



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h
Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Rav Huna says: Libations that became impure have a separate fire made for them, and they are burned. This is as the verse states: *In holiness...in fire it should burn.*

The *braisa* also states: Blood, oil, flour offerings, and libations that became impure have a separate fire made for them where they are burned.

Shmuel said to Rav Chana Baghdad: Bring me ten people and I will say to you in front of them that libations that became impure have a separate fire made for them, and they are burned. (92a)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, KOL HATADIR

Mishna

If blood of a *chataas* sprayed on clothing, it must be washed. Despite the fact that the Torah only discussed this law regarding sacrifices that are eaten, as the verse states: *In a holy place it should be eaten*, both the *chataas* that are eaten and the inner ones (*that are burned*) require that their blood be washed (*off clothing*). This is as the verse states: *One torah*, indicating that there is one law regarding all *chataas* sacrifices (*regarding washing off blood*).

The blood of an invalid *chataas* does not require washing, whether or not it was valid for some time. What are examples of cases where it was valid for some time? It is a case where the blood was left overnight, became impure, or was taken out of the Courtyard. What are examples of cases where it was not valid for some time? It is a case where the sacrifice was slaughtered with intent to eat or offer it outside

the allotted time or place, or if invalid people accepted the blood. (92a)

What Requires Washing?

The *Mishna* states: The blood of a *chataas* etc.

The *Gemora* asks: If there is one law for all *chataas*, including a bird *chataas*, why does the *braisa* state that one would think the blood of a bird *chataas* needs to be washed, which is why the verse states: *This (indicating that only the blood of an animal chataas is washed)*!

Rish Lakish says in the name of Bar Kapara: The verse states: *you should slaughter, indicating that it is only discussing (washing the blood of) sacrifices that are slaughtered.*

The *Gemora* asks: Perhaps it is discussing anything that is eaten, as the verse states: *in a holy place you should eat?* The inner *chataas* that are burned should be excluded!

The *Gemora* answers: This is why the verse states, *Toras*.

The *Gemora* asks: If so, we should even include a bird *chataas* (*as toras teaches that all chataas should be included*)!

The *Gemora* answers: There is the excluding word (*that excludes a bird chataas*), *this*.

The *Gemora* asks: Why should we exclude a bird *chataas* instead of the inner *chataas*?



The *Gemora* answers: The inner *chataos* should be included, as they are similar to a regular *chataos* in that they are animals, slaughtered in the north, their blood is accepted in a vessel, are sprinkled on corners of the altar, sprinkled with a finger, on the sharp part of the corner (see *Tosfos DH "v'keren"*), and it is burned on the fire.

The *Gemora* asks: On the contrary! The bird *chataos* should be included, as it is similar to a regular *chataos* in that it is offered totally outside the Holy, and is eaten.

The *Gemora* answers: The inner *chataos* clearly have more in common with a regular *chataos* than does a bird *chataos* (and is therefore included while the bird *chataos* is excluded).

Rav Yosef answers: (We know that a bird *chataos* is excluded from a different verse.) The verse states: *They will eat it*, indicating that these laws do not apply to one of the types of *chataos* that are eaten (i.e. only it, not another that it eaten).

The *Gemora* asks: What, then, is derived from the word *this*?

The *Gemora* answers: Without the word *this* I would think that *they will eat it* is just the normal way of speaking about this topic. The word *this* indicates that it is specific.

Rabbah says: The verse states: *that it will be sprinkled* (referring to the blood splashing onto clothing) is stated explicitly in a manner of sprinkling to teach that it applies to animal sacrifices whose blood are sprinkled. (Rashi understands that Rabbah is saying that this verse which uses the word "yazeh" used by inner *chataos*, as opposed to "zarak" used by a regular *chataos*, indicates that it is specifically regarding the inner *chataos*. Rabbah holds that the outer *chataos* are included from the word *Toras*, while bird sacrifices are excluded from the verse, *This*).

The *Gemora* asks a question on Rabbah from our *Mishna*. Didn't our *Mishna* explicitly state that the verse discussing washing the blood was only talking about sacrifices that were

eaten? (How can Rabbah say this verse is regarding the inner *chataos* that are not eaten?)

The *Gemora* answers: Our *Mishna* was saying that the verse did not refer to the inner *chataos* regarding pouring and rinsing, but it did say indicate the inner *chataos* regarding washing clothing.

