



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Zevachim, Daf ᠒᠔ – Daf ᠒᠕

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H  
v'l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf ᠒᠔---69-----

- **R' Yitzchak** said, I heard two rulings – one about the kemitza of a non-Kohen and one about the melika of a non-Kohen. Regarding one, the ruling was that if it was brought up onto the Mizbe'ach it would have to be taken off, and regarding the other, the ruling was that it would not have to be taken off. However, I don't remember which ruling was said for which case. **Chizkiya** said, it makes sense to say the kemitza would have to be brought down and that the melika would stay up on top.
  - **Q:** Why is melika different? If it is because it was done by a non-Kohen on a bamah, a kemitza was also done by a non-Kohen on a bamah! You can't say that he holds that there were no menachos brought on bamos, because **R' Sheishes** has said that whoever holds there were no menachos on bamos also holds that there were no birds brought on bamos! **A:** Rather, the mincha on a bamah was done without putting it into a kli shareis, and therefore it is different than the mincha brought on the Mizbe'ach, and can't serve as a basis for allowing it to stay up on top.

MALAK BISMOL OY BALAYLA...

- A Braisa says, we would think that a passul melika done in the Azarah would make the bird give off tumah when swallowed. The pasuk therefore says "neveila", which excludes a bird killed with melika. [**Q:** The Gemara asks, a bird killed with melika is also a "neveila"? **A:** The Braisa is darshening the word "treifa", not "neveila".] The Braisa continues, we learn from the word treifa that just as becoming a treifa is something that does not make anything mutar that was assur until then, so too, the only killing of a bird that makes it have tumah is a killing that doesn't make anything mutar that was assur until then. This excludes even a passul melika which makes the bird be allowed to stay on top of the Mizbe'ach if it was brought up and therefore a bird killed with a passul melika in the Azarah would not have tumah. At the same time, this drasha comes to include the cases of melika done to a bird of kodashim outside the Azarah, and to a melika on a bird of chullin whether inside or outside the Azarah – since the melika is not matir anything it makes the bird have tumas neveila when swallowed.
  - Another Braisa says, we would think that if a chullin bird is shechted in the Azarah, or if a bird of kodashim is shechted inside or outside of the Azarah, that it should get tumas neveila, the pasuk therefore says "neveila", which excludes these cases. [**Q:** The Gemara asks, a bird killed with shechita when it is not appropriate is also a "neveila"? **A:** The Braisa is darshening the word "treifa", not "neveila".] The Braisa continues, we learn from the word treifa that just as becoming a treifa is something that is the same whether it happens in the Azarah or outside, so too, the only killing of a bird that makes it have tumah is a killing that is the same whether done inside or outside. This excludes a chullin bird shechted inside the Azarah and a bird of kodashim shechted inside or outside, since they are not the same when done inside and outside, and they therefore don't give off tumah when swallowed.
    - **Q:** The shechting of a chullin bird is not the same when done inside and outside, but the shechting of a kodashim bird is the same in both places!? **A: Rava** said, if shechting a bird of kodashim outside the Azarah can make the person chayuv kares, it most definitely must be significant enough of an act to remove the bird from becoming tumas neveila. Based on this, the shechting inside and outside will not be the same, and therefore it will also not bring tumas neveila.
    - **Q:** Based on this we should say that melika on kodashim outside the Azarah should not make the bird have tumas neveila since it is not the same inside and outside the Azarah!? **A: R' Simi bar Ashi** said, the Braisa means to compare the inside and outside when they are both done in a way in which it is passul. Melika inside is valid, and therefore we would not learn melika outside from melika inside.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A Braisa learns from bamah that something of kodashim that was taken outside of the Azarah and is then brought up onto the Mizbe'ach is not taken down, even though by a bamah this is perfectly valid!? **A:** The Tanna actually learns this halacha from the pasuk of “zos Toras ha'olah”.

