

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Mixing different prohibited foods (cont.)

Abaye offers one resolution to the contradiction between a Baraisa and a Mishnah whether, according to R' Yehudah, there is a principle called רואין.

Rava suggests an alternative resolution to this contradiction.

### 2) Nullification

Rava teaches that sometimes nullification is measured by taste, sometimes by majority and other times by appearance.

Examples of each of these methods of nullification are presented.

### 3) Mixing different prohibited foods

It is noted that Reish Lakish's ruling that prohibited foods nullify one another is at odds with R' Elazar who maintains that prohibited foods do not nullify one another.

The Gemara cites and explains two Beraisos in a way that they contradict one another concerning the number of washings necessary for a liquid to be discharged from a utensil.

R' Pappa resolves the contradiction.

### 4) The disagreement between Tanna Kamma and R' Eliezer

R' Zevid offers one explanation of the dispute between Tanna Kamma and R' Eliezer concerning mixed bloods.

R' Pappa suggests another explanation of the dispute.

A challenge to R' Zevid's explanation is presented and the matter is left unresolved.

### 5) MISHNAH: The Mishnah continues to discuss different circumstances of bloods becoming mixed together. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What are the three ways in which the status of mixtures is determined?  
.....
2. What is the point of dispute between Reish Lakish and R' Elazar?  
.....
3. How does R' Pappa explain the dispute in the Mishnah between Tanna Kamma and R' Eliezer?  
.....
4. What was the purpose of the אמה in the Beis HaMikdash?  
.....

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### *Mixtures of the blood of offerings and invalid blood*

...אמר רב זביד בגזרין גזירה במקדש... ר' פפא אמר...

The final halacha in the Mishnah (77b-78a) was about blood of an offering that became mixed with blood of invalid offerings. Tanna Kamma rules that the entire mixture must be spilled out into the canal which ran through the courtyard where liquid wastes were placed to be washed out of the Mikdash into the Kidron Valley. Rashi (ibid.) explains that invalid blood includes blood from animals which are disqualified due to being used for sinful acts. Additionally, it includes the blood from offerings that flows after the life-blood. The "draining blood" may not be used for the offerings, and if it becomes mixed with valid blood, the mixture must be discarded, even if there is more valid blood in it than invalid blood. R' Eliezer rules that this mixture is valid.

Our Gemara now analyzes this disagreement. Rav Zevid explains that both Tanna Kamma and R' Eliezer agree that if there is not enough invalid blood in the mixture, it could technically be used for the service. However, Tanna Kamma holds that we disallow this mixture as a precaution. If we allow this mixture, we might also allow a mixture where the invalid blood is enough to nullify the valid blood. R' Eliezer says that we do not disqualify this mixture of blood simply due to a precaution.

Rav Pappa explains that all opinions would say that we do issue precautionary enactments in the Mikdash, but the disagreement is whether this case warrants such a ruling. Tanna Kamma holds that it is common to have more draining blood than life blood, so an enactment is warranted. R' Eliezer holds that it is not common to have more draining blood than life blood, so no enactment was necessary.

According to R' Eliezer, the mixture is therefore placed on the Altar, and we view the invalid portion of the blood as if it is merely water. Tosafos (ד"ה במאי קמפלגי) explains that this is consistent even with the view of the Sages (77a) who say that limbs of chattas and olah which become mixed must be left to be ruined and then destroyed, and we do not place them up on the Altar. The difference is that limbs of chattas and olah are both fit to be placed on the Altar, if it is done properly. We therefore cannot disregard this status and treat either as just wood to fuel the fire, as R' Eliezer contended. Invalid blood, however, is

# HALACHAH Highlight

*Does a nullified item adopt all the characteristics of the majority?*

אמור רבנן בטעמא ואמור רבנן ברובא ואמור רבנן בחזותא

The rabbis say that sometimes the status is determined by taste, sometimes by majority and sometimes by appearance.

