



# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## Maseches Zevachim, Daf ז – Daf יז

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

-----Daf ז--90-----

OFOS KODMIN...

- **Q:** Menachos should come first, because they can be brought by a tzibbur as well!? **A:** The fact that a bird korban has blood offerings is of more importance.

MINCHAS CHOTEI

- **Q:** A minchas nedavah should come before a sinner's mincha, because it is required to be brought with oil and levonah!? **A:** The fact that a sinner's mincha is brought on account of an aveirah that was done and brings a kapparah, is more important.
- **Q:** Between a sotah's mincha and a minchas nedavah, which would come first? Would it be the nedavah, because it requires oil and levonah, or is it the sotah's, because it comes to determine whether an aveira was done? **A:** The Mishna said that the sinner's mincha comes before the minchas nedavah, because it comes on account of a sin. This suggests that it is only the sinner's mincha that comes before the nedavah, and the sotah's mincha would not come before the nedavah.
  - This is not a good proof. The Mishna does not say that the sinner's mincha comes first because it brings kapparah, it says it is because "it comes on account of an aveirah". The sotah's mincha also "comes on account of an aveirah" and should therefore maybe also come before a nedavah!?
  - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from a Braisa which says that "this mincha comes before that one, because this one is brought from wheat and that one is brought from barley". Presumably the one brought from wheat refers to a nedavah and the one brought from barley refers to the mincha of a sotah! **A:** It may be that the mincha brought from wheat refers to the sinner's mincha.
    - **Q:** If it is referring to the sinner's mincha, why not contrast the two by saying that the sinner's mincha brings kapparah and the sotah's does not?
      - **Q:** It is no better to say that the wheat mincha is a nedavah mincha, because the contrast should have then been that the nedavah requires oil and levonah and the sotah's does not!? Rather, we must say that there are multiple points of contrast and the Braisa only chose one. For that same reason the Braisa may be referring to the sinner's chatas and only chose to give one point of contrast.

CHATAS HA'OF KODEMES...

- This is learned in a Braisa, which says that the pasuk of "v'hikriv es asher lachatas rishona" can't be coming to teach that the chatas bird is brought before an olah bird, because that is learned from the words "v'es hasheini yaaseh olah". Rather, this pasuk teaches regarding all chatas, that they are brought before the olah that is brought along with them. This applies whether they are both birds, whether they are both animals, and even if the chatas is a bird and the olah is an animal.
  - **Q:** There is a Braisa in which **R' Eliezer** says that the olah of a woman who has given birth comes before her chatas and gives a reason why that is so!? **A:** **Rava** said, that is only with regard to why it is written first in the parsha. However, with regard to being offered, the chatas is offered first.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that bulls come before rams, which come before goats. Presumably this is referring to the korbanos of Succos, where the goat is a chatas, and we see that the chatas does not come first!? **A:** It is referring to nedavos of olos. The reason bulls come before rams is because they require more nesachim, and rams come before goats because their tails are offered as well.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that the Kohen Gadol's par (which is a chatas) comes before the par helam davar (which is an olah), which comes before the tzibbur's goat brought for the aveira of avoda zara (which is a chatas). We see that an olah comes before a chatas!?

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** From the fact that the Kohen Gadol's par comes first we also see that a chatas comes before an olah!? **A:** We know that when a chatas and an olah are of the same species the chatas certainly comes first. Our question is when the olah is of a superior species to the chatas. We see from here that the olah comes first and yet the earlier Braisa said that a chatas bird comes before an animal olah!
- **A:** In EY in the name of **Rava bar Mari** they said that the chatas goat for avoda zara is written in the pasuk without the letter "aleph". The pasuk is teaching that this chatas is different than others in the sense that it will come after an olah. **A2: Ravina** said, the pasuk says "kamishpat", which teaches that with these korbanos the order should follow the order written in the pasuk, which is the olah before the chatas.
  - Based on this answer we can even say that the Braisa refers to the korbanos of Succos. The reason why the olah comes before the chatas is because the pasuk says "kimishpatam".
- **Q:** Between a bird chatas, an animal olah, and a korbon maaser, which would come first? We can't just bring the chats first, because the maaser should go before it. We can't just bring the maaser, because the animal olah should come before it. We can't just bring the animal olah, because the bird chatas should come before it!? **A:** In Bavel they said that the maaser comes first, then the bird chatas, then the olah. In EY they said that the bird chatas comes first, then the olah, then the maaser.

### MISHNA

- All chatas of the Torah come before an asham, except for the asham of a metzora, because it comes to make the metzora fit.
- All ashamos of the Torah are brought when the animals are in their second year, and must be worth at least 2 silver shekels, except for the asham of a nazir and of a metzora, which are brought from animals in their first year and need not be worth 2 silver shekels.
- Just as there are orders of precedence among the offering of the korbanos, there is the same precedence when it comes to eating the korbanos.
  - Between a shelamim of yesterday and a shelamim of today, the shelamim of yesterday should be eaten first.
  - Between a shelamim of yesterday and a chatas or asham of today, **R' Meir** says the shelamim comes first, and the **Chachomim** say the chatas comes first, because it is kodshei kodashim.
- With regard to all korbanos, the Kohen may eat the meat in any manner that he wants – he may eat it roasted, overcooked, or cooked, and may put in spices of chullin. **R' Shimon** says, he may also put in spices of terumah. **R' Meir** says, he may not put in terumah, so as not to bring terumah to a situation in which it will become passul.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** Between something that is tadir and something that is more kadosh, which would come first? **A:** The earlier Mishna says that the Tamid comes before the Mussaf, because the Tamid is tadir. This is so even though the mussaf is more kadosh (as we see it is brought on Shabbos).
  - This is not a valid proof. The Tamid of Shabbos also has extra kedusha from the Shabbos, and therefore there is no basis to say that the mussaf is more kadosh.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from the Mishna where it said that the mussaf of Shabbos comes before the mussaf of Rosh Chodesh. This is so even though the mussaf of Rosh Chodesh is invested with the extra kedusha of Rosh Chodesh! **A:** The mussaf of Shabbos is also invested with the extra kedusha of Rosh Chodesh when it falls on Rosh Chodesh, and therefore there is no basis to say that the mussaf of Rosh Chodesh is more kadosh.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from the Mishna where it said that the mussaf of Rosh Chodesh comes before the mussaf of Rosh Hashanah. This is so even though the mussaf of Rosh Hashanah is invested with the extra kedusha of Rosh Hashanah! **A:** The mussaf of Rosh Chodesh is also invested with the extra kedusha

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

of Rosh Hashanah (every Rosh Chodesh Tishrei), and therefore there is no basis to say that the mussaf of Rosh Hashanah is more kadosh.