### MISHNA

- If a Kohen did melika and the bird was found to be a treifa, **R' Meir** says the bird would not give off tumas neveila when swallowed, but **R' Yehuda** says that it would.
  - **R' Meir** said, I base this on a kal v'chomer – if the neveila of an animal, which gives off tumah when touched or carried, and yet shechita will prevent a treifa from becoming tamei, then with regard to a bird, whose neveila does not give off tamei through touch and carrying, certainly a shechita will prevent a treifa from becoming tamei. Now, just as a shechita permits it to be eaten and prevents the treifa from becoming tamei, so too a melika, which permits the bird to be eaten, will also prevent a treifa from becoming tamei.
    - **R' Yose** said, it is enough (“dayo”) to compare the birds to the animals – just as by an animal it is only a shechita (not a melika) that prevents it from becoming neveila, so too by a bird, it is only a shechita that will prevent it from becoming a neveila.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** Does **R' Meir** not hold of the concept of limiting a kal v'chomer based on “dayo”? We learn in a Braisa that this is a D'Oraisa concept!? **A:** **R' Yose the son of R' Avin** said, **R' Meir** actually learned the halacha regarding melika from a pasuk that makes a hekesh between an animal and a bird, not from a kal v'chomer. He says the hekesh comes to teach that anything that would make it mutar to eat also makes it not become tamei as a neveila.
  - **Q:** What does **R' Yehuda** hold? **A:** He says there word “treifa” in the pasuk regarding kosher birds is extra, because a treifa would already be covered by the word “neveila”, and teaches that the shechita of a treifa bird will not prevent it from having tumas neveila.
    - **Q:** **R' Shizbi** said, if this drasha is proper, then when the pasuk says that the cheilev of a neveila and the cheilev of a treifa are not tamei, we should also say that “treifa” is extra and should say that it comes include a treifa that was shechted, which would mean that only the cheilev of a treifa that was shechted is not tamei, but the meat it tamei. However, this can't be right, because **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** (or a Braisa) darshened the pasuk of “v'chi yamus *min* habeheima” to teach that only some animals become tamei and not others – the others being a treifa that was shechted! Rather, the word “treifah” regarding the cheilev comes to exclude the cheilev of a non-kosher animal. Similarly, we would say that the word “triefah” regarding the birds comes to exclude non-kosher birds from making tamei when it is swallowed. Therefore, this word is not extra!? **A:** **R' Yehuda** learns to exclude a non-kosher bird from the word “neveila” (therefore “treifa” is extra), as he says in a Braisa that “neveila” teaches that only something that is assur to eat because it is a neveila becomes tamei as a neveila. A non-kosher animal is assur to eat because it is non-kosher and therefore would not become tamei as a neveila.
  - **Q:** If so, the “neveila” regarding cheilev should also be able to teach this using the same logic, and if so the word “treifa” in that pasuk is extra as well!? **A:** **R' Yehuda** says, the word “treifa” regarding cheilev teaches that the cheilev of a chaya also does not become tamei as a neveila. We would have thought that the pasuk only refers to cheilev that is normally assur to eat, but the cheilev of a chaya, which may be eaten, is not included in the pasuk.
    - **Q:** Why should the cheilev of a chaya not become tamei? We have a pasuk that suggests that it does become tamei neveila!?