In the Gemara, Rava lays out the most basic principles of *bitul* - nullification. The exact mechanics of how *bitul* works is the subject of debate amongst commentators. Minchas Chinuch<sup>1</sup> addresses the case of a cooked matzah "that cannot be used for the mitzvah of matzah since it does not have the taste of matzah" that becomes intermingled with two regular matzos. He rules that although the cooked matzah becomes nullified in the majority of regular matzahs, nevertheless, if one ate only a single olive's volume of matzah from the three matzos the mitzvah would not be fulfilled. Although the principle of nullification indicates that a "prohibited" item becomes transformed into a permitted item, it cannot infuse matzah taste into cooked matzah that lacks matzah taste. In contrast, if a matzah that was not properly watched (אינו שמור) became intermingled with two regular matzos the matzah that was not watched is nullified in the other two and one who eats an olive's volume from all three matzos will fulfill his obligation since the only impediment was a halachic one and nullification changes the

(Insight...continued from page 1)

not fit for the Altar at all, so when it blends together with valid blood we can treat it as water.

The Mishnah on 77b ruled that we cannot place on the Altar a mixture of limbs of blemished animals, or ones used for sinful acts, together with limbs of kosher offerings, even according to R' Eliezer. This is unacceptable because these are despicable for the Altar. ■

halachic status of the "prohibited" item.

Teshuvos P'nei Mavin<sup>2</sup> disagrees with Minchas Chinuch and maintains that when an item becomes nullified in a majority it takes on all the characteristics of the majority. One proof that he cites is a Mishnah in Parah (9:1) cited in Tosafos<sup>3</sup> on our daf. The Mishnah presents a disagreement regarding what may be done when water falls into a flask of Chatas water. Tosafos asks why the water does not become nullified in the majority and answers that the halacha that the water does not become nullified represents a stringency that applies to Chatas water. This implies that if not for the stringency that is applied to Chatas water the regular water would be nullified and would even take on the characteristics of the Chatas water and the entire mixture could be used as Chatas water. ■

1. מצוה י' אות א'
2. שו"ת פני מבין אר"ח סי' קכ"ד אות א'.
3. תוס' ד"ה תנן התם. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

*The Loss of Days*

"וחכמים אומרים ישפך..."

אדם דואג על איבוד דמיו ולא על איבוד ימיו

"Man worries about lost money - literally 'blood'-but lost time does not bother him."<sup>1</sup> It is strange that so many people are very cavalier about how they use their time since every minute or hour of life is an irretrievable loss. Why be worried about money but not life itself?

Many are unaware that this famous saying is actually a play on words of a midrash regarding Avraham Avinu at the akeidah. There we find that when Avraham tied Yitzchak to the altar he

said, "הנני דואג על איבוד דמיו ולא על - איבוד ימיו I am worried about his lost blood, not his lost days."<sup>2</sup>

When Mahari of Sadigura, zt"l, met the Malbim, zt"l, he asked him to explain the words of this esoteric midrash. The Malbim immediately gave a brilliant explanation, "Clearly Avraham was not worried about Yitzchak's lessened days since he understood at that time that Hashem had commanded him to kill Yitzchak-his shortened life was the will of Hashem. What he worried about was losing the ability to bring up Yitzchak's blood on the altar.

"He could not use the blood since we find in Zevachim 79 that if two sacrifices get mixed together the sages hold that he may not sprinkle the blood for

either sacrifice. Instead, it must all be poured out. Although Yitzchak was brought up as an olah, he was also a bechor. Was it not plausible that his blood could not be offered? This is what Avraham Avinu meant that he was worried about the waste of blood."

After telling of this story, Rav Yitzchak Mordechai Padawa, zt"l, added a disclaimer, "I cannot take responsibility that this story is true, since who can tell, perhaps it is made up. I am recording it nevertheless, since it is a correct explanation..."<sup>3</sup> ■

1. ספר החיים, י' א'; This phrase is often attributed to Ibn Ezra, but its exact origins are in dispute.

2. ילקוט שמעוני, וירא

3. אילנא דחיי, ע' מ"ב ■

