

18 Tammuz 5778  
July 1, 2018



Zevachim Daf 79

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

### **Nullifying**

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. For it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Yehudah said in the name of Rabban Gamliel: Blood cannot nullify other blood (and even if the majority of the blood is not from the *korban*, the sprinkling on the altar is still valid; similarly, if there is blood from a wild beast or a bird, there is still a *mitzvah*

to cover it); spittle cannot nullify other spittle; and urine cannot nullify other urine. [The spittle and the urine of a *tahor* person, even though the latter exceed the former. This is a stringent view, and the similar stringent view above that two different kinds of substances that are similar in appearance, such as the water from the *mikvah* and white wine, cannot be nullified by a mere majority; rather, we view the wine as if it would be a different color and then make a determination how much water would it take to nullify the color of the wine, is likewise his teacher’s ruling, not his own.]

Rava answers: We are discussing a pail which is *tahor* on the inside and *tamei* on the outside (due to coming into contact with a *tamei* liquid, which, since its merely a Rabbinic *tumah*, only the outside becomes *tamei*), which by law - even a small quantity of *mikvah* water would be sufficient (just to ensure that the rim and the outside was completely immersed) and it was only the Rabbis who enacted a preventive measure, lest he will be concerned about the *chatas* water (that it should not become ruined) and not immerse it (even the outside in a proper manner). Accordingly, once there is a majority of *mikvah* water in the inside of the pail, nothing else is required.

Rava said: The Rabbis have said that flavor is the determining factor (in one type of mixture); and the



Rabbis have said the majority is the determining factor (*in one type of mixture*); and the Rabbis have said that appearance is the determining factor (*in one type of mixture*).

Now he explains the cases when each principle applies: When one kind is mixed with a different kind, flavor is the determining factor; and when one kind is mixed with the same kind, the majority is the determining factor; and when the issue is appearance, (*such as the case of the mikvah*), appearance is the determining factor. (78b – 79a)

### **Nullifying Prohibitions**

The *Gemora* notes: Rish Lakish's ruling (*above, that prohibitions can nullify each other*) is in disagreement with Rabbi Elozar, for Rabbi Elozar says: Just as *mitzvos* cannot nullify each other, so too prohibitions cannot nullify each other.

The *Gemora* notes that it is Hillel who maintains that *mitzvos* do not nullify each other, for it was taught in a *braisa*: It was said about Hillel the Elder that he would sandwich them (*the korban pesach, the matzah and the marror*) together and eat them, for it is written: *Together with matzos and bitter herbs shall they eat it (the meat from the pesach offering)*. [Evidently, *mitzvos* do not nullify each other.] (79a)

### **Nullifying Like Substances**

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: As to the (*tamei*) shard (*from a urinal*) of a *zav* and a *zavah*, the first and second time (*it was washed*) it is *tamei* (*for not all the urine will be removed*), but the third time, it is *tahor*. When does this

apply? This is if one poured water into it; but if one did not pour water into it (*but rather, he used the urine from a tahor person*), it is *tamei* even the tenth time (*because two kinds that are alike cannot nullify each other*). Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov said: At the third time it is *tahor* even if one did not pour water into it.

The *Gemora* notes: Now, who did you hear say that one kind is not nullified by its own kind? It was Rabbi Yehudah.

The *Gemora* asks a contradiction from the following *braisa*: If flax was spun by a *niddah*, he who moves it is *tahor* (*for her dry spittle does not transmit tumah*); but if it is moist, he who moves it is *tamei*, on account of the fluid of her mouth. Rabbi Yehudah said: Even if one moistens it in water he is *tamei*, on account of the fluid of her mouth; and even if he washes it with water many times! [*But why do we not say that all her spittle has been removed from the flax on account of the washing?*]

Rav Pappa answers: Spittle is different, because it absorbs deeply into the flax.

The *Mishna* had stated: 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.

Rav Zevid explains that they differ as to whether a preventive measure is enacted in the Temple. The *Tanna Kamma* holds that we enact a preventive measure (*to disqualify this mixture even though there is*



not enough invalid blood to nullify it on a Biblical level; for we are concerned that otherwise, they might validate a mixture where there was enough invalid blood to nullify it), while Rabbi Eliezer maintains that we do not enact a preventive measure.

Rav Pappa said: All agree that we do enact a preventive measure, but here they disagree as to whether it is common for the draining blood to exceed the lifeblood. The *Tanna Kamma* holds that it is common, while Rabbi Eliezer maintains that it is not common (and therefore they did not make any decree). (79b)

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### ***Matzah and Marror***

The *Gemora* cites the opinion of Hillel the Elder, who holds that a *mitzvah* cannot nullify another *mitzvah*. The *Gemora* in Pesachim cites a *Tanna* who disagrees.

How does *marror* nullify the *mitzvah* of *matzah*? The Rashbam and others explain that the strong bitterness of the *marror* nullifies the taste of the *matzah*, which is required in order to fulfill the *mitzvah*.

Rabbeinu David writes that the strong taste of the *marror* might not nullify the taste of the *matzah*. However, being that if one would eat a lot of *marror* it would nullify it, one does not fulfill the *mitzvah*. It is also possible that a large amount of *marror* would serve as a “*chatzitzah*” – “divider” between the *matzah* and one’s mouth. The *Gemora* in Pesachim 115b says that in such a case one does not fulfill the *mitzvah*. Due to these possibilities, the *Gemora* said one does not fulfill the

*mitzvah* of *matzah* if he eats the *matzah* and *marror* together.

However, the Meiri and others write that a Rabbinical *mitzvah* is considered a non-*mitzvah* act when it is combined with a Biblical *mitzvah*. It takes away the importance of the Biblical *mitzvah*, causing one to be unable to fulfill that *mitzvah* (one would still fulfill the *mitzvah* mid’*Rabanan*, in this case *marror*).

## DAILY MASHAL

### ***Yitzchak’s Blood***

The Malbim was asked to explain the following Yalkut. At the time that Avraham Avinu bound his son Yitzchak, he cried out with a grave cry and said, “I am concerned about the loss of his blood, but I am not concerned about the loss of his days!” He interpreted these ambiguous words based upon the following *Mishna* in Zevachim: if the blood from two different *karbanos* became intermingled with each other, the *Chachamim* maintain that the blood must be spilled out. Yitzchak was a *bechor* and an *olah* and accordingly it was as if there were two bloods mixed together, and his blood would need to be spilled out. It would emerge that his blood would not be accepted as an offering by the Ribbono shel Olam. This is what Avraham was saying, “I am concerned about the loss of his blood for his blood needed to be spilled out. I am not concerned, however, about the loss of his days, for regarding that, I was commended by Hashem Yisbarach to *shecht* him.