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 70-----

- The Gemara continues its lengthy discussion towards understanding the view of **R' Yehuda**, who says that melika will not prevent a bird that was a treifah from becoming tamei as a neveila. The Gemara said that he learns it from an extra word “treifah” in the pasuk regarding birds. The Gemara then asked that based on this he should also find the word “treifa” written with regard to cheilev to be extra. The Gemara had a back and forth about this and now continues.
  - **Abaye** said, the word treifah in the pasuk regarding cheilev is not extra. It is needed to teach that the cheilev of a treifah that died without shechita does not have tumas neveila. If not for this word we would think that since a non-kosher animal is assur when alive and an animal that is a treifah is assur when alive, we should say that just as the fats of a non-kosher animal are tamei, the fats of a treifah are also tamei.
    - **Q:** Based on this we should say that the word “treifah” written regarding a bird neveila is also not extra!? If not for this word we would say that since a non-kosher bird is assur to be eaten and a bird that is a treifah is assur to be eaten. Just as a non-kosher bird does not make tumas neveila when swallowed a bird that is a treifah is treated the same!? Furthermore, how can **Abaye** compare a non-kosher animal to a treifah? A non-kosher animal was never fit – it was born assur, whereas a treifah was kosher before it became a treifah! **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, the words “neveila” and “treifah” written regarding cheilev are needed, because the Torah is teaching that the issur of neveila and of treifa take effect on top of the issur of cheilev. The Torah needs to separately teach that this is true of neveilah, which could not be learned from treifa, because it is an issur that only comes about after death, and needs to teach it regarding treifah, which could not be learned from neveila, because it does not carry tumah like a neveilah.
  - **Q:** What does **R' Meir** (who argues on **R' Yehuda**) do with the word “treifah” in the pasuk of the kosher bird neveila? **A:** He uses it to teach that a chullin bird shechted inside the Azarah does not have tumas neveila.
    - **Q:** How does **R' Yehuda** learn that? **A:** He uses the word “treifa” written in another pasuk.
    - **Q:** What does **R' Meir** darshen with the word treifa in this other pasuk? **A:** He says that one pasuk comes to exclude the chullin bird shechted inside the Azarah (to teach that it does not have tumas neveila) and one teaches that a non-kosher bird doesn't have tumas neveila. **R' Yehuda** would learn this from the extra word “neveila”.
    - **Q:** What does **R' Meir** darshen with this word “neveila”? **A:** He says it teaches that the minimum amount of a kezayis must be eaten to make the person tamei.
      - **Q:** Why can't that be learned from the earlier pasuk that says “achila”, which is always understood to refer to a kezayis? **A:** One teaches the minimum of a kezayis and one teaches that it must be eaten “kidei achilas pras”. We would think that since the halacha of tumah coming about when it is swallowed is a chiddush, and it should therefore take place even when it is eaten in longer than a kidei achilas pras.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “v'cheilev neveila v'cheilev treifah”. The pasuk is referring to cheilev of a kosher animal and teaches that the fats of this neveila don't have tumas neveila. Maybe say it refers to the cheilev of a non-kosher animal? The Torah has said that things are tahor with regard to shechita and things are tahor with regard to cheilev. Just as shechita only makes a kosher animal tahor, so too the cheilev that is tahor must be from a kosher animal. Maybe instead say that the Torah said that things are tahor from having tumas neveila and things are tahor with regard to cheilev. Just as it is non-kosher species that are tahor from neveila so too it is non-kosher animals whose cheilev is tahor? The pasuk therefore says “treifa”, which teaches that it is referring to something that can fall into the category of treifa – which is only a kosher animal. We would then think to only exclude non-kosher animals, but to say that the cheilev of kosher chayos will also not be tamei, since it can also fall into the category of treifa. The pasuk therefore says “v'achol lo sochluhu”, which teaches that the pasuk refers to an animal whose cheilev is assur but whose meat is mutar. This excludes a chaya, whose cheilev is mutar.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yaakov bar Abba** asked **Rava**, the Braisa seems to say that the neveila of a non-kosher animal is not tamei!? **Rava** said, that is referring to birds, not animals.
- **R' Yochanan** said, when **R' Meir** said that melika on a bird that was a treifa prevents it from having tumas neveila, that is only if the bird didn't have a mum. **R' Elazar** said that **R' Meir** said his ruling even when the bird had a mum.
  - We learned that **R' Bibi in the name of R' Elazar** said that **R' Meir** said his ruling even if the bird had a mum, and even if done to geese and chickens (which are not fit to be brought as a korbon).
    - **R' Yirmiya** asked, what if someone does the “eglah arufah” process using a goat instead of a calf? Would that goat have tumas neveila? Do we say that geese and chickens are considered to be of the same species as the bird korbanos and that is why the melika on it prevents the tumah, but a goat is a “beheima dakah” which is considered to be of a different species than the calf which is a “beheima gasa” and therefore the goat will become tamei as a neveila, or do we say that goats and calves are both beheimos and therefore considered to be of the same species?
      - When **R' Dimi** repeated this, **Abaye** said, this suggests that an eglah arufa does not have tumas neveila. **R' Dimi** said that is correct, and as the yeshiva of **R' Yannai** said this is based on the fact that the pasuk says “kapparah” regarding the eglah arufah, which teaches that just as a korbon does not become tamei neveila the same is true with an eglah arufah.
      - **Q: R' Nosson** the father of **R' Huna** asked, a Braisa learns from a pasuk that the cheilev of an eglah arufah does not have tumas neveila. Now, if the whole eglah arufah doesn't have tumas neveila, why would I need a pasuk to teach that the cheilev doesn't have tumas neveila? **A:** The pasuk is needed for where the calf was shechted after it became assur b'hana'ah, instead of it being decapitated from behind as is supposed to be done to it.
        - **Q:** If it was shechted, the shechita should prevent it from become tamei as a neveila!? **A:** The pasuk is needed for a case where the calf died without shechita or decapitation. In that case the animal is tamei as a neveila, and the pasuk teaches that the cheilev is not tamei.
        - **Q:** This suggests that the animal is assur b'hana'ah even while it is still alive!? **A:** This is correct. We find that **R' Yanai** said regarding the time when the eglah arufah becomes assur b'hana'ah – I heard an answer as to when this happens, but have forgotten it. However, my colleagues have said that it becomes assur when it enters the rocky valley.