The *Gemora* asks: If so, why did the *Mishna* say, "Both (the *chataos*) that are eaten and the inner ones?" It should have said, "Both the inner ones and those that are eaten (as the verse mainly refers to the inner ones)!"

The *Gemora* answers: Indeed, according to Rabbah the correct text is, "Both the inner ones and those that are eaten!"

The *Gemora* asks: If the verse is discussing sacrifices that are not eaten, why not include bird sacrifices?

The *Gemora* answers: The verse states, *this* to exclude them.

The *Gemora* asks: If the verse is discussing sacrifices that are not eaten, why not exclude ones that are eaten?

The *Gemora* answers: The verse states, *Toras* to include them.

The *Gemora* asks: Why include animal *chataos* that are eaten and exclude bird sacrifices?

The *Gemora* answers: It is understandable that *chataos* that are eaten are included, as they are similar to an inner *chataos* in that they are animals, slaughtered in the north, their blood is accepted in a vessel, are sprinkled on corners of the altar, sprinkled with a finger, on the sharp part of the corner, and it is burned on the fire.

The *Gemora* asks: On the contrary! The bird *chataos* should be included, as it is similar to an inner *chataos* in that the verse



uses the word “yazeh” regarding a bird as well as by the inner *chatas* (as opposed to a regular *chatas* where the word “zarak” is used).

The *Gemora* answers: The regular *chatas* clearly has more in common with the inner *chataos* than does a bird *chatas* (and is therefore included while the bird *chatas* is excluded). (92a – 92b)

Blood Brought Inside

Rabbi Avin inquired: If the blood of a bird *chatas* was brought inside the Sanctuary while the blood was still on its neck, what is the law? Is its neck like a sacred service vessel, and it therefore is invalid (as any blood of a regular *chatas* brought inside the *Heichal* in a *kli* shares is invalid)? Or do we say that it is like the neck of the animal, and the verse only stated, from its blood (is invalid) excluding its flesh?

The *Gemora* suggests an answer from a *braisa*. The *braisa* states: If the animal had convulsions (after it was slaughtered) and ran into the Sanctuary, and then came back, the blood is valid. This indicates that if the *Kohen* would have brought it in, it would be invalid!

The *Gemora* asks: According to this reasoning, when the *braisa* states that if *kodshei kodashim* that were slaughtered had convulsions and ran into the south and then came back to the north (of the Courtyard), it only means if it came back by itself?! Rather, the reason why this *braisa* is stated is to emphasize a third case of the *braisa* that if any animal was being slaughtered and had convulsions and ran out of the Courtyard, it is invalid, even if it came back before it died. [In other words, one cannot deduce anything from this *braisa* about taking the animal to different parts of the Courtyard or Sanctuary.] (92b)

Spilled Blood

Rabbi Avin inquired: What if the blood of the bird *chatas* spilled on the ground, and the *Kohen* gathered it? Do we say that being that the Torah did not say a vessel should be used, it remains valid? Or do we say that the Torah indicated that

a sacred service vessel is invalid, and therefore if one gathers it from the floor it is invalid (as it is supposed to be sprinkled from the body of the bird onto the altar)?

Rava answers that we can prove this from the *braisa*. The *braisa* states: One might think that the blood of a bird *chatas* would require washing. This is why the Torah says, this. If one would say the blood gathered is invalid, the blood should certainly not need to be washed without a specific verse excluding it, as it would become invalid once it reached the airspace of the clothing! [Being that it is going to land on the clothing, it would have a law of invalid blood that does not have to be washed!]

Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua says: The case could be where clothing was stuck onto its neck. [Hence, the blood never was in the airspace of the clothing, and would not have become invalid beforehand.] (92b)

From One Garment to Another

Levi inquired of Rebbe: What is the law if blood of an animal sprays from one garment to another? Do we say that being that it was already on one garment it does not have to be washed anymore when it sprays onto the second garment (as the blood is certainly invalid), or not?

Rebbe answered: This is a good question, and the answer is that it does need to be washed. Being that an animal’s blood can be gathered from the ground with a vessel, it is still valid blood. If you say that gathering an animal’s blood from the ground is invalid, I hold like Rabbi Akiva who says that any blood that could have been sprinkled in a valid fashion, and it then became invalid, requires washing. (92b)

DAILY MASHAL

How Does One Admit the Truth?

It is told in the name of HaGaon Rav Yisrael of Salant: See how bad a person’s attributes can be. Even if a person errs and admits his error, he usually says “You’re right” and refrains from simply saying, “I was wrong.”