



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

Sacred Ovens

The *Gemora* asks: Why should the earthenware pots of the *Mikdash* have to be broken? Why don't we just return them back in the kilns (*and purge them from their absorptions through the intense heat*)? [*Rashi explains that this question is based upon the conclusion that the torah is concerned with the absorptions and not the cooking; for if the concern would only be the cooking, we would say that any earthenware vessel that cooked the meat of a chatas must be broken – regardless of the fact that the absorptions could be purged!*]

Rabbi Zeira answers: This is because there were kilns made in Yerushalayim (*so that the smoke shouldn't blacken the walls of the city*).

Abaye asked: Would they make heaps of garbage in the Courtyard (*from the broken earthenware pots*)?!

The *Gemora* answers: Abaye did not hear that which Shemayah said in Kalnevo. He said: A miracle occurred in the Temple that the shards of the earthenware vessels would be absorbed in the ground in their place.

The *Gemora* asks: Rav Nachman said in the name of Rabbah bar Avuhah that the oven of the Temple was made out of metal. Why didn't they make it out of earthenware since its firing up was done on the inside (*and thereby it*

would be hot enough to purge the absorptions from the earthenware pots)?

The *Gemora* answers: Being that it also had to bake the *shte'i ha'lechem* (*two loaves brought as a sacrifice on Shavuot*) and the *lechem ha'panim* (*showbreads*) which were baked in an oven and made sacred in an oven, the oven had to be a service vessel. We do not make a service vessel out of earthenware. Even Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah (*in Sukkah 50b*) only allowed service vessels to be made out of wood, not earthenware. (96a – 96b)

Cooking with Part of a Vessel

Rav Yitzchak bar Yehudah often learned Torah from Rami bar Chama. He left him, and went to study from Rav Sheishes. One day he met Rami bar Chama. Rami said to Rav Yitzchak: "The officer touched my hand and the smell (*of royalty*) now comes from my hand." Do you really think that because you learn from Rav Sheishes you are Rav Sheishes? [*In other words, he was hinting that he left him just to feel important that he was learning from Rav Sheishes.*]

Rav Yitzchak said: This is not why I left. Whenever I asked you a question, you would answer me with your logic. When I would find a *Mishna* or *braisa* that contradicted your logic, your logic no longer held weight. When I ask Rav Sheishes a question he answers me from a *Mishna* or

braisa. This way, even if I find a *Mishna* or *braisa* that contradicts that *braisa*, it is just an argument among *braisos* (but there is still validity in his answer).

Rami replied: Ask me a question, and when you check for a *Mishna* or *braisa* you will see that my answer is found in a *Mishna* or *braisa*.

Rav Yitzchak asked him: If someone cooked with only part of a vessel, does it require purging and rinsing? [*The Shitah Mekubetzes says that the case is where part of the vessel is away from the fire.*]

Rami answered: It is understandable that it should not require purging and rinsing, as it is like blood (of a *chatas*) that fell onto a garment (where only the stain must be washed, not the entire garment).

Rav Yitzchak asked: There is no *Mishna* or *braisa* that states this is the law!

Rami answered: It is logical that this is indicated by our *Mishna*! Just as the *Mishna* states that only the blood stain on the garment requires washing, so too the vessel only requires purging and rinsing where it was used for cooking.

Rav Yitzchak asked: The two cases are incomparable! Blood does not spread to the rest of the garment, while the heat of cooking does (and it is therefore possible that the law is that the entire vessel should be purged)!

Additionally, the *braisa* states: Blood that sprayed on a garment is more stringent than purging and rinsing, and purging and rinsing is more stringent than blood on a garment. Blood is more stringent as it even applies to the outer and inner animal *chataos* (the latter are not eaten), and it only applies before the sprinkling of the blood. This

is as opposed to the law regarding purging and rinsing, which only applies to sacrifices that are eaten and even after the sprinkling. Purging and rinsing has a stringent aspect in that it applies to both *kodshei kodashim* and *kodashim kalim*. Additionally, if one cooks with only part of the vessel, the entire vessel requires purging and rinsing, as opposed to blood that is sprayed on a garment (where only the stain needs to be washed)!

Rami answered: If that's what the *braisa* says, then that is what it says.

The *Gemora* asks: What is the reason for the law of the *braisa*?

The *Gemora* answers: The verse states: *And if it was cooked in a copper vessel* indicating even if part of the vessel was used for cooking, the entire vessel requires purging and rinsing.

The *Mishna* says that both *kodshei kodashim* and *kodashim kalim* require purging and rinsing.

The *braisa* states: The verse says: *chatas*. We only know this applies to a *chatas*. How do we know this applies to all *kodashim*? The verse states: *It is kodesh kodashim*. This indicates it applies to all *kodashim*. One might think this even applies to *terumah*. This is why the verse states: *It*. This excludes *terumah*. These are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. Rabbi Shimon says: *Kodshei kodashim* require purging and rinsing, as opposed to *kodashim kalim* that do not. This is as the verse states: *Kodesh kodoshim*. This indicates that only *kodshei kodashim* require purging and rinsing, not *kodashim kalim*.

The *Gemora* asks: What is Rabbi Yehudah's reasoning?

The *Gemora* answers: Being that the verse had to say it to exclude *terumah*, this indicates that *kodashim kalim* do require purging and rinsing.

The *Gemora* asks: How does Rabbi Shimon understand the verse *it*?