**HADRAN ALACH PEREK CHATAS HA'OF!!!**

-----Daf נ"ז---71-----

**PEREK KOL HAZEVACHIM -- PEREK SHEMINI**

### MISHNA

- All korbanos that became mixed with chata'os that must be left to die, or with oxen that must be killed with skila, even if one became mixed in 10,000 other animals, all the animals must be left to die.
- If a korbon became mixed with an ox with which an aveira was committed – with an ox that killed a person but was only witnessed by one person, or was witnessed only by the owner of the ox, or an animal that sodomized a person, or an animal that was sodomized by a person, or an animal that was designated for avoda zara, or an animal that was worshipped, or an animal that was used to pay a zonah, or was used to exchange for a dog, or with an animal that was kilayim, or was a treifah, or an animal that was born with a Caesarean section – in all

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

these cases the animals must be left to graze until they get a mum, after which time they are sold and he brings the type of korbon that was mixed up with these, using the value of the most expensive animal in the group.

- If a korbon became mixed with animals of chullin that don't have a mum, the chullin animals should be sold to people who need to bring the same type of korbon as the korbon mixed in (and all the animals are then brought for this type of korbon).
- If a korbon became mixed with another korbon of the same kind (e.g. a chatas with a chatas, or an olah with an olah), the Kohen should offer the korbanos "for whoever is the owner" (without intending specifically for either person). If korbanos became mixed with korbanos of different kinds, the animals should be left to graze and develop a mum, and the animals are then sold, and new korbanos should be purchased, each with the value of the most expensive animal in the mixture, with the shortfall coming from the owner's own money. If a korbon became mixed with a bechor or an animal of maaser, they are left to graze and develop a mum, (the korbon is then redeemed and the money is used to buy an animal for a replacement korbon) and all the animals are then eaten as a bechor or maaser.
- Any kind of korbon can become mixed among others except for a chatas and an ashm (they are brought from different types of animals than the rest).

### GEMARA

- **Q:** What does the Mishna mean when it says "*even* if one became mixed in 10,000 other animals, all the animals must be left to die"? If it was one korbon mixed in 10,000 animals that must be left to die, of course that one korbon must also be left to die!? Even if one became mixed in 10,000 other animals, all the animals must be left to die!? **A:** The Mishna means, even if there are 10,000 valid korbanos and one animal that must be left to die became mixed among them, they must all be left to die.
  - **Q:** Another Mishna already teaches the halacha that an animal that is assur to be brought as a korbon, for example an animal involved in sodomy with a person, that becomes mixed among other animals, makes the entire mixture assur in any amount (even if the assur animal is one among many valid animals). Why does our Mishna need to repeat this halacha? **A: R' Ashi** said that **R' Simi** explained, if we only had that Mishna we would say that this stringency (of it not becoming batul) only applies for use on the Mizbe'ach, but for private use we would allow it to become batul. If we only had our Mishna, we would say that this ruling only applies to animals that are assur b'hana'ah (a chatas that must be left to die, or an ox that must be stoned), but other animals would become batul. Therefore, we need both Mishnayos.
    - **Q:** Our Mishna discusses animals that are not assur b'hana'ah as well!? **A:** Our Mishna's discussion of those animals doesn't say that it is never batul, only that the mixture is assur. We would think that there is a certain amount which would make the mixture batul. We therefore need the other Mishna to teach that.
      - **Q:** So why even discuss this case in our Mishna? **A:** Our Mishna teaches how to remedy the situation, whereas the other Mishna does not.