-----Daf נ"ט--91-----

- The Gemara is trying to answer the question of which takes precedence – something that is tadir or something that is more kadosh.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from a Braisa which says that when reciting kiddush, the bracha on the wine comes before the bracha made for Shabbos, because the bracha on wine is more tadir. Now, this is so even though the bracha of Shabbos is more kadosh, since it is made in honor of Shabbos! **A:** Even the bracha made on wine, when made on Shabbos, has a higher level of kedusha because of the Shabbos. Therefore, they are considered to be on the same level of kedusha and we therefore give precedence to the tadir.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from the ruling of **R' Yochanan** that says that if it is time to daven mincha and a person has not yet davened mussaf, he should first daven mincha and then mussaf, because mincha is more tadir. Now, this is so even though the mussaf is more kadosh, since it is davened in honor of Shabbos! **A:** Even the tefilla of mincha, when davened on Shabbos, has a higher level of kedusha because of the Shabbos. Therefore, they are considered to be on the same level of kedusha and we therefore give precedence to the tadir.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from our Mishna. The Mishna said, between a shelamim of yesterday and a chatas or asham of today, the shelamim of yesterday comes first. This implies that if the shelamim was also of today, the chatas or asham would come first. This is so even though a shelamim is more tadir (there are more shelamim offered than chataos or ashamos)! We see that kedusha is more important than tadir! **A: Rava** said, this is not what we mean by tadir. When we discuss tadir we are referring to something that is obligated to be brought with more frequency than something else. A shelamim is brought more often, but not as an obligation. This would be referred to as “matzuy”. With regard to matzuy we know that kedusha would come first. Our question is regarding something that is tadir.
    - **Q: R' Huna bar Yehuda** asked **Rava**, a Braisa refers to milah as tadir, even though it is not something that is done at regular intervals, and is just more commonly done!? We see that even this is considered to be tadir and not matzuy!? **A:** The Braisa refers to milah as tadir because we are commanded regarding it so many times. We can also answer that when milah is compared to Korbon Pesach (which is the subject of the Braisa) it is considered to be tadir.
- **Q:** What would be if we have something that is tadir and something that is not, and the thing that is not tadir was shechted first? Would we say that since it was already shechted we should offer it first, or do we say that we give the blood to someone to stir it, go ahead and shecht and offer the tadir, and then come back and offer the one that is not tadir? **A: R' Huna of Sura** said, our Mishna says, if there is a shelamim of yesterday and a chatas or asham of today, the shelamim of yesterday comes first. Presumably, the case is where the shelamim was shechted first (although we should have shechted the chatas or asham first), and because it waited since yesterday to be shechted, once it was, we go ahead and offer it before we even shecht the chatas or asham. Now, in a similar case, but where the shelamim was of today – which would be where the shelamim was shechted first even though it should not have been done – the Mishna implies that we would offer the chatas or asham first. We see that we would allow the blood of the less kadosh shelamim to be stirred while we shecht and offer the chatas or asham!
  - The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. The Mishna may be referring to a case where the shelamim was shechted first, but the chatas or asham was then shechted as well. We now have the blood of each in front of us. It is in that case that we say that if the shelamim was from yesterday we would offer it first, which would imply that if the shelamim was from today we would not offer it first. However, in a case where the shelamim was shechted but the chatas or asham was still alive, we still have the question whether we would offer the shelamim blood or would wait, shecht the chatas or asham, offer the chatas or asham, and then come back and offer the shelamim.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Maybe we can answer from a Braisa which says that when reciting kiddush, the bracha on the wine comes before the bracha made for Shabbos, because the bracha on wine is more tadir. Now, the bracha for the Shabbos is obligated to be made before the wine is even brought to the table. This is similar to a case in which a less tadir was shechted before a tadir, and yet the Braisa says that we give precedence to the more tadir! **A:** This is different. Since the wine is there when he is ready to make the bracha on the Shabbos, it is considered to be a case of where both are already “shechted”.
- **Q:** Maybe we can answer from the ruling of **R’ Yochanan** that says that if it is time to daven mincha and a person has not yet davened mussaf, he should first daven mincha and then mussaf, because mincha is more tadir. This is so even though the time for davening mussaf arrived first. Yet, we say that the tadir comes and takes precedence! **A:** Here too, once the time for mincha has arrived it is considered to be a case of where both are already “shechted”..
- **Q:** **R’ Acha the son of R’ Ashi** said to **Ravina**, maybe we can answer from a Mishna which says that if the Pesach was shechted before the afternoon Tamid, it is valid, but the blood of the Pesach should be stirred until the Tamid is shechted and offered, and then the blood of the Pesach is offered. This seems to answer our question! **A:** The case of the Mishna may be where he went ahead and shechted the Tamid, and therefore has the blood of the Pesach and of the Tamid waiting to be offered. It is only in that case where the blood of the Pesach would wait until the blood of the Tamid was offered. In fact, **R’ Acha Sabba** showed how the words of the Mishna suggest that that is the case that the Mishna is talking about.

### UVIKULAN KOHANIM RASHA’IN...

- This is based on the pasuk of “l’mashcha”, which teaches that the Kohanim are given the meat for greatness, to be eaten like kings eat their meat (in the tastiest of ways).

### MISHNA

- **R’ Shimon** said, if you see oil being given out to the Kohanim in the Azarah, you don’t have to ask what this oil is – it must either be the leftover of the “rekikei menachos” of Yisraelim or the leftover of the log of oil of a metzora. If you see oil being put onto the fire of the Mizbe’ach, you don’t have to ask what this oil is – it must be the leftover of the “rekikei menachos” of Kohanim, or the leftover of the mincha of the Kohen Gadol. It cannot be a nedavah of oil, because one may not give a nedavah of oil as a korbon. **R’ Tarfon** says, one may donate oil as a korbon.

