



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Wine offering (cont.)

The Gemara concludes its last unsuccessful challenge to Shmuel's description of a wine offering.

2) Libations

R' Huna describes what is done with libations that become tmei'im.

A Baraisa is cited in support of this ruling and Shmuel also expresses an interest in publicizing this ruling.

הדרן עלך כל התדיר

3) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah elaborates on the parameters of the obligation to launder a garment upon which the blood of a korban splatters.

4) Chattas blood

The Gemara questions why the exposition does not teach that the garment onto which the blood of a bird chattas splatters must be laundered.

Reish Lakish in the name of Bar Kappara offers an explanation.

This explanation is challenged until the Gemara clarifies the reason a garment onto which the blood of a bird chattas splatters does not have to be laundered.

R' Yosef suggests another source to exclude the bird Chattas from the requirement of laundering.

Rabbah offers another reason why the word זאת does not exclude the inner chattas.

This explanation faces numerous unsuccessful challenges.

5) Bird Chattas blood

R' Avin inquires about the status of bird chattas blood brought into the Sanctuary while still in the bird's neck.

An unsuccessful attempt to resolve this issue is presented and the matter is left unresolved.

R' Avin inquires about the status of bird chattas blood that spills on the floor and then is gathered up.

Rava makes an unsuccessful attempt to resolve this inquiry and it is left unresolved.

6) Chattas blood

Levi inquires about the status of a garment if chattas blood splattered on it from off of another garment.

The response is that the garment will require laundering. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Which blood of chattas must be laundered out of a garment?
 חטאת פטולה אין דמה טעון כיבוס

The opening Mishnah of the perek deals with the blood of a chattas offering that splashes on one's clothes. The verse (Vayikra 6:20) teaches that when a garment has the blood of a chattas upon it, the garment must be laundered in the courtyard of the Mikdash. The Mishnah later (93b) teaches that this halacha is unique to the blood from a chattas, and it does not apply to blood of any other offering.

The Mishnah points out that if a chattas becomes invalid, either through a problem in regard to its blood or flesh, this halacha of laundering a garment which has blood splashed upon it does not apply. Rashi explains that this dispensation is based upon the verse (ibid.) which, in reference to the blood, states, "that which will be sprinkled." Rashi notes that only blood eligible to be placed upon the Altar need be laundered from a garment, and not if the blood is from a disqualified offering.

The Achronim note that the verse which Rashi cites as the source for this halacha is not the same verse which the Gemara itself cites on 93a. There, the Gemara explains that the verse states, "מדמה - from its blood," which indicates that it is only some blood of a chattas which must be laundered out of a garment, but not all its blood. In other words, the halacha of laundering a garment applies to blood of some cases of chattas, but not to all. The distinction is that the halacha applies only when a chattas is valid, but not when it is not valid. Why does Rashi refer to a source for this halacha using a phrase in the verse other than the one which the Gemara identifies?

Leshem Zevach explains that Rashi intends to show how we know that the verse and its halacha to launder garments upon which blood splashes is discussing the case of a valid

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is done with libations that become tmei'im?
2. What type of Chattas blood that splatters on a garment does not have to be laundered?
3. What is מרוקה ושטיפה?
4. Why must Chattas blood that splatters on a garment off of another garment be laundered?

HALACHAH Highlight

Burning tamei libations

נסכים שנטמאו עושה להן מערכה בפני עצמן ושורפן

Libations that become tmei'im are burned in a separate pyre

R' Huna teaches that when libations become *tmei'im* a special fire is made to burn them. This principle is derived from a pasuk and support for this ruling is cited from numerous sources. Later commentators note that this seems to contradict a comment of Rashi. Rashi in Temurah (33b)¹ teaches that liquids are not burned, rather they are buried. Accordingly, Rashi explains that when the Gemara discusses items that are prohibited from benefit and rules that those things that are burned are burned and those things that are buried are buried the intent was that foods are burned and liquids are buried. How then does Rashi reconcile our Gemara which clearly indicates that even liquids are burned?