### -----Daf עב--72-----

- **Q:** Why does our Mishna have to teach that the assur animal makes the entire mixture assur even for private use? Another Mishna already teaches that yayin nesech and avoda zara are assur and make an entire mixture assur even if present in a minute amount!? **A:** If we only had that Mishna we would have thought that it becomes assur for individual use, but for hekdes it should not be assur and thereby cause a loss to hekdes. If we only had our Mishna we would think to say that it only is not batul when the assur item is mixed with kodashim, because it is considered to be disgusting for the kodashim. However, when the mixture is with chullin, we would have thought to say that the assur items do become batul.
- **Q:** Why don't we say that the assur animal becomes batul in the majority of the mutar animals? If you will say it is because they are chashuv and therefore don't become batul, that only works according to the view that something which is *typically* sold by count does not become batul – which is the way **Reish Lakish** explains the

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

view of **R' Meir** in a Mishna, but according to the view that only things that are *always* counted don't become batul - which is the way **R' Yochanan** explains the view of **R' Meir** in a Mishna, why wouldn't the animals become batul (animals are not always sold by count)!? **A: R' Pappa** said, the Tanna of the Mishna, who holds that animals do not become batul, is the Tanna of a Braisa regarding a litra of dried figs, who says that if something is even sometimes sold by number, it does not become batul even D'Rabanan, and certainly will not become batel D'Oraisa.

### -----Daf 73-----

- The Gemara had asked why the assur animal in our Mishna does not become batul among the many mutar animals. The Gemara answered that the Mishna follows the view of the Tanna (**R' Yehuda in the name of R' Yehoshua**) of a Braisa who says that since figs are *sometimes* sold by the unit, they do not become batul even for a D'Rabanan, and certainly not for a D'Oraisa.
  - **R' Ashi** said, our Mishna can even follow the **Rabanan** (who hold that there are only 6 things that don't become batul). The reason why the animals don't become batul is because they are live beings and as such are considered to be especially significant and do not become batul.
- **Q:** Why don't we go to the mixture of animals and take them one by one and bring them as korbanos, based on the principle that whatever is separated from a mixture is considered to be from the majority ("kol d'parish meiruba parish")? **A:** The assur animal is in a fixed place, and we have another principle that "kol kavu'ah k'mechtza ahl mechta dami" (it is considered to be 50/50). Therefore, removing one animal at a time will not be a solution.
  - **Q:** We should make all the animals move so that they are no longer considered to be "kavu'ah" ("in its place") and we will therefore follow the first principle!? **A: Rava** said, we would not do this, as a gezeira for a case where, for example, 10 Kohanim will come at the same time and offer the 10 animals that were taken one-by-one (and make up the majority of the mixture). In that case, since the majority is being offered together we must again be concerned that the assur animal is in this majority.
    - **Q:** One of the Rabanan said to **Rava**, once each animal was separated, they become fully valid korbanos! You can't say that if they were later offered at the same time they would again become assur!? **A:** The gezeira is for a case when 10 Kohanim come at the same time and *take* the animals from the mixture at the same time. In that case, since the majority is being taken at the same time we must again be concerned that the assur animal is in this majority.
      - **Q:** Is it possible for 10 Kohanim to each take an animal at exactly the same time, which would lead to this concern!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, the gezeira is that we are concerned that someone would take an animal from the mixture while the animals were still in their place, before they were moved. In that case we would have to follow the second principle, and it would be considered 50/50.
- **Rava** said, now that the **Rabanan** have said that we may not offer any animals from this mixture, if someone does offer an animal from this mixture, the korban would not be effective.
  - **Q: R' Huna bar Yehuda** asked **Rava**, a Mishna says, if an olah bird and a chatas bird became mixed up, even if it was one in 1,000 of the other, they must be left to die. The Mishna says, this is what we would tell a Kohen who asked what to do. However, if a Kohen went and offered all the birds above the line (and there were an equal amount of olos and chata'os), or if he offered them all below the line, then half would be valid and half would be passul. If he offered half above and half below they would all be passul. Now, we see from here that even though he was not supposed to offer these birds, if he did they are valid b'dieved!? **A: Rava** is following the Tanna who holds that living things can become permanently rejected from the Mizbe'ach. This Mishna regarding the birds is following the view that living things cannot become permanently rejected from the Mizbe'ach.
    - **Q:** In the case of animals which have been shechted, all would agree that they can become permanently rejected, and yet a Mishna says that **R' Eliezer** says, if a passul head of an olah animals was mixed among other heads of olos and one of the heads was then offered on the Mizbe'ach, the remaining heads may then be offered (we assume the passul one was the one

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

that was offered first). **Rava** should say the same thing and the korbanos should not be permanently rejected!? **A: R' Eliezer** was following the view of **Chanan Hamitzri**, who holds that nothing, not even an animal that was shechted, becomes permanently rejected.