### GEMARA

- **Shmuel** said, according to **R’ Tarfon**, when someone makes a nedavah of oil as a korbon the Kohen takes a kometz for the Mizbe’ach, and the rest is eaten. This is based on the pasuk of “korbon mincha” (the word “korbon” is extra) which teaches that one may give a nedavah of oil as a korbon, and that it is treated like a mincha – a kometz is removed for the Mizbe’ach and the remainder is eaten by the Kohanim.
  - **R’ Zeira** said, we can prove this from our Mishna as well. The Mishna said that **R’ Shimon** said that if you see oil being given out to the Kohanim in the Azarah, you don’t have to ask what this oil is – it must either be the leftover of the “rekikei menachos” of Yisraelim or the leftover of the log of oil of a metzora....and you don’t have to think that it may be a nedavah, because one may not give oil as a nedavah for a korbon. Now, this suggests that according to the view that one may give a nedavah of oil, it would be given out to the Kohanim. **Abaye** said to **R’ Zeira**, the next part of the Mishna said, if you see oil being put onto the fire of the Mizbe’ach, you don’t have to ask what this oil is – it must be the leftover of the “rekikei menachos” of Kohanim, or the leftover of the mincha of the Kohen Gadol. It cannot be a nedavah of oil, because one may not give a nedavah of oil as a korbon. This suggests that according to the view that one may give a nedavah of oil, the offering would be put onto the fire in its entirety!
    - **Q:** The first part of the Mishna is difficult according to **Abaye** and the next part is difficult according to **R’ Zeira**!? **A:** According to **R’ Zeira** we can say that the first part of the Mishna deals with the leftover oil and the second part deals with the kometz. According to **Abaye** we will say that in truth there is no argument regarding the first part of the Mishna. Even if oil may be given

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

as a nedavah, it is not given out to the Kohanim. It is only in the second case that there is an argument. The only reason the Mishna taught the first case is because it wanted to teach the second case, and therefore taught the complementary case of the first case.

- **Q:** There are times that we say that a later part is taught on account of an earlier part that was taught. How can we say that an earlier part was taught on account of a later part? **A:** We can. In fact, in EY they would say that this is sometimes done.
- **Q:** A Braisa says, according to **R' Akiva** who says that one may make a nedavah of wine as a korbon, the wine is poured into the bowls (where nesachim are typically poured). According to **R' Tarfon** who says that one may make a nedavah of oil, the oil is poured onto the fire of the Mizbe'ach. Now, presumably just as the wine is poured into the bowls in its entirety, the Braisa is teaching that the oil is put onto the fire in its entirety as well. This refutes **Shmuel**!? **A:** It may be that the wine is poured in its entirety and the oil is not. We don't have to say that they are done the same way.
- The ruling of **Shmuel** is subject to a machlokes Tanna'im. A Mishna says, if one donates oil as an offering he must donate at least one log. **Rebbi** says it must be at least 3 log. The **Rabanan** said to **R' Pappa** that this machlokes is based on whether when we learn through a hekesh do we learn just one point from the item it is compared to, or do we learn everything from that item. The **Rabanan** (the **T"K**) hold that we learn everything. Therefore, since we learn that one may donate oil from the pasuk of mincha, we learn that just as a mincha must have one log of oil, a donated oil offering must also have one log. Presumably they would then also learn that just as a mincha has a kometz removed for the Mizbe'ach and the remainder is given to the Kohanim, the same would be for the oil offering. **Rebbi** holds that we only learn one point from mincha – that oil can be donated as an offering. However, with regard to the amount we say that the oil must be like all other wine nesachim (since they are both liquids) – 3 lugin, and further, just as wine nesachim are poured in their entirety into the bowls, so too the oil would be poured in its entirety onto the fire. **R' Pappa** said to **Abaye**, that is not the basis of the machlokes. All agree that we learn out everything from the thing it is compared to. The machlokes is based on from where we learn that a person may donate an oil offering – the **Rabanan** learn it from a mincha, and **Rebbi** learns it from the word "ezrach" written regarding wine nesachim.
  - **R' Huna the son of R' Nosson** asked **R' Pappa**, how can you say that **Rebbi** learns this from "ezrach"? A Braisa says, the pasuk says "korbon mincha", which teaches that one may donate oil as a korbon, and if done must be at least 3 lugin. Now, it is **Rebbi** who says it must be 3 lugin, and we see that he learns it from mincha!? **R' Pappa** said, if we have this Braisa then I take back what I said.
- **Shmuel** said, if someone donates wine as an offering, he brings it and the Kohen sprinkles it onto the fire of the Mizbe'ach. This is based on the pasuk "v'yayin takriv...ishei rei'ach nicho'ach LaHashem".
  - **Q:** That will extinguish the fire, which is assur to do!? **A:** A partial extinguishing is not assur.
    - **Q: R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** said, that if a person takes a coal off the Mizbe'ach and extinguishes it he is chayuv. We see that even partial is assur!? **A:** That is talking about when that is the only coal on the Mizbe'ach. **A2:** When extinguishing is done in the performance of a mitzvah (e.g. sprinkling the wine) it is not assur.
      - **Q: R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** taught in a Braisa that the Kohen may not extinguish the coals in the performance of doing the terumas hadeshen!? **A:** He is able to do it without extinguishing the fire, by waiting for it to go out on its own. Therefore it is assur to do it.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that according to **R' Akiva** who says that one may make a nedavah of wine as a korbon, the wine is poured into the bowls (not onto the fire like **Shmuel** said)!? Also, another Braisa says that the wine of nesachim must be poured into the bowls and not onto the fire so as not to extinguish the fire!? **A:** The view that it is poured into the bows follows **R' Yehuda** (who says that one may not do something that will be assur, even if he is doing it unintentionally), whereas **Shmuel** follows the view of **R' Shimon** (who says that if it is done unintentionally it is mutar).
    - **Q:** Can we say that **Shmuel** agrees with **R' Shimon**? We see that **Shmuel** does not agree with **R' Shimon**, in a case where there is burning wood in the reshus harabim, **Shmuel** says one may not

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

put out the flame, although there is a sakana and it is a “melacha she’eina tzricha l’gufa”, because he would thereby be oiver an issur De’Oraisa?! **A:** He agrees with **R’ Shimon** that a “davar she’eino meskaven” is mutar. He disagrees with **R’ Shimon** with regard to a “melacha she’eina tzricha l’gufa”.

- **R’ Huna** said, if nesachim became tamei, we make a separate fire for them in the Azarah and burn them there (rather than take them out of the Azarah to be burned). This is based on the pasuk of “bakodesh...ba’aish tisaref”.
  - A Braisa says this as well, and **Shmuel** held like this as well.

