

19 Tammuz 5778
July 2, 2018



Zevachim Daf 80

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

Bloods Mixed up

The *Mishna* discusses cases where blood from different sacrifices got mixed together.

Blemished and intact

If the blood of (*invalid*) blemished sacrifices got mixed together, the blood must be spilled to the ditch. If vessels of the blood from these sacrifices got mixed up, and one was already applied, Rabbi Eliezer says the rest may be applied, while the Sages say that the remaining vessels must be spilled to the ditch, even if all but one were already applied.

Sacrifices applied on the top half and sacrifices applied on the bottom

If the blood of sacrifices applied on top got mixed together with blood of sacrifices applied on the bottom, Rabbi Eliezer says that it should be applied on top, as we consider the blood of the bottom one as if it is water, and then applied on the bottom. The Sages say that it should be spilled in the ditch, but if the *Kohen* already applied it on top, he may apply the rest at the bottom, and both sacrifices are valid.

Different number of applications

If the blood of sacrifices which all require one application got mixed together, they should be applied once. If the blood of sacrifices which all require four applications got mixed together, they should be applied four times. Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua differ about what to do when the blood of a sacrifice requiring one application gets mixed with blood of a sacrifice requiring four applications. Rabbi Eliezer says that it should be applied four times, while Rabbi Yehoshua says that it should be applied only once. Rabbi Eliezer argued that by only applying once, the *Kohen* transgresses the prohibition of *bal tigrá* – *do not reduce* from the commandments, since he has not applied the blood requiring

four applications correctly. Rabbi Yehoshua responded that by applying four times, he transgresses the prohibition of *bal tosif* – *do to add on to* the commandments, since he has applied the blood requiring only one application more than necessary. Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua both responded that the prohibitions of reducing or adding to the commandments only apply when one incorrectly modifies the application of the blood of only one sacrifice, but not when it is mixed with another sacrifice, with differing requirements. Rabbi Yehoshua adds that by applying four times, the *Kohen* has actively modified the applications (*of the one requiring one*), but when he applies one time, he has only passively modified the applications (*of the one requiring four*). (79b – 80a)

Reminders

In the *Mishna*, Rabbi Eliezer says that if blood of a sacrifice with a blemish got mixed in with blood of other sacrifices, and then blood of one was applied, we may assume that it was of the blemished sacrifice, and the rest can then be applied. Rabbi Elozar says that Rabbi Eliezer only allows the *Kohen* to apply the remaining blood in pairs, since we then are sure that at least one of the applications done is valid, but not individually.

Rav Dimi challenged this from the continuation of the *Mishna*, where the Sages say that even if all bloods but one were already applied, the remaining one must be spilled, implying that Rabbi Eliezer allows the *Kohen* to apply this individual blood.



Rabbi Yaakov told Rabbi Yirmiyah bar Tachlifa that the “one” remaining refers to one *pair*, which is consistent with Rabbi Elozar’s statement.

The *Gemora* explains that the *Mishna* had to teach the dispute of Rabbi Eliezer in both the case of the blood of a blemished sacrifice that got mixed in and the case of the limbs of a blemished *olah* that got mixed in, to illustrate the extent of the dispute. If only the case of the limbs was taught, we may have limited Rabbi Eliezer’s position to that case, as the atonement has already been done, while if only the case of the blood was taught, we may have limited the Sages’ position to that case, since the atonement was not yet done. (80a)

Liquid Mixtures

The *Gemora* cites a *Mishna*, which states a dispute in the case of a minute amount of water which fell into a jug of the *chatas* - red heifer water. Rabbi Eliezer says that it is still valid, as long as two sprinkles are made, while the Sages say it is invalid.

The *Gemora* says that the Sages’ position is understandable, as they hold that liquids mix evenly, and there is a minimum quantity of *chatas* water that must be sprinkled. Since the liquids mix evenly, each drop has part of the non *chatas* water, making the drop smaller than the minimum quantity for the sprinkle.

