



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

Zevachim Daf Tzaddik Hey

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.
- **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 korbon in a keili or whether he poured hot liquid from it into the keili, whether it was a korbon 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 korbon 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.