### HADRAN ALACH PEREK KOL HATADIR

-----Daf צב---92-----

### PEREK DAM CHATAS -- PEREK ACHAD ASSAR

#### MISHNA

- If chatas blood splattered onto a garment, it must be washed. Even though the pasuk is written regarding the chataos that are eaten, as the pasuk says “b’makom kadosh tei’acheil”, the same halacha would apply to chataos offered on the inside Mizbe’ach, which are not eaten. This is taught by the pasuk of “Torah achas”, which teaches that there is one rule for all chataos.
- If blood of a passul chatas splattered onto a garment, it would not need to be washed. This is true whether the chatas had a period of validity or not.
  - What is an example of something that had a period of validity? It would be a korbon that became passul through linah, or that became tamei, or that went out of the Azarah. What is an example of something that did not have a period of validity? It would be a korbon that was shechted with intent for it to be consumed beyond its allowable time or place, or where a passul person did the kabbalah.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** If “Torah achas” teaches that all chataos have the same rule, we should say that this rule even applies to a bird chatas as well!? However a Braisa says that the word “zos” teaches that this rule does not apply to a bird chatas!? **A: Reish Lakish in the name of Bar Kappara** said, the pasuk says “tishacheit”, which teaches that the pasuk is referring to korbanos that are shechted, which excludes birds.
  - **Q:** We should similarly say that “b’makom kadosh tei’acheil” teaches that this only applies to chataos that are eaten!? **A:** The pasuk says “Toras”, to include even the inside chataos.
    - **Q:** If so, it should include chatas birds as well!? **A:** We have the exclusionary word “zos”. Since we have to include one group and exclude one group, it makes sense to include the inside chataos, because they are also animals, are shechted in the north of the Azarah, have kabbalah in a keili, have their blood applied to the horn on the corner, with the Kohen’s finger, on the actual point of the corner, and they have parts that are burned on the Mizbe’ach.
      - **Q:** Maybe we should rather include bird chataos, because they are offered outside the Heichal and are eaten like a regular chatas!? **A:** The inside chataos are similar to the regular chataos in many more ways.
      - **R’ Yosef** said, the pasuk says “yochlena” (he shall eat *it*), which is exclusionary and teaches that this rule only applies to this type of eaten chatas, not any other type.
        - **Q:** Based on this, why do we need the exclusion of “zos”? **A:** Without “zos” we would think that “yochlena” is not exclusionary, but is simply the style of writing of the pasuk.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Rabbah** said, the pasuk says “asher yizeh”, which we darshen to teach that the pasuk is referring to chataos whose blood is *sprinkled* – which therefore includes an inner chatas, but not a bird chatas.
  - **Q:** The Mishna said that the pasuk is only speaking of chataos which are eaten, so how can **Rabbah** say it even speaks of the inside chataos!? **A:** The Mishna means that with regard to the halachos of “merika and shtifa” (purging and rinsing) the pasuk only refers to chataos which are eaten. However, with regard to washing, the words “asher yizeh” refer to all chataos whose blood are sprinkled – which therefore refers to the inside chatas and the outside chatas.
    - **Q:** If so, the main teaching is regarding the inner chataos, and the Mishna should therefore say that this rule applies to “inside chataos and chataos that are eaten” instead of saying that this rule applied to “chataos that are eaten and inside chataos”!? **A:** Read the Mishna to say that.
    - **Q:** The blood of the bird chatas is also sprinkled and should therefore be included in this rule!? **A:** The pasuk of “zos” excludes it.
    - **Q:** The word “zos” should exclude the outside chatas as well!? **A:** The word “Toras” includes them. Since we have to include one group and exclude one group, it makes sense to include the outside chataos, because they are also animals, are shechted in the north of the Azarah, have kabbalah in a keili, have their blood applied to the horn on the corner, with the Kohen’s finger, on the actual point of the corner, and they have parts that are burned on the Mizbe’ach.
      - **Q:** Maybe we should rather include bird chataos, because their blood is sprinkled!? **A:** The outside chataos are similar to the inside chataos in many more ways.
- **Q: R’ Avin** asked, what is the halacha regarding a bird chatas whose blood was brought into the Heichal while it was still on its neck (not having been put into a kli shareis)? Do we say that its neck is like a kli shareis and it therefore becomes passul when it enters the Heichal, or do we say that its neck is like the neck of an animal chatas, and we learn from “midamah” that if the blood of an animal chatas entered the Heichal while still on the animal’s neck it would not become passul? **A:** A Braisa says, that if after the melika the spasms of the bird made it enter the Heichal and then go back into the Azarah, it remains valid. This suggests that if it didn’t enter on its own, but was rather brought in by a Kohen it would become passul, even though the blood is still on its neck.
  - The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. The Braisa also discusses kodshei kodashim that left the north part of the Azarah after the shechita due to its spasms and says that it would be valid. Now, in that case it is clear that it would be valid even if the Kohen brought it there. The reason it speaks in terms of spasms is for a different case of the Braisa – where kodshei kalim left the Azarah due to a spasm. In that case if the Kohen took it out it would become passul. Similarly regarding the bird, it may be that even if the Kohen took it there it would be valid.
- **Q: R’ Avin** asked, what is the halacha if the blood of the bird chatas spilled from the neck onto the Azarah floor and was then gathered into a kli shareis? Do we say that normally the blood is not put into a kli shareis because it is not required, but it may be done, and therefore this would be valid, or do we say that this blood becomes passul if put into a kli shareis, and therefore in this case it would be passul? **A: Rava** said, the Braisa quoted earlier said that “zos” excludes the requirement to wash the blood of a bird chatas from a garment. Now, if the blood becomes passul in a kli shareis, it should become passul as soon as it enters the airspace of the garment (which is a keili), and if it becomes passul we have learned that there is no requirement of washing. If so, why is the word “zos” needed to exclude? It must be that it does not become passul in a keili.
  - **R’ Huna the son of R’ Yehoshua** said, this is not a valid proof. The word “zos” would still be needed for a case where the garment touched the blood while still on the neck. In that case the blood never became passul. That is when the exclusionary “zos” would be needed.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: Levi** asked **Rebbi**, what if the blood of an animal chatas splattered onto a garment, and then went from that garment onto a second garment, would that second garment be required to be washed? Do we say that when the blood enters the first garment it becomes passul for zrika and therefore will not make the second garment be subject to washing, or do we say that even in the garment it remains valid for zrika (if it is squeezed out) and therefore would require that the second garment be washed as well? **A: Rebbi** said, this is a good question. The answer is, that in any case the second garment would require a washing. If the blood in the first garment is still valid for zrika, the second garment must be washed because the blood is still valid. Even if it becomes passul in the first garment, I hold like **R' Akiva** who says that if the blood had a period of validity and then became passul, a garment on which such blood splattered would require a washing.

