



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

Mitzvah with a Vessel

The *Mishna* stated that if an earthenware vessel which cooked a *chatas* left the Courtyard, it must be returned and broken in the Courtyard. If it became impure, it must first be pierced, to remove its impurity, and then brought to the Courtyard and broken.

The *Gemora* asks that the Torah writes that a “vessel” must be broken (for the *mitzvah* of breaking), and this (because it was pierced) is not a vessel!?

The *Gemora* answers that it is pierced in the size of a small root (which, evidently, is sufficient to remove its *tumah* status, but it nevertheless retains it is still classified as a vessel).

The *Mishna* had stated that if a metal vessel which cooked a *chatas* left the Courtyard, it must be returned and washed in the Courtyard. If it became impure, it must be made unusable with a large hole, and then brought to the Courtyard and washed.

The *Gemora* asks that it is not a vessel (because it was made unusable with a large hole)!?

The *Gemora* answers that he closes the hole with a hammer (before the washing). (95a)

Washing the Me’il when Tamei

Rish Lakish said: If the *Kohen Gadol’s* robe became impure (outside the Courtyard after it was sprayed with the blood of a *chatas*, and it cannot be torn in order to allow it into the courtyard to be washed, for it is forbidden to rip the robe), one must bring it in less than three fingerbreadths square (for then, it cannot be used as a patch, and therefore, he is not bringing a *tamei* garment into the Courtyard), and wash it like that, because it is written: *it shall not be torn*.

Rav Adda bar Ahavah asked from a *Mishna*: Thick garments and soft cloths are not subject to the law of three fingerbreadths square (for they are not made into patches; accordingly, the robe, which was made from a very thick material, could be brought in even in larger pieces)!?

The *Gemora* answers: They (a piece of the robe three by three) count because of the parent garment. [Since it is a whole garment, each three fingerbreadth square section would be regarded as a garment; it, therefore, can only be brought in less than three at a time.] (95a)

Washing Garments

The *Gemora* asks a question on the *halachah* of washing these garments in the Courtyard: But surely, the washing requires seven detergents (which are listed in a *Mishna* in *Niddah*), for Rav Nachman said in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha: The blood of the *chatas* and the appearance of *tzara’as* (on a garment) require seven detergents; and it was taught in a *braisa*: But urine may not be brought into

the Courtyard!? [And since urine is one of those seven detergents, how can they discharge their obligation of washing those bloodstained garments from a chatas in the Courtyard?]

The Gemora notes that it cannot be answered that the urine was mixed into them all (and therefore it is not a disgrace to bring it into the Courtyard), and then it is washed with them all at once, for it was taught in a Mishna that if they were not applied in their correct order (as listed there), or if they were all applied simultaneously, it is regarded as if nothing was done! And it cannot be answered that he mixes it up with one of the detergents, for it was taught in a Mishna that he must rub the stain three times with each and every detergent!?

Rather, the Gemora answers that the urine is mixed with tasteless saliva, for Rish Lakish said that tasteless saliva is mixed with each and every one of the detergents. (95a – 95b)

Mishna

Whether one cooked in it or poured hot broth into it, whether it was from *kodshei kodashim* or *kodashim kalim* – they require purging and rinsing. Rabbi Shimon says: *Kodashim kalim* do not require purging and rinsing. [Rashi notes that the pots have flavor of *nossar* absorbed inside of them and need to be purged; just not with all the guidelines necessary for the purging and rinsing mandated by the Torah.] (95b)

Cooking and Absorbing

The Gemora cites a *braisa*: It is written: (An earthenware vessel) in which the chatas will be cooked (it shall be broken). I know that this (the earthenware vessel needs to be broken) is the *halachah* only when one cooked the

meat inside of it; how do I know it when one poured hot broth into it? It is because it is written: that the chatas will be cooked in it shall be broken. [Since the Torah juxtaposed the word “in it” to “shall be broken,” this teaches us that it needs to be broken in all cases.]

Rami bar Chama inquired: What if one suspended (the meat of the chatas) in the air-space of an earthenware oven? Is the Torah particular about cooking and absorbing (and since there is no absorption, there is no requirement of breaking); or perhaps, it is particular about cooking even without any absorption!?

Rava said: This may be resolved from our Mishna, which stated that whether one cooked in it or poured hot broth into it (the pot would need to be purged and rinsed). [Although there is absorption but no cooking, it needs to be purged and rinsed; it would stand to reason that if it would be used for cooking, it needs to be purged and rinsed, even though there was no absorption!]

The Gemora rejects this line of logic: We were not inquiring about a case of absorption without cooking (for then it is obvious that purging and rinsing is required); we were inquiring about cooking without absorbing: what is the *halachah*?

The Gemora attempts to resolve this from that which Rav Nachman said in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha: The Temple oven was made of metal. [The meat of the sacrifices was lowered into the oven on a spit.] Now, if you think that cooking without absorbing does not necessitate breaking, let it be made out of earthenware!?

