Zevachim 79 – Good Morning Raboisai

Summary of Reb Eli Stefansky's Shiur

1️⃣ Introduction – Three Types of Bitul: Taste, Majority, and Appearance

Today's daf reviews **three different systems of nullification** used throughout Shas:

1. **טעם (Taste)**
    - Standard Bitul: *Batel b'Shishim* – 1/60 cancels flavor.
    - Applies to *min b'she'eino mino* (two different items).
2. **רוב (Majority)**
    - 51% overrides 49%.
    - Applies to *min b'mino* (two identical items).
3. **ראייה (Appearance / Substitution Test)**
    - Used when two things **look identical** (e.g., white wine + water).
    - You *pretend* one of them is a completely different substance and test dilution based on that.

This daf explains **when we use each system** and why sometimes Chazal require one over the other.

2️⃣ Why Not Use "Rayan" (Appearance Test) for Min b'Mino?

Question:
If two things are identical (min b'mino), why rely on *rov*?
Use **Rayan**, which often requires *more* dilution than rov.

Example:
White wine + water in a mikveh.
White wine doesn't change color, so how can you tell if the mikveh water overcame the wine?
→ Pretend it's **red wine**, test how much water is needed to dilute red wine into clear water.
That is Rayan.

But the Gemara concludes:

Whether we use **rov** or **rayan** is a **machlokes Tanaim**.

---

3 Rav Yehuda vs. Rabban Gamliel – Two Systems

The Beraisa shows two methods:

- **Rabban Gamliel** → Rayan (pretend white wine is red)
- **Rabbi Yehuda** → Rov (simple majority)

But this creates a problem:

Across Shas, Rabbi Yehuda holds:
Min b'mino *loi batul*!
You cannot nullify one thing with its identical counterpart.

Why here does he allow rov?

Tosafos explains:
This sugya follows **Rava**, who later clarifies how to reconcile all the cases.

---

4 Rava's Major Principle – Min b'Mino Is *Never* Batel

Rava says:

- **Min b'mino** → *never* batel
- **Min b'she'eino mino** → use *Rayan*
- **Chutz from the case of Mei Chatas (Parah Adumah water)**

Why is Mei Chatas different?
Because of a halachic requirement tied to **tvilas keli containing holy water**.

---

5 The Case – How to Toivel a Kli With Mei Chatas Inside

Scenario:
You have a **kli** with **Mei Chatas** inside (very powerful kedushah).
You need to toivel the **outside** of the vessel, because *tumas mashkin* touched the outside.
But if mikveh water enters and mixes inside →
You ruin the Mei Chatas (since it cannot be batel).

So what do you do?

- If you avoid getting water inside,
  → You might not truly immerse the entire **outside** surface.

- If you immerse fully,
  → Water *will* enter and touch the inside.

Chazal say:

You *must* allow some mikveh water in,
Otherwise we assume you did not immerse the outside properly.

But how much water?

This depends on **Rayan vs. Rov**.

---

6 The Halacha – Only a Slight Amount Is Enough

Rava explains:

Because the concern is **about cheating on the outside**,
NOT about purifying the inside,
the Chachamim only required **a small amount of water** to enter the kli.

Thus:

- It's not about batel
- It's about the **psychology** of making sure the toveler immerses the whole kli completely.

Therefore:

In *this* case only, Rava agrees we use **rov** – not Rayan.

This answers the Tosafos question and aligns all of Rabbi Yehuda's positions.

---

7 Summary of All Three Types of Bitul With Examples

Type	Example	When Used
טעם – Batel b'Shishim	Cooking wheat in rice	When different types mix
רוב – Majority	Two chicken nuggets from two brands	When identical items mix
ראייה – Appearance Test	White wine + water in mikveh	When they look the same and can't be judged by taste

---

8 New Sugya – Mixing Noisar and Pigul

Rish Lakish held:

If one kazayis Pigul and one kazayis Noisar mix,
and you eat them → you get **Malkus**.

Reason:
One issur overpowers the other even though they're both assur.

Rebbi Elazar disagrees:

One issur cannot be mevatel another issur.

But "Issurei Achila" do not cancel each other.

Halacha follows **Rish Lakish**.

---

9 Using "Korech" (Hillel's Sandwich) as a Proof

Hillel would wrap Pesach + Matza + Maror together.

Gemara uses this to show:
Even if Maror is sharp and Matza is mild,
one doesn't nullify the other.

Thus, isur + isur becomes a combined entity.

---

10 Final Mishnah – Mixed Blood in the Beis HaMikdash

Two cases of mixed blood:

Case 1: Kosher Dam + Pasul Dam

If the blood for Zrika mixes with:

- Dam Pigul
- Dam Nosar
- Dam of a disqualified korban

Halacha:

Pour into the drainage ditch (the amah).
May NOT be used for Zrika.

Case 2: Dam HaNefesh + Dam HaTamtzis

Dam HaNefesh = blood that spurts at shechita (valid for Zrika)
Dam HaTamtzis = drainage blood after death (invalid)

Chachamim → Also pour into the amah.

But **Rebbi Eliezer** says:
You MAY still do Zrika with the mixture.

1️⃣1️⃣ Rava's Clarity – Why Are There Two Separate Cases?

Because:

- **Case 1:** Everyone agrees = assur
  → Always pour into the amah
  → Mixture includes Dam that is NEVER valid.
- **Case 2:** Real machlokes
  → Is there enough **Dam HaNefesh** that it should still count?
  → Do we fear future mistakes in the Beis HaMikdash?

Thus the Mishnah repeats:

"שֹׁופְכוֹ לָאֲמָה" twice
Because each line refers to a **different halachic principle**.

✨ Takeaway – Zevachim 79

- Three systems of halachic cancellation: **taste**, **majority**, **appearance**.
- Rabbi Yehuda always holds: **Min b'mino is NOT batel**.
- Rava resolves contradictions:
  → The case of Mei Chatas is unique because the issue is **ensuring proper immersion**, not Bitul.
- Mixed issurim like **Pigul + Noisar** create a combined entity → possible malkus.
- Mixed blood cases split into:
  → **Absolutely invalid mixtures**
  → **Debatable mixtures (Dam Tamtzis)**
- The Mishnah repeats "pour into the drainage" because the two cases have different halachic logic.

לעילוי נשמת אמי מורתי רות בת הרב מנחם מנדל