### -----Daf ל"ט-----93-----

- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked **R' Chisda**, what is the halacha if blood from the korbon splattered onto a tamei garment? Would it have to be washed? [**R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** explained, it must be that he holds that when we say that blood that had a period of validity and is now passul, such blood would not need to be washed from a garment, that is only when it first became passul and then splattered onto the garment. However, in this case it touched the garment and becomes tamei at the same time, and therefore maybe it is different]. **A: R' Chisda** said, this is actually a matter of machlokes in a Braisa between **R' Elazar and the Rabanan** according to the view of **Rabbah** as explained by **Abaye**. The Braisa says, **R' Elazar** says that chatas water (parah adumah water) that became tamei can still make a person tahor, since we find that the chatas water can be sprinkled onto a niddah to make her tahor (even though she makes the water tamei). **Rabbah** said, **R' Elazar** is following the view of his rebbi **R' Akiva** who says that when chatas water passes over a place that is tamei, it becomes tamei just as if it came to rest on that place (therefore in **R' Elazar's** case the water became tamei before it landed on the niddah, and it is therefore a valid proof that waters that were tamei before they touched the person can still make the person tahor). **Abaye** asked that a Braisa says that **R' Akiva** agrees that if chatas water is sprinkled over a tamei keili or similar item, that the water remains tahor!? Rather, **Abaye** said that even **R' Akiva** agrees that when chatas water passes through an airspace of something that is tamei it does not become tamei as if it landed there. Rather, **R' Akiva** in the Braisa holds that when the water is *passed* over the tamei keili we are goizer that it is tamei. However, in a case where it is *sprinkled* over a tamei object, we are not goizer. Based on this understanding of **R' Akiva**, **Abaye** said that the machlokes between **R' Elazar and the Rabanan** is whether we can learn the case of chatas water that became tamei before it was sprinkled from a case of chatas water that became tamei at the time that the sprinkling is effective (when it touches the niddah). **R' Elazar** says we could learn the former from the latter and the **Rabanan** say that we cannot. **R' Chisda** is saying that according to **R' Elazar** we would say that the blood that splattered onto a tamei garment would not need to be washed out (it is no different than if the blood was already tamei and was then sprinkled onto the garment).
  - **Rava** said, we can say that even **R' Elazar** holds that we cannot compare the cases of where it becomes tamei as it becomes effective from a case of where it was previously tamei. Rather, the machlokes is that **R' Elazar** holds that there is a minimum required amount of chatas water needed to be effective, and that minimum amount may be reached from multiple sprinklings. Therefore, when less than that amount is sprinkled onto a niddah it becomes tamei before it is effective (it is not effective until completion of the minimum required amount). Since this is effective for the niddah, it proves that tamei chatas water is effective. The **Rabanan** say there is no minimum required amount, and therefore we only see a case of where it becomes tamei at the same time it becomes effective, and there is nothing that can be taught from there to a case of where it was previously tamei.

#### CHATAS PESULAH...

- A Braisa says, the pasuk of “midamah” teaches that the garment only requires washing if the blood was valid, not if it was passul. **R' Akiva** says, if it had a period of validity and then became passul it would still require washing, but if not, it would not. **R' Shimon** says, in either case it would not require washing.
  - **R' Shimon's** view is based on the two exclusionary words of “osah” and “midamah”. One can be used to teach that there is no requirement of washing even if it had a period of validity.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Akiva** uses the word “osah” to exclude terumah from the requirement of purging and rinsing, mentioned in the preceding pasuk. **R' Shimon** doesn't need the pasuk to teach this, because he says that even kodashim kalim don't need purging and rinsing, so certainly terumah would not need it.

### MISHNA

- If blood splattered directly from the neck onto the garment, it does not require washing. If it splattered from the horn on the corner or from the base, it does not require washing. If it splattered from blood that had spilled onto the floor and was then gathered up, it also does not require washing. The blood that would require washing is blood that had a kabbalah into a kli shareis and is fit for zrika.

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, we would think that even if it splattered onto a garment directly from the neck it should require washing. The pasuk therefore says “asher yizeh”, which teaches that it must be blood that is fit to be used for zrika.
- Another Braisa says, we would think that even if it splattered onto a garment directly from the horn on the corner of the Mizbe'ach or from the base, it should require washing. The pasuk therefore says “asher yizeh”, which teaches that it must be blood that was not already used for the zrika.

### NISHPACH AHL HARITZPAH...

- **Q:** Why is this general rule needed to be taught as well? **A:** It is giving the reason why if it had spilled and was gathered up that it does not require washing. The reason is, that the only blood that requires washing is blood that had kabbalah in a kli shareis and is fit for zrika.

### RA'UY L'HAZA'AH

- This comes to exclude a case where blood that is less than the amount needed for zrika was put into one keili and a similar amount of blood was put into another keili. If these are later combined into one keili it would not require washing, because this blood is not valid.
  - We see this in a Braisa regarding chatas waters, in which **R' Chalafta bar Shaul** said, if the Kohen was mekadash less than the amount needed in one keili and a similar amount in another keili, they do not become kadosh. They then asked, does this concept apply to blood of a korbon as well? Do we say that regarding chatas water it is a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai and we therefore can't learn from it to the case of blood, or do we say that we learn it there from the pasuk of “v'taval bamayim”, and since by blood it says “v'taval...badam” we learn the same concept for blood as well? They answered, that **R' Zrika in the name of R' Elazar** said that even in the case of blood it would not become kadosh.
    - **Rava** brings a Braisa which explicitly says this as well, that the entire required amount of blood must be received into one keili.
      - This Braisa also says that the pasuk of “min hadam” teaches that the blood applications on the inside Mizbe'ach must be done with the blood that is discussed in that parsha. **Rava** explains, this comes to exclude the using of leftover blood on the Kohen's finger that was there from the previous application. This supports **R' Elazar**, who says that the blood from one sprinkling that is left on the finger of the Kohen cannot be used for the next sprinkling (rather, he must again dip his finger into the blood for each sprinkling).
        - **Q: Ravin bar R' Ada** said to **Rava**, your talmid said in the name of **R' Amram** that a Braisa says that if the blood from the Kohen's finger went onto a garment the halacha is as follows: if he had not yet sprinkled it, the garment requires washing. If he had, it does not require washing. Presumably, this means that if he had not yet finished all the required sprinklings (all 7) it would require washing. This shows that the blood left on the finger is valid for all of the sprinklings! **A:** The Braisa means that if a sprinkling was not yet done after he dipped his finger into the blood, the garment requires washing. However, if he did one sprinkling since the dipping it would not require washing even if he still

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

has to do more sprinklings. This is because each sprinkling requires him to again dip his finger into the blood in the keili.

