each*) and ate it, he is exempt. This is because when he is chewing them, it is impossible that they will not be nullified. [*Rashi explains that as he chews an olive of two of these they become mixed together, and since in each piece that he chews, there is more of one kind and less of the other, the lesser part is nullified in the greater and assumes the status of the larger kind. This will happen with each piece that he chews, and as it is impossible to equalize them, one of the kinds has less than the standard (as much as an olive is the minimum to involve liability). Now, liability in general is not incurred unless a formal warning, is first given to the offender; this warning must be specific, e.g., ‘We warn you that for eating such-and-such you will incur such and such penalty.’ In this instance such a precise warning is*



impossible, for if it is not known if he is eating an olive volume of piggul or an olive volume of nossar. Hence only a doubtful warning can be given, and such is not regarded as a warning.] (78a)

Rules of Nullification

The *Gemora* notes: We see three lessons from this statement. We see that prohibited items nullify each other. We see regarding the *halachah* that a small amount of forbidden food imparts flavor and prohibits a permitted food, even when the permitted food is a majority, is only prohibited according to Rabbinic law (*for if it would be Biblical, he should still be liable to lashes, for each forbidden item will impart flavor to the other one*). We also see that a doubtful warning is not deemed a warning.

Rava asked a question from a *Mishna*, which states: If he made dough from both wheat and rice, if it tastes like grain it is obligated in the separating of *challah*. This indicates that this is even the law if a majority of the mixture is made of rice!?

The *Gemora* answers: It is only obligated in *challah* according to Rabbinic law.

The *Gemora* asks: If so, how can the end of this *Mishna* state that a person can fulfill the *mitzvah* of *matzah* with this dough?

Rather, the *Gemora* answers: It must be that when there are two different types of things that are mixed together, the flavor determines the identity of the mixture. When two things of the same type are mixed

together, the majority of the mixture determines its identity.

The *Gemora* asks: Why don't we determine the identity of these different types of mixtures in the same way? This is as the *Mishna* states: If it was mixed with wine, we regard it as though it were water (*and we determine if the blood would have been recognizable in that amount of water – then it would be valid*). This indicates that even though wine and blood look the same, we determine the nature of the mixture as if the wine would be water. This shows that we do look at mixtures of the same type and of different types in the same fashion in order to determine the identity of the mixture! [*Accordingly, when there is a mixture of two foods with the same flavor, we should view the permitted food as if it were a different type, and the forbidden food should only prohibit the mixture if that different type would be capable of imparting flavor into the mixture!?*]

The *Gemora* answers: No. The *Mishna* means that we look at the blood as if it is water (*and it is invalid, as the majority is wine*).

The *Gemora* asks: If this is the meaning of the *Mishna*, why doesn't it merely say that the water is nullified? Additionally, the *braisa* states: Rabbi Yehudah says that we look at it (*the white wine and milk, as explained below*) as if it is red wine. If its color was lessened, it is valid. If not, it is invalid. [*This also indicates that we look at items of similar types as if they were of different types!*]

The *Gemora* answers: There is indeed an argument amongst the *Tannaim* regarding this topic. The *braisa*



states: If a *tamei* pail had white wine or milk in it and one immersed it in the *mikvah*, we decide whether or not it became *tahor* based on what the majority of the liquid inside of it was when it was immersed (*if the majority was mikvah water, it is tahor*). Rabbi Yehudah states: We look at the white wine or milk as if it was red wine. If its color would have faded because of the *mikvah* water, it is valid. If not, it is *tamei*.

The *Gemora* asks a question on this from a *braisa*, which states: If a *tamei* pail was full of spittle and it was immersed in a *mikvah*, it is as if it was not immersed (*since spittle is thick, and does not allow water in*). If it had urine in it, we look at it as if it was water (*and it does not require a majority of mikvah water*). [*The immersion here is valid based upon "hashakah," which means that any water connected to the mikvah water is regarded as being part of the mikvah.*] If it was full of *chatas* water (*the mixture of water and ashes from the parah adumah*), there must be a majority of *mikvah* water for it to be *tahor*. Rabbi Yehudah seems to be the author of this *braisa*, as he is the one who says "we view it as if etc.," yet, he says that the *chatas* water is decided based on a mere majority! [*This means that he does not require us to view the chatas water as wine, and we should need a substantial amount of mikvah water to cause its color to fade!?*]

Abaye answers: The *Mishna* is in accordance with Rabbi Yehudah's own opinion, whereas the *braisa* reflect the (*stricter*) opinion of his teacher. (78a - 79a)

DAILY MASHAL

In the sefer *Aryeh Sha'ag* it is written that the reason *mitzvos* do not nullify each other is because the angels

who are created from each *mitzvah* are angels of peace, and on the contrary, each angel is connected to his fellow, for the six hundred and thirteen *mitzvos* collectively make up the entire person, and each limb connects to its fellow; however, regarding prohibitions, one can nullify the other. This is because every angel that is created from a transgression is separate from his fellow, and one has no connection to the other at all.