The *Gemora* attempts to understand Rabbi Eliezer’s position. If he says that liquids do not necessarily mix evenly, perhaps both sprinkles are from the non *chatas* water, and are not valid. If he says they mix evenly, why does he require two sprinkles? If he says there is no minimum size of a sprinkle, one should suffice. If he says there is a minimum, how do two sprinkles suffice? If two half sprinkles (*done separately*) do not combine, these two are not valid, but even if they do combine, perhaps there is not enough *chatas* water between the two?

The *Gemora* offers the following explanations of Rabbi Eliezer’s position:

1. Rish Lakish says that Rabbi Eliezer says liquids do mix evenly, and there is a minimum quantity for a sprinkle. The case of the *Mishna* is when only one drop (*the minimum quantity for a sprinkle*) of water mixed with one drop of *chatas* water. Therefore, between the two sprinkles, there must be at least a sprinkle worth of *chatas* water, which combines.
2. Rava says that Rabbi Eliezer says liquids do mix evenly, but there is no minimum quantity for a sprinkle. Technically, one sprinkle would suffice, but the Sages fined the person, to ensure that he does not benefit from the extra water that fell in.
3. Rav Ashi says that Rabbi Eliezer says liquids do not mix evenly, but the case is that only a minute amount of non *chatas* water fell in. There is no minimum size for a sprinkle, but to ensure that there is some of the *chatas* water, two sprinkles are made, as the minute amount cannot be in both sprinkles.

The *Gemora* attempts to disprove some of the suggestions. The *braisa* cites Rebbe, who says that according to Rabbi Eliezer, any size of sprinkling is sufficient, as there is no minimum size. Even if a sprinkle has half *chatas* and half non *chatas* water, it is valid. This disproves Rish Lakish, who says that Rabbi Eliezer requires a minimum amount for a sprinkle.

The *Gemora* goes on to challenge Rav Ashi, by citing a *braisa* about a mixture of *chatas* blood (*to be applied at the top of the altar*) and blood to be applied at the bottom. Rabbi Eliezer says that he should apply the mixture on top, and the remaining blood which is poured at the bottom counts for the remainder. This would indicate that Rabbi Eliezer says that liquids mix evenly, as otherwise we cannot assume that any of the *chatas* blood was applied on the top.

The *Gemora* deflects this by saying that the case is one where most of the blood was *chatas* blood, and the top application was of more blood than the amount of *olah* blood. Although



Rabbi Eliezer says the application at the bottom counts, implying that we assume some of the *olah* blood was applied below, the *Gemora* deflects by saying that he only means that it counts as spilling the leftovers of the *chatas*, but not for the *olah*.

The *Gemora* cites the continuation of the *braisa*, which says that if the *Kohen* already applied the blood below, and then inquired what he should do next, Rabbi Eliezer says that he should apply it on top, and then spill the remainder at the bottom, and the bottom application also counts.

The *Gemora* again deflects this, saying again that it is a case where most of the blood was from the *chatas*, the blood applied on top was more than just the *olah* blood, and the bottom application only counts for the remainder of the *chatas*.

The *braisa* continues to say that if the *Kohen* already applied on top, and then inquired what he should do next, both Rabbi Eliezer and the Sages agree that he should apply the rest below, and both applications count.

The *Gemora* again deflects this, saying again that it is a case of mostly *chatas* blood, the blood applied on top was more than just the *olah* blood. Although the *braisa* concludes this section saying that *both* are valid, indicating that the application below counts not just for the remainder of the *chatas*, but also for the application of the *olah*, this statement is only of the Sages, who indeed say that liquids do evenly mix.

The *Gemora* attempts to disprove Rav Ashi from our *Mishna*, which says that if the blood of sacrifices requiring one application got mixed together, they should be applied once, implying that we assume this one application contains blood from both.

The *Gemora* deflects, saying that the case is one where that enough for one application from each was mixed in, and the

Mishna means that an application is made for each, ensuring that each was applied.