- **Q: Abaye** asked, a Mishna says that after the Kohen finishes sprinkling the blood of the parah adumah he wipes off the blood from his hand onto the body of the cow. This suggests that this is only done after all of the sprinklings, not after each of the sprinklings, which shows that the blood left after one sprinkling may be used for the next!? **A: Rava** answered, the Mishna means that after all the sprinklings he wipes his *hand*, but in between each sprinkling he only wipes his *finger*, not his entire hand.
  - **Q:** If, between sprinklings, he wipes his finger on the cow, his finger will be dirty and not fit for doing the Avodah!? **A: Abaye** said, he wipes it on the edge of the bowl.

### MISHNA

- If the blood splattered onto the skins of an animal, the halacha is as follows: **R' Yehuda** says, if it was not yet skinned from the animal it would not be required to be washed, but if it was already skinned from the animal it would be required to be washed. **R' Elazar** says, even if it was skinned from the animal it would not be required to be washed.
- The only thing that must be washed is the place where the blood is (not the entire garment), and only something that can become tamei, and only something that can be washed. A cloth garment, sackcloth, and animal skins all require a washing. The washing must be done inside the Azarah. The breaking of an earthenware keili in which a korbon was cooked must also be broken in the Azarah. The purging and rinsing of a copper keili in which a korbon was cooked must also be done in the Azarah.
- This requirement that the blood of a chatas must be washed from a garment is a chumra that chatas has over other kodshei kodashim.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that the washing requirement applies to materials other than cloth garments? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk says “begeg”. We would think to limit this requirement to a cloth garment. The pasuk therefore says “asher yizeh aleha tichabeis”, which teaches to include animal skins after they have been skinned from the animal. We would think to even include skins that were not yet skinned from the animal. The pasuk therefore says “begeg”, which teaches that only something that *is fit* to become tamei is included in this requirement. This is the view of **R' Yehuda**. **R' Elazar** says, “begeg” would seem to limit it to cloth garments. The pasuk of “asher aleha...tichabeis” teaches to include even other materials. We would think to include skins after they have been skinned from the animal. The pasuk therefore says “begeg”, which teaches that only something that *can become* tamei is included in this requirement.
  - **Q:** What is the point of difference between them? **Abaye** said, the machlokes would be regarding a cloth that is less than 3x3 etzba'os. According to **R' Yehuda**, since this is *fit* to become tamei (if he intends to use it in a garment) this would be included. According to **R' Elazar** it would not be included, because right now it cannot become tamei. **Rava** said, the difference would be regarding a full sized garment that one intends to embroider (so it is not yet a completed garment). According to **R' Yehuda**, since this is *fit* to become tamei (if he decides not to embroider) this would be included. According to **R' Elazar** it would not be included, because right now it cannot become tamei. **Some** say that **Rava** said the difference would be regarding a cloth that was used for sitting on, which one decided to trim (it can be used for this purpose even without trimming it). According to **R' Yehuda**, since this is *fit* to become tamei (if he decides not to trim) this would be included. According to **R' Elazar** it would not be included, because right now it cannot become tamei.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### EIN TA'UN KIBUS...

- A Braisa says, we would think that if blood splatters on only a part of the garment we would be required to wash the entire garment. The pasuk therefore says “asher yazeh”, which teaches that only the place with the blood on it must be washed.

### DAVAR SHEHU RA'UY L'KABEL TUMAH...

- This part of the Mishna is an anonymous statement that follows the view of **R' Yehuda**.

### RA'UY L'KIBUS

- This comes to exclude a keili, which is cleaned by scraping, not washing.

### ECHAD HABEGED V'ECHAD HASAK...

- **Q:** The Mishna says that leather is considered to be something that can be washed. However, a Mishna says, that if a leather pillow becomes dirty on Shabbos one may pour water on it to clean it, although this would not be allowed for a pillow made of material. If this is allowed on Shabbos it means that leather is not something that is considered to be washed with water!? **A: Abaye** said, that Mishna is the view of the **Rabanan** and our Mishna is the view of the **Others** in a Braisa. The Braisa says, if blood splatters on a garment or sackcloth, it must be washed. If it splatters onto a keili or leather, it must be scraped. **Others** say, if it splatters onto a garment, sackcloth, or leather it must be washed, and if it was on a keili it must be scraped.
  - **Q: R' Chiya bar Ashi** said, that many times he would pour water onto **Rav's** shoes on Shabbos to clean them. Whose view did that follow? **A:** It followed the view of the **Rabanan**.
  - **Q: Rava** asked, how can there be a view that leather is not something that can be washed with water, when the pasuk regarding tzaraas lists leather as one of the items that can be washed!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, this pasuk and our Mishna are discussing soft leather. The machlokes in the Braisa is regarding a hard leather.
    - **Q: R' Chiya bar Ashi** said. that many times he would pour water onto **Rav's** shoes on Shabbos to clean them. If all agree that soft leather can be washed, this should not have been permitted on Shabbos!? **A:** These shoes were made of hard leather and he was following the view of the **Rabanan**.
    - **Rava** then said, what I said is incorrect. The pasuk regarding tzaraas seems to be referring to all leather – hard or soft, and yet it says that it can be washed with water. Rather, **Rava** said, tzaraas on a piece of leather weakens it, and makes it soft. The thing that I find difficult is the Mishna that allows pouring water on the leather pillows. Pillows are made of soft leather, and yet the Mishna allows pouring water on it on Shabbos!? Rather, **Rava** said, pouring water without scrubbing the material is not called washing. That is why the Mishna allows pouring the water. When **R' Chiya bar Ashi** said that many times he would pour water onto **Rav's** shoes on Shabbos to clean them, which suggests that he would only pour water on them, but would not rub them, it can either be talking about soft leather and follows all views, or can be talking about hard leather and would follow the view of the **Others**.
      - **Q:** If washing is only accomplished with scrubbing, why does the Mishna in Shabbos not allow water to be poured onto material pillows? **A:** Leather needs to have water and to be scrubbed in order to be washed. Other materials are washed by having water on them, even if they are not scrubbed.
    - **Rava** darshened that it is mutar to wash (which seems to allow scrubbing as well) shoes on Shabbos. **R' Pappa** said to him, **R' Chiya bar Ashi** said that many times he would pour water onto **Rav's** shoes on Shabbos to clean them, which suggests it is mutar to pour water onto them, but not to scrub them!? **Rava** then publicly retracted his ruling and said that it is mutar to pour water onto shoes, but not to scrub them.

