



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

**Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

One may not boil etc. Our Rabbis taught: [You shall not eat of it raw, nor boiled at all] with water: I only know [that it may not be boiled] in water; from where do we know [it of] other liquids? You can answer, [it follows] with a kal vachomer,<sup>1</sup> if water, which does not impart its taste, is forbidden; then other liquids, which impart their taste, how much more so! Rebbe said: ‘With water’: I only know it of water; from where do we know [it of] other liquids? Because it is stated, ‘nor boiled at all’, [implying] in all cases. Wherein do they differ? — They differ in respect of [that which is] roasted in a pot.<sup>1</sup> And the Rabbis: how do they utilize this [phrase] ‘nor boiled at all’? — They employ it for what was taught: If he boiled it and then roasted it, or roasted it and then boiled it, he is liable.<sup>2</sup> As for ‘if he boiled it and then roasted it, he is liable,’ that is well, seeing that he boiled it. But if he roasted it and then boiled it, surely it is ‘roast with fire’; why [then is he liable]? — Said Rav Kahana: The author of this is Rabbi Yosi. For it was taught: The law<sup>3</sup> is complied with by [eating] an [unleavened] wafer that is soaked or boiled, but not dissolved; this is the view of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yosi said: The law is complied with by [eating] a wafer that is soaked, but not with one that is boiled, even if not dissolved.<sup>4</sup> Ulla

<sup>1</sup> Without any liquid, save its own juice. If we deduce the interdict of other liquids with a kal vachomer, this however is permitted. But when we learn it from the emphatic doubling of the verb, even this is forbidden. — The pesach sacrifice was roasted on a spit directly over the fire.

<sup>2</sup> He incurs lashes for eating it.

<sup>3</sup> Relating to the eating of matzah on Pesach.

<sup>4</sup> Because it is not called bread, notwithstanding that it was previously baked in an oven. Similarly, if the pesach offering is

said: You may even say [that it agrees with] Rabbi Meir; here it is different, because Scripture said, ‘nor boiled at all’, [implying] in all cases.<sup>5</sup> (41a1 – 41a2)

Our Rabbis taught: You might think that if he roasted it as much as it needs,<sup>6</sup> he should be liable. Therefore it is stated: You shall not eat of it semi-roast nor boiled at all with water’; semi-roast or boiled did I forbid you, but not that which is roasted as much as it needs. How is that meant? — Said Rav Ashi: That he rendered it charred meat. (41a2)

Our Rabbis taught: You might think that if he ate as much as an olive of raw meat, he should be liable; therefore it is stated, You shall not eat of it semi-roast [na] nor boiled at all [with water]; semi-roast and boiled did I forbid you, but not raw. You might think that it is permitted; therefore it is stated, ‘but roast with fire’. How is ‘na’ understood? — Said Rav: as that which the Persians call abarnim.<sup>7</sup> (41a2)

Rav Chisda said: He who cooks [food] in the hot springs of Teveryah on the Shabbos is not culpable;<sup>8</sup> if he boiled the pesach sacrifice in the hot springs of Teveryah, he is

boiled after being roasted, it is no longer regarded as ‘roast with fire’.

<sup>5</sup> Even after roasting. This answers the question, ‘And the Rabbis: how do they utilize this (phrase), “nor boiled at all”?’.

<sup>6</sup> I.e., he overroasted it, thus burning it. I might think that this is not called ‘roast with fire’ but ‘burnt with fire’, and therefore he incurs lashes for eating it.

<sup>7</sup> Half-done meat.

<sup>8</sup> For the desecration of the Shabbos, because this is not really cooking.

culpable. Wherein does the Shabbos differ, that [he is] not [culpable]? Because we require the product of fire, which is absent! Then [in respect to] the pesach sacrifice too it is not a product of fire? — Said Rava, What is the meaning of his statement, ‘he is culpable’? That he transgresses on account of ‘[You shall not eat ...] but roast with fire.’<sup>9</sup> Rav Chiya son of Rav Nassan recited this [dictum] of Rav Chisda explicitly. [Thus:] Rav Chisda said: He who cooks in the hot springs of Teveryah on the Shabbos is not culpable; but if he boiled the pesach sacrifice in the hot springs of Teveryah, he is culpable, because he transgressed on account of ‘but roast with fire’. (41a2 – 41a3)

Rava said: If he ate it semi-roast, he incurs lashes twice;<sup>10</sup> if he ate it boiled, he incurs lashes twice;<sup>11</sup> [if he ate] semi-roast and boiled, he incurs three sets of lashes. Abaye said: We do not lash on account of an implied prohibition. Some maintain: He does not indeed incur lashes twice,<sup>12</sup> but he nevertheless incurs lashes once.<sup>13</sup> Others say: He does not even incur lashes once, because [Scripture] does not particularize its prohibition, like the prohibition of muzzling.<sup>14</sup> Rava said: If he [a nazir] ate the husk [of grapes], he incurs lashes twice; if he ate the kernel, he

<sup>9</sup> He is not culpable on account of, ‘You shall not eat of it . . . boiled with water’ because this is not designated boiling. But the other portion of the verse, ‘but roast with fire’, is an implied negative injunction, the command being that you must not eat anything which is not roast, and what is boiled in the springs of Teveryah is therefore forbidden by implication. He thus holds that a man incurs lashes for an implied negative injunction, i.e., one which is not explicitly stated.