-----Daf 74-----

- **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha in the name of Rav** said, if the ring of avoda zara became mixed among 100 other rings, and one of them then fell into the ocean, all the remaining rings are mutar, because we say that the assur ring was the one that fell into the ocean.
  - **Q: Rava** asked **R' Nachman**, our Mishna said that even if there was one assur animal among 10,000 mutar korbanos they must all be left to die. Now, according to you, as soon as the first one dies we should say that it was the assur animal that died, and the remaining animals should be mutar!? **A: R' Nachman** said, **Rav** follows the view of **R' Eliezer** (quoted earlier) who says that once the first head in a mixture of heads of olos was offered, we can assume that it was the passul one that was offered and the remaining ones therefore become mutar to be offered. However, our Mishna follows the view of the **Rabanan** who argue on **R' Eliezer**.
    - **Q: Rava** asked, **R' Elazar** said that **R' Eliezer** would only allow two heads to be offered together, not one at a time. If so, how can each individual ring be mutar? **A: R' Nachman** said, I also mean that the rings are mutar if they are benefitted from using two at a time.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, if a ring of avoda zara became mixed among 100 other rings, and 40 of the rings then moved to one place and 60 moved to another, then if one of the group of 40 falls into another mixture of mutar rings it would not make the entire mixture assur, but if one of the group of 60 fell into such a mixture it would make the mixture assur.
  - **Q:** The reason that when one falls from the 40 it doesn't make the mixture assur is because we say that the assur ring is in the majority of the group of 60. We should similarly say that even when one from the group of 60 falls in, we should say that that one is from the majority and not the one of avoda zara!? **A:** Rather, what **Rav** meant was that if the *entire* group of 40 falls into another mixture of mutar rings, they are all mutar, but if the entire group of 60 falls into such a mixture, the entire mixture becomes assur.
  - **R' Yehuda** said, when I repeated this ruling of **Rav** to **Shmuel** he said to me that the case of avoda zara is different, because even a "sfek sfeika" would be assur, and therefore even if the group of 40 fell into a new mixture, the entire mixture would become assur.
    - **Q:** A Braisa says that the sfek sfeika of avoda zara is mutar!? **A:** It is a machlokes among Tanna'im. A Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** says, if "rimonei Badan" that were assur (as orlah) became mixed with ones that are mutar, they do not become batul. For example, if one that is assur fell into 10,000 mutar ones, and one from that mixture then fell into another 10,000 mutar ones, they are all assur. **R' Shimon ben Yehuda in the name of R' Shimon** said, when the assur one falls into 10,000 mutar ones, they are all assur. But, if one from that mixture then falls into a group of 3 other mutar ones, and then one of that mixture falls into yet another mixture, they are mutar. We see from here that there is a machlokes whether something that is not batul would become mutar in a case of sfek sfeika.
      - **Q:** Who would **Shmuel** hold like? He can't hold like **R' Yehuda**, because **R' Yehuda** says that other issurim (like orlah in the Braisa) have the same halacha as avoda zara, whereas **Shmuel** said that avoda zara is different!? He also can't hold like **R' Shimon**, because **R' Shimon** would say that even a case of avoda zara would be mutar with a sfek sfeika!? **A: Shmuel** holds like **R' Yehuda** with regard to avoda zara, but disagrees with him regarding other issurim.
      - **Q:** Why does the Braisa give the case where one of the 10,000 then fell into a mixture of 3 mutar? Even if it fell into two mutar ones it should be mutar (because the mutar are the majority)!? **A:** The Braisa means that with this assur one there are three – 2 mutar plus this one assur.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- We can also answer that **Shmuel** holds like **R' Eliezer** of a Mishna, who holds that even the sfek sfeika of avoda zara is assur.
- **Reish Lakish** said, if a barrel of terumah wine became mixed with 100 barrels of chullin wine and one barrel then fell into the ocean, all the remaining barrels are mutar, because we say that the assur one was the one that fell into the ocean.
  - Although **R' Nachman** stated a similar ruling above (regarding the ring of avoda zara), this ruling of **Reish Lakish** is needed as well. If we only had **R' Nachman** we would say that only applies to avoda zara, which can never become mutar, and that is why we are meikel. However, regarding terumah, which can be sold to a Kohen, maybe we are not meikel. If we only had **Reish Lakish** we would say that in the case of the barrels it is mutar because it is very noticeable when one barrel is lost, and people will not think that it is mutar even before one is lost. However, in the case of rings where it is not noticeable, maybe it should remain assur.
  - **Rabbah** said, **Reish Lakish** only said it is mutar in this case of barrels, because it is noticeable when one is lost. However, if we were dealing with figs of terumah he would not allow this case. **R' Yosef** said that he would even say it is mutar in the case of a fig – just as one falling in makes it assur, so too, one being lost can make it mutar.
- **R' Elazar** said, if a barrel of terumah wine became mixed with 100 barrels of chullin wine, a person may open a barrel (which makes it not significant and therefore subject to bitul), remove from it the percentage of terumah wine in the mixture (1/101) and may then drink the rest of the wine in the barrel. When **R' Dimi** repeated this, **R' Nachman** said it would not be permitted to open a barrel to make it subject to bitul. Rather, if one *did* open a barrel (b'dieved it was already done), in that case he can remove from it the percentage of terumah wine in the mixture (1/101) and may then drink the rest of the wine in the barrel.
- **R' Oshaya** said, if a barrel of terumah wine became mixed with 150 barrels of chullin wine, and a person then opened 100 barrels (which make them not significant and therefore subject to bitul), he may remove from it the percentage of terumah wine in the mixture (1/151) and may then drink the rest of the wine in the barrels. The remaining 50 barrels remain assur unless they too are opened, because we do not say that the assur barrel is one of the majority that were already opened.