Teshuvah Mikor Baruch² cites others who offer the following resolution. Generally, liquids are not burned and when the Torah refers to the necessity to burn invalid items it does not refer to liquids. The one exception to this rule is sacred (korban) liquids that are to be burned on a pyre. The basis of this principle is the Gemara Yoma (21b) that teaches that the fire on the altar burned liquids and solids alike. Therefore, those sacred liquids are destroyed by burning.

This resolution explains a difficult Rambam. Rambam³ writes that when libations become *tmei'im* a separate fire is made on the altar to burn them. The ruling that the libations are burned on the altar is in conflict with Rashi⁴ who writes that *tamei* libations are burned on the floor of the Courtyard the

(Insight...continued from page 1)

chattas. This is indicated from the words "אשר יזה," which refers to a case where the blood can still be sprinkled on the Altar. This then sets the stage for the interpretation of the word "מדמה" to be understood to refer to blood of a valid chattas.

The Gri"z (cited in Chiddushim of R' Moshe Feinstein, ז"ל) writes that the main source of this halacha begins with the phrase in the verse to which Rashi refers. Only blood that is eligible to be sprinkled on the Altar is the type which must be laundered out of a garment if it splashes on it. We need the verse of "מדמה" to teach us about disqualified blood which was brought on the Altar, where the halacha is that once it is on the Altar that it should not be taken off. Here, we would consider the blood in the realm of that which is fitting for the Altar, and therefore the type that needs to be laundered out of a garment. The verse מדמה brought in the Gemara is necessary to teach that any disqualified blood need not be laundered out of a garment, even if the blood was brought on the Altar. ■

same as other invalid sacred items. The question is how Rambam knew that libations are burned on the altar rather than in the standard location on the floor when the Gemara did not mention that they are burned on the altar. The answer is that as a liquid it would never be burned on the floor since liquids are buried. It is only because the liquid libations are sacred that they are treated differently and must be burned and the only location for the burning of liquids is on the altar. ■

1. רש"י תמורה ל"ג: ד"ה את שדרכך.

2. שו"ת מקור ברוך ח"ב סי' ל"ו אות ג'.

3. רמב"ם פ"ו מהל' איסורי מזבח ה"ה.

4. רש"י ד"ה מערכה. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Freed from Captivity

"ידם חטאת שניתז על הדם..."

The Remah, ז"ל, gives a very inspiring explanation of a central concept on today's daf. "It is very interesting, that, specifically the blood of chattas which spilled on a garment requires laundering in the Azarah, unlike the blood of other kodoshei kodoshim. We may wonder why specifically the blood of korban chattas?

"The key to understanding this is the dictum of our sages that 'even tzaddikim gemurim cannot stand in the place of

ba'alei teshuvah.' The blood of a korban chattas atones for sins, so Hashem instilled within it a special kedushah. This symbolizes that the blood and the nefesh of a ba'al teshuvah is holier than that of tzadikim gemurim.

"But this is only applicable to blood of a chattas which spilled before it was put on the mizbeach since the status of ba'al teshuvah is only applicable to one who is actively doing teshuvah. The moment his sin has been atoned for and he stops being involved in teshuvah he may be a tzaddik gamur but he is no longer a ba'al teshuvah."¹

Someone once asked Rav Pinchas of Koritz, ז"ל, "What value can teshuvah have when the ba'al teshuvah falls right

back into his old behavior?"

Rav Pinchas replied with a parable. "This can be compared to a king whose son was taken captive. The king pines after his son and every effort is made to find a way to free him, but this is not yet possible. Yet a short meeting—of a day or even an hour—can be arranged between the king and his son, doesn't this alone have great value?

"Limited teshuvah is like a short furlough from prison. Even when one cannot yet do a complete teshuvah, even a short time spent trying to do teshuvah is also very precious to Hashem."² ■

1. תורת העולה, ח"ג, פי ל"ה

2. אמרי פנחס, ח"א, שער פרשיות ומועדים,

תק"ב ■