<sup>10</sup> Once on account of the injunction against semi-roast, and again because of the interdict, ‘You shall not eat . . . but roast with fire’.

<sup>11</sup> On account of the injunction against boiled flesh, and again as in the case of semi-roast meat.

<sup>12</sup> Since he incurs lashes on account of the direct prohibition, ‘You shall not eat of it semi-roast’, or, ‘nor boiled’, he does not incur lashes on account of the implied interdict too.

<sup>13</sup> E.g., he who boils it in the hot springs of Teveryah. Since there is no explicit injunction, we fall back upon the implied injunction.

incurs lashes twice; [for] the husk and the kernel, he incurs lashes three times.<sup>15</sup> Abaye maintained: We do not administer lashes on account of an implied prohibition — Some say: He does not indeed incur lashes twice, but he nevertheless incurs lashes once. Others maintain: He does not even incur lashes once, because [Scripture] does not particularize its prohibition, like the prohibition of muzzling. (41a3 – 41b1)

Our Rabbis taught: If he ate as much as an olive of semi-roast [pesach offering] before nightfall,<sup>16</sup> he is not culpable; [if he ate] as much as an olive of semi-roast flesh after dark, he is culpable. If he ate as much as an olive of roast meat before nightfall, he does not disqualify himself from [being one of] the members of the company;<sup>17</sup> [if he eats] as much as an olive of roast meat after dark, he disqualifies himself from [being one of] the members of his company. (41b1 – 41b2)

Another [Baraisa] taught: You might think that if he ate as much as an olive of semi-roast before nightfall he should be culpable; and it is a logical inference: if when he is subject to [the mitzvah] ‘arise and eat roast [flesh]’, he is

<sup>14</sup> This is an interdict explicitly forbidding a particular action, and this is the model of all interdicts the disregard of which involves lashes, since it immediately follows the law of lashes. But the interdict of ‘you shall not eat of it . . . but roast with fire’ does not particularize any method of preparation as forbidden.

<sup>15</sup> All the days of his nezirus he shall not eat anything that is made of the grape vine, from the kernels eaten to the husk. According to Rava, the kernels and the husk are explicitly prohibited, while they are also included in the implied prohibition of ‘he shall not eat anything that is made of the grape vine’, and the offender incurs lashes on account of each.

<sup>16</sup> Lit., ‘while it was yet day’ — on the fourteenth of Nissan.

<sup>17</sup> Each pesach offering had to be eaten by one company, the members of which had registered for that particular animal. It might not be eaten by two companies, while on the other hand no man might eat in two separate places. It is now taught that if he eats some roast meat before nightfall, he is not disqualified from eating elsewhere with his company after nightfall, the earlier eating not being regarded as eating of the pesach offering in this sense.

subject to [the prohibition] ‘do not eat it semi-roast’; then when he is not subject to [the mitzvah], ‘arise and eat roast’, is it not logical that he is subject to [the prohibition] ‘do not eat it semi-roast?’ Or perhaps it is not so: when he is not subject to [the mitzvah] ‘arise and eat roast’, he is subject to, ‘do not eat it semi-roast’, [while] when he is subject to [the mitzvah], arise and eat roast’, he is not subject to [the prohibition] ‘do not eat it semi-roast’, and do not wonder, for lo! it was released from its general prohibition in respect to roast;<sup>18</sup> Therefore it is stated, ‘You shall not eat of it semi-roast’; nor boiled at all [bashed mevushal] with water, but roast with fire’. Now, ‘but roast with fire’ should not be stated;<sup>19</sup> then why is ‘but roast with fire’ stated? To teach you: When he is subject [to the command] ‘Arise and eat roast’, he is [also] subject to ‘You shall not eat of it semi-roast’; when he is not subject to [the command] ‘Arise and eat roast’, he is not subject to, ‘You shall not eat of it semi-roast.’<sup>20</sup>

The Baraisa continues: Rebbe said: I could read ‘bashed’; why is ‘mevushal’ stated [too]? For I might think, I only know it<sup>21</sup> where he boiled it after nightfall. From where do we know it if he boiled it during the day? Therefore it is stated, ‘bashed mevushal’, [implying] in all cases. But Rebbe has utilized this ‘bashed mevushal’ in respect of [flesh] roast[ed] in a pot and [flesh boiled] in other liquids? — If so, let Scripture say either bashed bashed or mevushal mevushal: why ‘bashed mevushal’? Hence you infer two things from it. (41b2 – 41b3)

Our Rabbis taught: If he ate roast [pesach offering] during the day, he is culpable; and [if he ate] as much as an olive of semi-roast after nightfall, he is culpable. [Thus] he

<sup>18</sup> For even roast pesach offering is not permitted before nightfall, as it is written, ‘and they shall eat the flesh in that night, roast with fire’, which implies, but not before; at night this implied prohibition is lifted. Hence we might argue: granted that the general prohibition is not lifted at the outset in respect of semi-roast too, yet if he ate it he is not liable to punishment.