### HAROVEYA V'HANIRVA...

- **Q:** The Mishna listed a number of examples of animals that are passul to be brought as a korban and said that if they become mixed with other animals, all the animals would be passul. Now, this makes sense for all the pessulim listed except for an animal that is a treifa. If the treifa is noticeable, let it just simply be removed, and if it is not noticeable, how do we even know that the animal is a treifa altogether!? **A:** The yeshiva of **R' Yannai** said, the case is where an animal that was stabbed with a thorn (which typically does not become a treifa) became mixed with an animal that was attacked by a wolf (which does become a treifa). **Reish Lakish** said, the case is that an animal that fell from a roof (which is a treifa, but is not noticeable as such) became mixed with other animals, and he holds that such an animal cannot be examined by simply seeing if it can walk. **R' Yirmiya** said, the case is that the offspring of a treifa became mixed with other animals, and the Mishna follows the view of **R' Eliezer**, who says that the offspring of a treifa may not be brought as a korban.
  - The others did not want to answer like **R' Yannai**, because they feel there is a noticeable difference between the wound caused by a thorn (it is round) and the wound caused by a wolf (it is long). The others did not want to answer like **Reish Lakish**, because they hold that if the animal can walk it is not a treifa. The others did not want to answer like **R' Yirmiya**, because they did not want to say that the Mishna must follow **R' Eliezer**.

### -----Daf ע"ה---75-----

### KODASHIM B'KODASHIM MIN B'MINO...

- **Q:** How can the Mishna say the korbanos are to be brought "for whoever the owner is"? The korbanos need semicha, and therefore each owner must know exactly which is his korban so that he can do semicha!? **A:** **R' Yosef** said, the Mishna is discussing the korbanos of women, which do not require semicha.