### HAKIBUS B'MAKOM KADOSH...

- A Braisa says, the requirement for the garment to be cleaned in the Azarah is learned from the pasuk of “tichabeis b'makom kadosh”. The requirement that the earthenware keili must be broken in the Azarah is learned from the pasuk “ukli cheres asher tevushal bo yishaver”, which follows the last pasuk. This pasuk then

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

continues and says “v’ihm bikli nechoshes bushala umorak v’shutaf bamayim”, which teaches that the purging and rinsing of a metal keili must also be done in the Azarah.

ZEH CHOMER B’CHATAS...

- **Q:** There are other chumros that a chatas has, for example that its blood can sometimes be brought into the Heichal!? **A:** The Mishna is referring to outside chatas.
  - **Q:** There is the chumra that if the blood of such a chatas is brought into the Heichal it becomes passul!? **A:** The Mishna is following **R’ Akiva**, who says that this halacha applies to all korbanos.
  - **Q:** There is the chumra that they bring kappara for aveiros that carry the kares penalty!? **A:** The Mishna is referring to a chatas brought for “shmiyas kol”, which is not an aveira that carries kares.
  - **Q:** There is the chumra that it is required to be applied with 4 applications!? **A:** The Mishna follows **R’ Yishmael**, who says that all korbanos are required to be applied with 4 applications.
  - **Q:** There is the chumra that it is required to be applied to all 4 corners!? **A:** There are also more chumros – that it must be placed on the horn, with the finger, and on the edge of the corner. The Mishna mentions one of many chumros.

MISHNA

- If a garment that got chatas blood on it was taken out of the Azarah, it must be brought back into the Azarah to be washed there. If it became tamei outside the Azarah, it is ripped so that it loses the tumah, and is then brought back in and washed.
- If an earthenware keili in which a chatas was cooked was taken out of the Azarah, it must be brought back into the Azarah to be broken there. If it became tamei outside the Azarah, we make a hole in it so that it loses the tumah, and is then brought back in and broken.
- If a copper keili in which a chatas was cooked was taken out of the Azarah, it must be brought back into the Azarah to be purged and rinsed there. If it became tamei outside the Azarah, we make a large opening in it so that it loses the tumah, and is then brought back in and purged and rinsed.

GEMARA

- **Q: Ravina** asked, how can we rip the garment and then bring it back in to be washed? The pasuk says that we must wash the “begeg”, and when it is ripped it is not classified as a “begeg”!? **A:** He rips most of it, but leaves over the size of a kerchief which he does not rip. In that way it loses its tumah, but is still classified as a beged.
  - **Q: R’ Huna** has said that when a garment is ripped, but a piece the size of a kerchief is not ripped, it remains tamei!? **A:** It only remains tamei D’Rabanan. However, D’Oraisa it loses its tumah.

-----Daf 75-----95-----

KLI CHERES SHEYATZA...

- **Q:** How can we make a hole in it and then bring it back in to break in the Azarah? The Torah says that the “kli” must be broken, and once there is a hole it is no longer classified as a keili!? **A:** We make a hole the size of a small root. A hole this size removes the tumah, but still leaves it classified as a keili.

KLI NECHOSHES...

- **Q:** If he makes this large opening it is no longer a keili!? **A:** Before purging and rinsing they hammer it closed. Therefore, it regains its classification as a keili.
- **Reish Lakish** said, if the “me’il” of the Kohen Gadol got chatas blood on it and then became tamei, we must bring in the parts with the blood, less than 3x3 etzba’os at a time. We cannot rip it (as was suggested for other garments) because the pasuk regarding the me’il says “lo yikareya”.
  - **Q: R’ Ada bar Ahava** asked, a Mishna says that very thick cloths and very soft cloths do not become tamei at the size of 3x3 etzba’os. Rather, they only become tamei at the size of 3x3 tefachim. Now, the me’il was very thick. If so, we should be able to bring in up to 3x3 tefachim at a time!? **A:** This is true for thick pieces of material that are not part of a completed garment. However, when it is part of a garment, the applicable size is 3x3 etzba’os.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The washing that is done to the garments requires using 7 different cleaning agents, one of which is urine. A Braisa says that we may not bring urine into the Azarah. How do we do the required washing!? It can't be that all 7 agents are mixed together and as a mixture it may then be brought in, because a Mishna says that the 7 must be applied separately, and in a particular order!? It can't be that the urine is mixed with only one of the other 7 (and since it is not all 7 together it would work), because the Mishna says he must scrub with each of these agents 3 times, which suggests that each must be done separately!? **A:** We mix the urine with tasteless saliva. In fact, we find that **Reish Lakish** says that each of the cleaning agents must be mixed with tasteless saliva.

### MISHNA

- Whether one cooked a korbbon in a keili or whether he poured hot liquid from it into the keili, whether it was a korbbon of kodshei kodashim or of kodshei kalim, the keili would require purging and rinsing (if it was a metal keili, and would be required to be broken if it was an earthenware keili). **R' Shimon** says, keilim in which were cooked kodashim kalim are not required to be purged and rinsed.