teaches roast similar to half-roast: just as semi-roast [after nightfall] is [prohibited] by a negative injunction, so is roast [before nightfall] subject to a negative injunction. As for half-roast, it is well: it is written, ‘You shall not eat of it semi-roast’. But from where do we know [the negative injunction for] roast? Because it is written, ‘And they shall eat the flesh in that night’: only at night, but not by day. But this is a negative injunction deduced by implication from an affirmative command, and every negative injunction deduced by implication from an affirmative command is [technically] an affirmative command? — Said Rav Chisda, The author of this is Rebbe. For it was taught: Either a bullock or a lamb that has anything superfluous or lacking in its parts, that may you offer for a freewill-offering; [but for a vow it shall not be accepted]: that you may dedicate for the Temple repair, but you may not dedicate unblemished [animals] for the Temple repair. Hence it was said, Whoever dedicates unblemished [animals] for the Temple repair transgresses an affirmative mitzvah — I only know [that he transgresses] an affirmative mitzvah; from where do we know [that he transgresses also] a negative injunction? Because it is stated, And Hashem spoke to Moshe, saying [leimor]: this teaches concerning the whole section that it is subject to a negative injunction: this is Rabbi Yehudah's view. Rebbe asked Bar Kappara: How does that imply it? Said he to him, Because it is written, ‘leimor’: a ‘not’ [‘lo’] was stated in [these] matters. The School of Rav interpreted: Leimor, a negative injunction [law] was stated. (41b3 – 42a1)

<sup>19</sup> For the previous verse states: And they shall eat the flesh on that night, roast with fire.

<sup>20</sup> I. e., lashes for eating semi-roast meat of the pesach offering is incurred only on the evening of the fifteenth, when one is bidden to eat the roast of the pesach sacrifice, but not on the day of the fourteenth, before the obligation commences.

<sup>21</sup> That boiled pesach offering flesh must not be eaten.

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### **Solar Water Heaters**

Our *Gemora* states that if someone cooks something in the hot springs of Teveria on *Shabbos*, he is not liable for cooking on *Shabbos*. A similar case, where an egg is cooked by placing it in a handkerchief heated by the sun, is discussed at length in the *Gemora* in *Shabbos* (38b). The *Tanna Kamma* says that such an action is forbidden on *Shabbos*, while Rabbi Yosi says it is permitted. The *Gemora* explains that everyone agrees that it is permitted to cook using the natural light of the sun (i.e. placing an egg outside in a very hot spot) on *Shabbos*. Everyone likewise agrees that one cannot use fire to cook something, even if that fire is being used indirectly (*heating up the metal on the bottom of a pot that contains food that becomes cooked*). The argument is regarding using something that is heated by the sun to in turn cook the food. The *Tanna Kamma* says that this is forbidden according to Rabbinic law (*though permitted according to the Torah*) because one might otherwise end up cooking with fire, while Rabbi Yosi says it is permitted. The codifiers rule like the *Tanna Kamma* (see *Shulchan Aruch Orach Chaim* 318:3)

While this sounds like a case that does not have practical application, it actually is at the heart of an interesting Halachic debate regarding solar water heaters (*used by almost every apartment in Israel*). Is an apparatus that traps the rays of the sun, enabling it to heat the water coursing through its pipes, considered like the hot springs, or as if the sun itself is heating the water? Even if we say that it is more like the hot springs, is there any way that the turning of the faucet, which allows cold water to enter and be cooked by the hot water that is already there, is considered indirect enough that this should be considered permitted when the prohibition to start off with is only a Rabbinic decree? Without getting into the entire topic, there were some Poskim who were lenient (see *Har Tzvi Orach Chaim* 1:188 and R' Shlomo Zalman Auerbach in the

first edition of *Shemiras Shabbos k'Hilchasah*). However, most poskim rule that using the hot water from a solar water heater on *Shabbos* is forbidden (see subsequent versions of *Shemiras Shabbos*, *Minchas Yitzchak* 4:44, and others).

### **DAILY MASHAL**

Rav Chisda said: He who boiled the pesach sacrifice in the hot springs of Teveryah, he is culpable.

The Commentators ask: How can the pesach sacrifice be boiled with the hot springs of Teveryah; the *Gemora* earlier tells us that these hot springs were not found in Yerushalayim!? If the korban was brought beyond Yerushalayim, it would be come disqualified!

Ben Yehoyahada answers that this question is theoretic in nature, but he cites a *Tanchuma* that all the lands of the earth are connected to Yerushalayim, and Shlomo was an expert in this; he was able to determine which specific portion of land in Yerushalayim extended to Teveryah. He could have then dug there until water was found; those hot waters would have the status of the hot springs of Teveryah.

Additionally, the hot springs could have been brought to Yerushalayim through the means of a demon or by using the Name of Hashem.

Mareh Kohen explains that our *Gemora* is referring to the times when it was permitted to sacrifice on the bamos located throughout Eretz Yisroel.