The Gemora deflects this proof by saying that there were the remainders of the *minchah* offerings, which were baked in the oven, so that there is cooking and absorbing; therefore, the oven must be made out of metal.



Bread - only Pareve?

A certain oven was greased with animal fat. Rava bar Ahilai forbade always (*even after the oven was fired up again*) the bread baked inside of it to be eaten even with salt, lest one come to eat it with *kutach* (*a condiment made of sour milk, moldy beard crusts that are chametz, and salt*).

The *Gemora* asked from a *braisa*: Since people eat bread with all food – both dairy and meat – one may not knead dough with milk. If one violated this prohibition, the bread may not be eaten, even on its own. He may not bake bread in an oven greased with animal fat to avoid coming to the prohibition of meat and milk. If one violated this prohibition, the bread is forbidden, until the oven is fired up again (*which will burn the fat away*). This is a refutation of Rava bar Ahilai. It is indeed a refutation.

Ravina said to Rav Ashi: Now since Rava bar Ahilai was refuted, why did Rav say that pots (used for *chametz*) must be broken on *Pesach*? [*Couldn't the flavor be removed through extreme heat?*]

Rav Ashi replied to him: Rav understands that the *braisa* is referring to a metal oven (*and that is why firing up the oven will purge the fats from it; this will not help by earthenware pots*). Alternatively, it may be an earthenware oven, but there is a difference if the oven is fired from the inside or from the outside.

The *Gemora* asks: Then let him fire up the earthenware pot from the inside?

The *Gemora* answers: He would spare it, lest it break. (95b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

The *Gemora* introduces the prohibition on producing and eating meat or dairy bread. The Tur and Shulchan Aruch discuss this prohibition at length in YD 97. Below are a number of issues related to this topic.

Rationale

The *Gemora* explains that these breads are forbidden due to a concern that one may eat the bread with meat of milk. This is true even if the bread was baked with bird fat, even though bird meat and milk is only Rabbinically prohibited.

The Poskim question why this is not a *gezeirah l'gezeirah* – a Rabbinic decree applied to a Rabbinic decree.

The Pri Megadim (Sifsei Da'as 97:1) answers that bread is such an essential staple that indiscriminately eating bread with meat or milk – i.e., assuming it is *pareve* – is so pervasive and common as to be certain. Therefore, the Rabbinic prohibition on a milk and bird meat mixture includes the prohibition of such bread.

Other Applications

The Taz (YD 97:1) applies this prohibition to other essential foods that are assumed *pareve*, including spices. Therefore, the Taz says that if one had a spice grinder which was used as *pareve*, and then one ground meat in it, it may not be used for any spices, even for use with meat.

Exceptions

The *Gemora* (Pesachim 36a) allows one to make such bread when made *k'ain tura* – *like an ox*. Rashi says this means that when one bakes only a small amount, which

will be eaten in one meal, we are not concerned that it will be accidentally eaten with the wrong type of food, and is therefore permitted.

The Rif says that this means that if the bread baked has a distinctive shape and/or appearance, we are not concerned that one will eat it with the wrong food. For example, a muffin type of bread, or bread with obvious cheese or meat in it, would be permitted.

The Rama (YD 97:1) says that this is why it is customary to bake bread with milk for *Shavuos*, and with fat for *Shabbos*, since the bread looks different, and only a small amount is baked this way.

Taste Once Removed

The *braisa* says that if one coated an oven with fat, one may not bake bread in it until he burns out the fat.

The Rishonim discuss why simply cleaning the fat from the surface is not sufficient. The Rashba says that cleaning the surface is sufficient, but the *braisa* gave the more common action of burning it out.

Tosfos (Pesachim 30 Dilma) says that since the fat is so hard to clean at the surface, we assume that cleaning the surface will not be done thoroughly enough, and therefore one must burn it out.

The *Poskim* discuss whether the case of the oven whose surface is cleaned out is a case of *nat bar nat* – an embedded taste that is one step removed. If it is, the question and answers given by the Rishonim may indicate their position on whether one may intentionally create food that is *nat bar nat* for eating with meat or milk. See Yalkut Yosef YD 89, footnote 35.

DAILY MASHAL

Reversing Garments of the Eve of Pesach

On the eve of Pesach it is forbidden to sew new garments but it is allowed to repair an old garment for the holiday (*Shulchan „Aruch, O.C. 468:2*). In former times people would not discard an old garment. They would reverse it, alter it here and there, and behold! A new garment... Is this permitted on the eve of Pesach? To solve this question (cited by *Orchos Chayim* on *Shulchan „Aruch, ibid*, in the name of Responsa *Shemesh Tzedakah, 27*), the Maharsham (*Da'as Torah* to *O.C. ibid*) brings proof from our *sugya*: Tosfos explain the words *deratzif mirtzaf* as meaning that a person hammered a utensil, turning it inside-out and that therefore it is not considered new (see *ibid*). From this we learn that such an act is allowed on the eve of Pesach (see further, *ibid*).