



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

Zevachim Daf Ayin Ches

MISHNA

- If blood of a korban became mixed with water: if the mixture still looks like blood, it is considered to be valid blood (and can be used for zrika).
 - If the blood became mixed with wine, we view the wine as if it were water (if there is enough blood in the mixture that if the wine were water the mixture would look like blood, it is valid).
 - If blood of a korban became mixed with blood of an animal that is not a korban or with the blood of a chaya, we view the other blood as if it were water (if there is enough blood in the mixture that if the other blood was water the mixture would look like blood, it is valid). **R' Yehuda** says that blood cannot nullify blood (and therefore if even a drop of korban blood was mixed into a large amount of blood from an animal that is not a korban, the mixture is valid to be used for zrika).
 - If the blood became mixed with blood of a passul korban, the mixture must be poured into the "amah" (the canal that flowed out of the Azarah). If the blood became mixed with blood of the korban other than the "dam hanefesh" (which is the blood that must be used for the zrika), the mixture must be poured into the "amah". **R' Eliezer** says it is valid. If he did not ask and went and applied the blood to the Mizbe'ach, it is valid.

GEMARA

- **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the mixture of blood and water is only valid when water fell into blood, but if blood fell into water in small amounts, every drop of blood becomes batul as it falls into the water and the mixture is therefore not valid as blood.
 - **R' Pappa** said, with regard to the mitzvah of "kisuy hadam" (one must cover the blood of a shechted bird or chaya) even if the blood fell into water there would still be a requirement to cover the mixture, because there is no rejection of mitzvos (even if the first drops become batul, when the later drops then join and make the water become the color of blood, it again becomes subject to the mitzvah of kisuy hadam).
- **Reish Lakish** said, if meat of piggul, nossar, and tamei became mixed together (with a kezayis of each in the mixture) and a person ate the mixture, he would be patur from malkus, because it is not possible that one doesn't become batul in the other (and the warning given not to eat the item may be given on the wrong item).
 - We learn 3 things from here: 1) issurin can be mevatal each other, 2) the rule that an assur thing that is a minority of a mixture, but which gives taste into the majority makes the majority thing assur, is only D'Rabanan, and 3) a warning given as a safek is not considered to be a warning.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, a Mishna says, if a dough is made from wheat and rice, then if the dough has the taste of wheat it is chayuv in challah, even if the majority of the mixture is rice. Now, according to what we said it should not be subject to challah, because it is only the minority!? **A:** The Mishna means it is chayuv in challah D'Rabanan.
 - **Q:** The Mishna then says that a person can use this mixture to be yotzeh his chiyuv of matzah on Pesach. This means that even D'Oraisa the taste of the wheat makes it not become batel to the majority of the rice!? **A:** Rather, when the mixture is of two unlike items we follow taste. When they are not different items (which is what **Reish Lakish** is referring to) we look to the majority, not to the taste.

- **Q:** Even when they are like items, why don't we view them as unlike items and determine if there is enough of the assur item to give a taste into the mutar item? Our Mishna said we use this concept when blood falls into wine, and said that we view the wine (the passul substance) as if it was water!? **A:** The Mishna means that we view the *blood* as if it was water, and it becomes passul if there is a majority of wine.
 - **Q:** If that is what the Mishna meant, it should have said that the blood becomes batel!? Why does it say "we view it as if it was water"? Furthermore, there is a Braisa regarding white wine in a keili that is being toiveled in a mikvah in which **R' Yehuda** actually uses this concept of looking at a like-kind item as if it were an item that is not like-kind – he says we view the white wine as if it were red wine!? **A:** It is actually a machlokes among Tanna'im whether we use this concept. In fact, this Braisa just referenced shows this machlokes, because the **T"K** says we don't use this concept (and instead says that we follow simple majority) and **R' Yehuda** says that we do.
 - **Q:** Another Mishna seems to say in one case that we do use this concept (which presumably must follow **R' Yehuda**), and in another case regarding water of parah adumah suggests that we follow a simple majority!? **A:** **Abaye** said, we could say that in fact **R' Yehuda** does not use this concept. When he does so in the Braisa he is actually referring to the view of his rebbi, **R' Gamliel**. **A2:** **Rava** said, he may in fact use the concept. The reason he doesn't in the case of the parah adumah water is for a different reason entirely – it is because the case there is a case involving a gezeira D'Rabanan.