The *Gemora* attempts to prove the same point from the next case of the *Mishna*, where the blood of sacrifices requiring four applications are mixed, and again deflects, saying that the blood from each sacrifice was enough for four applications, and four applications are made for each sacrifice.

The *Gemora* then attempts to prove this point from the last case, where Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua differ when the blood of a sacrifice requiring one application mixed with blood from a sacrifice requiring four.

The *Gemora* says that this cannot be a case of just enough blood for the four (*or one*) applications, since Rabbi Yehoshua says that applying four applications would be *bal tosif*. If there is only enough for one application from the sacrifice requiring one application, we know that its blood was not applied more than once.

Rava answers that all the cases of blood mixed together are not ones where the bloods physically mixed *together*, but rather where the vessels containing the blood of the sacrifices got mixed *up*. In all these cases, Rabbi Eliezer says we can view the blood applied in the wrong place as water, while the Sages say we cannot. (80a – 81a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Leftovers

The *Gemora* discusses the dispute of Rabbi Eliezer and the Sages about non *chatas* water that fell into *chatas* water. Rish Lakish says the case is one where one drop of non *chatas* water mixed with one drop of *chatas* water. Rabbi Eliezer says that liquids mix evenly, there is a minimum size of a sprinkle, and two halves combine for the minimum.



Tosfos (80a kegon) cites Rabbi Chaim, who asks how this can work. The *Gemora* in Yoma states that all (*i.e., even those who says there is no minimum size of a sprinkle*) agree that the vessel being sprinkled from must have a minimum amount. If there are only two drops in the vessel, one being non *chatas* water, the second sprinkle is not coming from a vessel containing the minimum amount, and therefore is invalid.

Rabbi Chaim answers that since the sprinkling process began with a vessel containing the minimum amount, it is sufficient to render the whole process valid. The *Mishna* in the beginning of Yadayim states a similar *halachah* regarding washing hands. Although one must wash hands from a vessel containing at least a *revi'is*, two can wash together from a vessel containing just one *revi'is*, since the second person's washing came from the leftovers of a valid quantity.

Tosfos suggests, based on Rashi, that Rish Lakish does not literally mean that there was only one drop of *chatas* water, but rather that there is only one drop on non *chatas* water, mixed in with *at least* a drop of *chatas* water. Therefore, even for the second sprinkling, there is sufficient *chatas* water left in the vessel.

Half of Something is...?

Rav Ashi says that Rabbi Eliezer says that liquids do not necessarily mix evenly, but since only a minute amount fell in, between the two sprinkles, at least one will include *chatas* water.

Tosfos (80a Rav Ashi) asks why Rav Ashi did not agree with Rish Lakish, and only emphasize that only a minute amount fell in? Just as Rav Ashi says that between two sprinkles we assume some *chatas* water is included, we can apply the same logic to say that between the two sprinkles, a minimum amount of *chatas* was included.

Tosfos says that Rav Ashi must be saying that we assume that there is valid *chatas* water between the two, and not that

one is exclusively *chatas* water, since it is impossible for the minute amount to be too small to split in two.

Tosfos Yom Tov (Para 9:1) cites this Tosfos, and agrees that mathematically, any amount can be divided into two. [See Zeno's paradox (<http://www.iep.utm.edu/zeno-par/#SH3b>) for a fuller discussion of how things can be continually divided.]

Two Sprinkles

The Rambam on this *Mishna* (Para 9:1) says that Rabbi Eliezer means that one must sprinkle *off* two drops, and then use the rest for purification.

Rabbi Ovadia Bartenura objects to this explanation, saying it does not match any of the suggestions of our *Gemora*. See Tosfos Yom Tov, Chidushei Mahariach, and *Mishna Acharona*, who all suggest answers for the Rambam, including:

1. The Rambam is ruling like Rav Ashi, who is saying that one must sprinkle off two drops, and then can use the rest.
2. The Rambam understands that the fine that Rava refers to is not using the first two drops. If only one drop was not used, the person would not gain by the extra drop, but would not lose.

DAILY MASHAL

Nullifying Aveiros, but not Mitzvos

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.