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** So, if the mixture was of the korbanos of men they could not be offered? **Abaye** asked, a Braisa says, if an individual's korban became mixed with another individual's korban, or if the korban of the tzibbur became mixed with another korban of the tzibbur, or if the korban of an individual and the korban of the tzibbur became mixed together, the Kohen should make 4 zrikos for each korban (4 actual applications if they were chataos, and 2 which are like 4, if they are olos). If he did only one zrika from each, he is yotzeh. If (for olos) he made one double zrika (on one corner) for each, he is yotzeh. When do we say that l'chatchila he should make 4 zrikos for each korban? That is when they were mixed when they were alive. However, if they were first mixed after they were shechted, he makes 4 zrikos from the mixed bloods together, and even if he makes one zrika from the mixed bloods he is also yotzeh. **Rebbi** says, we must determine whether there was enough blood in the zrika for each korban – if there was it is valid, if not it is passul. Now, the Braisa seems to refer to an individual that is similar to the tzibbur – just as the tzibbur includes men, the individual refers to men as well. We see from here that the korbanos are offered even though semicha cannot be done!? **A: Rava** said, I can prove that this Braisa cannot be understood as being correct. The Braisa says that if the korbanos became mixed after they were shechted the zrikos may be done together. Now, why should that be different than when they were mixed while they were still alive!? Even then, as long as the bloods are still separate, the zrikos should be done separately!? Rather, the Braisa is only referring to animals that are no longer alive. The Braisa is saying, if they were mixed after the shechita in a way *similar to live animals* – i.e. the blood of each is in a separate keili – then a separate zrika should be done for each. But, if the bloods became mixed, the zrika can be done for them together. Since the Braisa is not referring to live animals, it does not get involved in the question of semicha and therefore does not refute **R' Yosef**.
  - **Q:** Does **Rebbi** really hold that there is a minimum amount needed for a zrika? We find that **Rebbi** discusses (and presumably holds like) the view of **R' Eliezer** in a Braisa, which says that there is no minimum amount needed for the water needed for the para adumah!? **A:** He discusses the view of **R' Eliezer**, but doesn't hold of the view. **A2:** Zrika of blood has a minimum. Sprinkling of the water of the para adumah is different and does not have a minimum.

### NISARVU B'BECHOR UMAASER...

- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked, **B"V** hold that a bechor which has a mum may not be eaten by a niddah. What about the temurah of a bechor? Also, a bechor which has a mum may not be redeemed. What about the temurah of a bechor? A bechor which has a mum and was shechted may not have its meat weighed using regular weights. What about the temurah of a bechor? **A: Rava** said, a Braisa says, when a bechor or maaser get a mum they can still be used to create temurah, and their temurah is just like them.
- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked, if a bechor with a mum was given by the Kohen to hekdes for "bedek habayis", can it be weighed with regular weights when it is sold? Do we allow it so that hekdes can get the most profit possible, or do we not allow it so as not to degrade the kedusha of a bechor? **A: R' Yosef bar Zevida** said, our Mishna says that when a korban becomes mixed with bechor, they are allowed to get a mum and may then be eaten like a bechor. Presumably this means that it is treated like a bechor and may not be weighed with regular weights. This is so even though it will prevent hekdes from getting the maximum profit, and answers the question.
  - **R' Huna and R' Chizkiya**, the talmidim of **R' Yirmiya** said, these cases can't be compared. The Mishna is discussing two different animals, whereas the question was regarding one animal.
  - **Q: R' Yosef bar Avin** asked, if someone said "redeem for me a bechor that was given to bedek habayis" (and allow it to be worked with, etc.), would we allow it? Of course not! So why would we even think that the bechor with a mum could be sold using regular weights!? **A:** The pasuk clearly says "lo sifdeh", that a bechor may not be redeemed. Weighing it may be different.
  - **R' Ami** said, the Kohen only gives to hekdes the rights that he had in this animal. Since he could not have weighed it using regular weights, hekdes may not do so either.

### HAKOL YECHOLIN L'HISAREV...

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Why does the Mishna only say that a chatas and asham can't become mixed up, presumably because the chatas is a female and the asham is a male? The same is true for a chatas and an olah (which can also only be brought from a male)!? **A:** There is the case of the male goat chatas of a Nasi.
  - **Q:** If so, the chatas can also be mixed with an asham!? **A:** The chatas goat has hair, whereas an asham is a ram, which has wool.
  - **Q:** A Pesach and an asham also can't get mixed up, because a Pesach is in its first year and an asham is in its second year!? **A:** The asham of a nazir and of a metzora are both brought when in their first year, and can therefore be mixed up with a Pesach. **A2:** Sometimes an animal in its first year can look like it is in its second year, and visa-versa.