

28.11.4; 95b (משנה זו) → 96b (שטיפה יתירתא)

1. וכלי חרש אשר תבשל בו ישבר ואם בכלי נחשת בשלה ומרק וטוף במים: ויקרא ו, כא
 2. כל זכר בפהגנים יאכל אתה קדש קדשים הוא: ויקרא ו:בג

- I זז forms of בישול which necessitate מריקה ושטיפה and the range of the מצוה (v. 1)
- a Whether or not: he cooked in it or poured boiling water over the meat (in the pot) requires שביירה/מריקה ושטיפה
- i Source: בו אשר תבושל (v. 1)
- b Range: קדשים קלים and קדשי קדשים (even though פסוק is anchored in תורת החטאת)
- i Dissent (ר"ש): does not apply to קדשים קלים
- ii Source: ברייתא referring to v. 2
- 1 תרומה excludes אותה; קדשים קלים extends to all קדש קדשים; חטאת ד' יהודה
- (a) Reasoning: since אותה is needed to exclude תרומה, all קדשים (including קדשים קלים) must be included
- 2 חטאת פסולה אותה; קדשי קדשים extends to other קדשים; חטאת ד"ש → חטאת ד"ש
- 3 Challenge (to both): תרומה does require cleaning, per ברייתא:
- (a) A pot: which was used for בשר should not be used for חלב; if it is, must be cleansed בנ"ט
- (b) And: a pot which was used for תרומה should not be used for חולין; if it is, must be cleansed בנ"ט
- (i) Answer1 (אב"י): in that case, only spot of בישול is required, not entire כלי
- (ii) Answer2 (רבא): in that case, even wine may be used; in our case (+ חטאת), must be water
- (iii) Answer3 (רבה בר עולא): in that case, even hot water may be used
1. Challenge: we have an opinion that מריקה is with hot water
2. Answer: but it still requires an extra שטיפה not so for תרומה
- II חמא בר רמי's question and the implications of the discussion
- a Question: if he held the בשר חטאת over the (hot) air of the pot, must it be processed?
- i Lemma1: the תורה is concerned both with בישול (happened) and בליעה (didn't happen) → not required
- ii Lemma2: the תורה's only concern is בישול → requires processing
- iii Provisional answer (רבא): from our משנה – even pouring boiling water over it necessitates processing
- 1 Dismissal: question is not about בליעה without בישול – but the inverse
- iv Proposed solution (רבה בר אבונה): the oven used in the מקדש was metal
- 1 Explanation: if cooking in air space didn't matter, they could have used earthenware
- 2 Answer: since they bake the מנחות inside, such that there is both בישול and בליעה – they used metal
- b Related ruling: רבה בר אהילי – a תנור which they smeared with fat; he ruled that all breads baked in it – forever – are אסור – even to eat with salt (alone), as a precaution against eating it with כותח (which is dairy)
- i Challenge: ברייתא – if dough is mixed with milk, prohibited (מפני הרגל עבירה); similarly, if an oven is smeared with lamb's fat, any bread baked in it is prohibited until they burn it out - רבה בר אהילי - ruling is refuted
- 1 Question: if so, why did רב rule that any pots used for חמץ must be broken on פסח (why not burn out חמץ?)
- 2 Answer1: רב read the ברייתא as being metal תנור
- 3 Answer2: even if earthenware – the תנור is burned on the inside, can exude all טעם, unlike קדירות
- (a) Question: if so, why not burn the pots from the inside?
- (b) Answer: people are afraid they'll burst and won't fire them up properly
- (c) Conclusion: a baking mold, which is burned from the outside, cannot be "burned out"
- 4 Question: if so, why did the תורה require breaking חרס? כלי חרס? Why not return them to the kiln?
- (a) Answer: they don't allow kilns in ירושלים (due to smoke)
- (b) Challenge (אב"י): do they have trash areas in עזרה? (to dispose of broken parts of חרס (כלי חרס))
- (i) Note: אב"י forgot report of שמעיה of קלנבו – שברי כ"ח – would be swallowed up in ground (בנס)
- (c) Question: if so, why not make the תנור in the מקדש out of earthenware?
- (i) Answer: since שתי הלחם and לחם הפנים are baked inside and become קדוש when put there, they are considered שרת כלי; we don't make שרת כלי חרס (demeaning)
1. Note: even יהודה בר יוסי ר' יוסי בר יהודה, who allows עץ כלי for שרת כלי, wouldn't allow חרס כלי
- 5 Story: רבי"ה asked רב"ה because רב"ה would answer from סברא, not שמועה, when רבי"ה asked רבי"ה to "give him one more chance", student asked whether מריקה ושטיפה involve entire כלי or just spot of contact
- (a) Answer: spot of contact – via analogy from כיבוס בגדים
- (i) Note: רבי"ה challenged his analogy – and a ברייתא which set מריקה ושטיפה as more severe than כיבוס – as entire כלי must be processed (הזאה of חומרא) – applies to חטאות פנימיות and before זריקה
- (ii) Note: reason for distinction – v. 1 – ואם בכלי נחשת בושלה –