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “asher tevushal bo”. This only teaches that an earthenware keili in which the chatas was *cooked* must be broken. How do we know that if hot liquids of the chatas were poured into it, it must also be broken? The extra word of “bo” teaches to darshen “bo tishaver” – if it is in it, it shall be broken. This includes the case where the hot liquids were poured into it.
- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked, if the chatas was roasted in the airspace of an earthenware oven, is it required to be broken? Does the Torah require breaking for the cooking *and* absorption (and when it hangs in the airspace there is no absorption, because there is no direct contact) or is it required to be broken simply for the korbbon being cooked in it? **A: Rava** said, our Mishna says it must be broken even if it was poured into the keili, in which case there is absorption but no cooking in the keili. We see that one of the two is enough to require breaking of the keili.
  - This is not a valid proof. We never asked about absorption without cooking, because we know that breaking is required in that case. The question is when there is cooking without absorption.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from a statement of **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha**, who said that the oven in the Beis Hamikdash was made of metal. Now, if cooking without absorption does not need to be broken, why didn't they use an earthenware oven there? It must be that cooking alone would require it to be broken! **A:** It may be that metal was used because the leftover menachos were baked there, and from those there was absorption as well as cooking. However, for the meat it may be that an earthenware oven would have sufficed.
- **Rava bar Ahilai** prohibited eating bread baked in an oven that was greased (no matter how long before, because it is impossible to remove the grease) with fats (making the oven “fleishig”) out of concern that he may dip that bread into a dairy dip.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, one may not knead a dough with milk, and if he does, the bread becomes assur, because we are concerned that he will eat the bread with meat. Similarly, one may not grease an oven (in which he bakes bread) with animal fats, and if he does, any bread baked in that oven is assur unless the oven is fired up beforehand to remove the grease. We see from the Braisa that it is possible to rid the oven of the grease!? **A: TIYUFTA** of **Rava bar Ahilai**.
    - **Q: Ravina** asked, if **Rava bar Ahilai** was proven as being incorrect, why did **Rav** say that an earthenware pot that was used for chametz must be broken? Why can't he burn out the chametz just like the Braisa says can be done for the oven!? **A: R' Ashi** answered: the Braisa is discussing a metal oven (which purges what it had absorbed), but an earthenware pot does not do so; or we can say even the Braisa is discussing an earthenware oven, but an oven which is fired up from the inside has more intense heat which purges all it had absorbed. A pot is heated on the outside and therefore is not effective in purging it all. Firing up a pot from the inside will often make it break, so people would not do that either.

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 96-----

- **Q:** The Gemara previously said, that even flavors that were absorbed into earthenware can be removed with intense heat. The Gemara asks, why is it that the earthenware pots in the Beis Hamikdash had to be broken after korbanos were cooked in them? Why couldn't we just put them back into the kiln (furnace used to make pottery) and purge the flavors? **A: R' Zeira** said, it is because we don't make kilns in Yerushalayim (because their smoke would blacken the walls of Yerushalayim).
  - **Q: Abaye** asked, breaking all these keilim would make a garbage pile in the Azarah, which is also something we are not allowed to do!? **A: Abaye** forgot the Braisa taught by **Shmaya** in Kalbeno, that said that the broken pieces of the earthenware keilim were miraculously absorbed into the ground where they were.
  - **Q:** We have quoted the statement of **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha**, who said that the oven in the Beis Hamikdash was made of metal. Why couldn't it have been made of earthenware, since an oven is fired up from the inside and therefore effectively remove the absorbed flavors!? **A:** The reason is that the Lechem Hapanim and the Shte Halechem were baked in the oven and became kadosh in that oven (that is the keili that made the kadosh, there was no other kli shareis that was used for them). The oven was therefore a kli shareis. We don't make a kli shareis out of earthenware. Even according to **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda**, a kli shareis may be wood, but not earthenware.
- **R' Yitzchak bar Yehuda** used to learn as a talmid by **Rami bar Chama**, but left and went to learn by **R' Sheishes**. When he met **Rami bar Chama** he explained that he left because **Rami bar Chama** would answer questions based on logical reasoning, which could be refuted by a Mishna or Braisa, whereas **R' Sheishes** would always answer based on a Mishna or Braisa, which cannot be refuted by another Mishna or Braisa. **Rami bar Chama** told him to ask anything, to show him that he would answer based on logical reasoning that could be substantiated by a Mishna or Braisa. **R' Yitzchak bar Yehuda** asked, if a korbon was cooked using only part of a metal pot, would the entire pot be required to be purged and rinsed or not? **Rami bar Chama** said, only the areas used for cooking would be subject to purging and rinsing, just as we see that only the part of the garment on which the blood splattered is subject to washing. **R' Yitzchak bar Yehuda** asked, the cases are not similar, because blood does not spread in the garment, whereas flavor can spread throughout a metal keili!? He asked further, that a Braisa says that the chumra of the purging and rinsing requirement over the washing requirement is that purging and rinsing applies to kodshei kodashim and kodshei kalim, and that even if only part of a metal pot was used for cooking, the entire pot must be purged and rinsed!? **Rami bar Chama** said, if there is a Braisa that says so, I stand corrected.
  - The word "b'kli" in the pasuk of "b'kli nechoshes..." teaches that even if only part of the keili was used for cooking, the entire keili must be purged and rinsed.

## ECHAD KODSHEI KODASHIM...

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says "chata", which teaches that a pot in which a chatas was cooked required purging and rinsing. How do I know that the same is for all korbanos? The pasuk says "kodesh kodashim hee". We would think to include a pot in which terumah was cooked as well. The pasuk therefore says "osah", which comes to exclude terumah. This is the view of **R' Yehudah**. **R' Shimon** says, the words "kodshei kodashim" teach that only kodshei kodashim require purging and rinsing, not kodshei kalim.
  - **R' Yehuda** says, that if "osah" is needed to exclude terumah, it must be that kodshei kalim are included in this requirement. **R' Shimon** uses "osah" for another drasha and therefore does not have this reasoning.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that terumah flavor absorbed into a pot makes that pot assur to be used for cooking of chullin for a non-Kohen. We see that terumah does require purging!? **A: Abaye** said, when they say that purging is not required for terumah they are referring to the requirement that the entire pot must be purged even if only part of the pot was used for the cooking. **Rava** said when they say that purging is not required for terumah they are referring to the requirement that purging of korbanos must be done with water, not with wine or even diluted wine. For purging of terumah, even wine or diluted wine may be

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

used. **Rabbah bar Ulla** said, when they say that purging is not required for terumah they are referring to the requirement that after purging the flavor of the korbanos using hot water, there is an additional requirement of purging and rinsing with cold water. It is this additional requirement that is not needed for terumah.

- **Q: Rabbah bar Ulla's** answer only works according to the view that there is an additional purging and rinsing of cold water that is required for korbanos. According to the other view, what would he answer? **A:** There is still a requirement for a rinsing with cold water after the purging of the flavor of korbanos. That additional rinsing is not needed for terumah.