



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

### Zevachim Daf Ayin Daled

- **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 by 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.
- 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**.