The *Gemora* answers: Rabbi Shimon understands that *it* excludes blood that could have been sprinkled and that became invalid from having to be washed (*as stated on 93a*).

The *Gemora* asks: Does *terumah* not require purging and rinsing? Doesn't the *braisa* state: If a person cooked meat in a pot, he should not cook milk in that pot. If he did, it is only forbidden if the meat imparts flavor to the milk. If he cooked *terumah* in a pot, he should not cook *chullin* (*regular*) food in that pot. If he did, it only has the status of *terumah* if it gives a taste to the *chullin*. [*This shows that a pot in which terumah was cooked requires purging and rinsing to take out the terumah from it.*]

Abaye answers: The difference is regarding a pot that was only partially used cooking (*part of it was not on the fire at all*). If *kodashim* was cooked, the entire pot must be purged and rinsed. If *terumah* was cooked in the pot, only the part over the fire must be purged and rinsed.

Rava answers: The difference is regarding the teaching of the master in a *braisa*: *in water* (*regarding the purging and rinsing of kodashim*) excludes wine and diluted wine. Wine and diluted wine can be used for purging and rinsing *terumah*.

Rabbah bar Ulla answers: The difference is regarding the teaching of the master in a *braisa* that the purging and rinsing of *kodashim* must include a cold rinse (*after the*

boiling water is poured all over it). *Terumah* does not require a cold rinse.

The *Gemora* asks: This is understandable according to the opinion that a cold rinse is needed after the purging and rinsing of hot water. However, according to the opinion that purging refers to hot water and rinsing refers to cold water, how is *terumah* different? [*We said that it also requires purging and rinsing!*]

The *Gemora* answers: There must be an additional cold rinse according to this opinion that is not required by *terumah*. (96b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Purging with Liquids other than Water

The Rama in Hilchos Pesach (452:5) quotes the dispute between the Ramban and Rashba whether *hag'alah* can be done using other liquids or whether it must be done specifically with water. The Rama writes that you cannot do *hag'alah* with any liquid other than water, but, after the fact, it works even if done with other liquids.

The Gr"a points out that our *Gemora* seems to contradict the Ramban because when the *Gemora* tries to figure out the distinction between *hag'alah* and purging and rinsing, Rava suggests that the difference is whether one must use water. By purging and rinsing the Torah explicitly insists on water. But for *hag'alah* one can even use wine. Clearly we see that other liquids are acceptable for *hag'alah*!?

The Gr"a says that according to the Ramban we must say that only wine would be acceptable for *hag'alah* but no other liquid. Or perhaps we rule like the other distinctions



that the *Gemora* makes between *hag'alah* and purging and rinsing, not like Rava.

Although the Rama says that *b'dieved*, we can rely on purging using other liquids, R. Akiva Eiger (Teshuvos 83) explains that once food has been cooked in a pot that has been kashered using another liquid the food can be eaten, however one cannot, at the outset, cook in a pot that was kashered using another liquid. However, in situations where there is no possibility of kashering with water we can use other liquids since this situation is like a *b'dieved*.

R' Moshe (Igros Moshe Y.D. 2:41) proves that the Rashba is correct and that other liquids can be used from the *Gemora* in Avodah Zarah 76a (which is also quoted in the *Gemora* Zevachim 97a) where each day of cooking a *korban shelamim* served as a *hag'alah* for the previous days *korban* that was cooked in that pot and prevents the absorbed food from becoming *nossar*. The cooking of *korban* meat qualifies as "other liquids," not water, yet it seems to be an acceptable method of *hag'alah*.

One example when it is necessary to kasher using other liquids is in a chocolate factory. Chocolate is very sensitive to water and can be ruined by even a small amount of moisture. Therefore, the only way to kasher from non-kosher (or non cholov yisroel) chocolate would be to do a run of kosher chocolate on the machine, and consider the first run to be non-kosher since it is used as the kashering run.

Rabbah bar Ulla says that the distinction between *hag'alah* and purging and rinsing is that for purging and rinsing the vessel must be rinsed in cold water after the *hag'alah*. Tosafos points out that when one kashers using *hag'alah* it isn't necessary to rinse the utensil in cold water after kashering, but concludes that the custom is to do so. This is also recorded in Shulchan Aruch (O.C. 452:7) that

the custom is to rinse the vessels in cold water immediately after *hag'alah*. The rationale for this custom is to explain the *Gemora* that purging and rinsing requires an extra rinsing, implying that even *hag'alah* requires one rinsing (Tosafs in Avodah Zarah 76 quoted by Gr"a). Those who don't require a rinsing for *hag'alah* (Rashi and Tosfos) understand that the "extra rinsing" refers to the cold rinsing that is done after the hot one, and doesn't refer to an extra cold rinsing.

DAILY MASHAL

The Fire Came from Above and Burned the Lower Things First

Our *Mishna* says that one must first burn the limbs of an *'olah* and then the parts of a *chatas*. At the inauguration of the altar in the Sanctuary, the Torah says that they put the *'olah* on the altar and, above it, the parts of the other sacrifices (Vayikra 9). But when the fire came out from before Hashem and "consumed on the altar", the verse says that it consumed the "*'olah* and the **fats**." In other words, first the fire burned the *'olah* and then the fats above the *'olah*! The Netziv writes that this was a miracle to observe the *halachah* that the limbs of an *'olah* are burnt before the parts of other sacrifices (*Ha'amek Davar, Shemini*).