

22 Shevat 5781  
Feb. 4, 2021



Pesachim Daf 75

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 roast the pesach-offering etc. A story [is quoted] in contradiction? — The text is defective, and it teaches thus: But if it is a perforated grill, it is permitted, and Rabbi Tzadok said [likewise]: it once happened that Rabban Gamliel Said to his servant: go out and roast us the pesach-offering on the perforated grill’. (75a1)

Rav Chinena bar Idi asked Rav Idi bar Ahavah: If a man fires an oven with the shells of orlah and then sweeps it out and bakes bread in it, what is [the law] on the view that it is forbidden?<sup>1</sup> The bread is permitted, he answered. Said he to him, But Rav Chinena the Elder said in Rav Assi's name in Rabbi Yochanan's name: If a man fires an oven, sweeps it out, and roasts the pesach-offering in it, that is not ‘roast with fire,’ because ‘roast with fire,’ is stated twice.<sup>2</sup> [Thus] the reason is that the Divine Law revealed [it by stating] ‘roast with fire’ twice; but if the Divine Law had not revealed it, I would say, it is ‘roast with fire’?<sup>3</sup> — The Divine Law revealed it there, replied he, and we learn from it [for elsewhere]. Alternatively, there the reason is that the Divine Law wrote ‘roast with fire’ twice; but if the Divine Law had not written ‘roast with fire’ twice, I would say, the Divine Law insisted on fire, and even if he swept it out, that too is ‘roast with fire’;<sup>4</sup> but here the Divine Law objected to forbidden fuel, which is [now] absent. (75a1)

Our Rabbis taught: If he cut it<sup>5</sup> and placed it on the coals, Rebbe said: I maintain that this is ‘roast with fire.’ Rav Achadvoi bar Ammi pointed out a contradiction to Rav Chisda: Did then Rebbe rule [that] coals are fire? But the following contradicts it: [Or when the flesh has in the skin] a burn from fire [etc.]: I know it only where it was burnt from fire; if it was burnt with coals, hot ashes, boiling lime, boiling gypsum, or anything produced by fire, which includes hot water [heated] by fire, how do we know it?<sup>6</sup> Therefore ‘a burning’ is stated twice, as an amplification. [Hence] it is only because the Divine Law amplified [it by writing] ‘a burning’ twice, but if the Divine Law had not amplified [it by writing] ‘a burning’ twice, [I would say that] coals are not fire? Scripture does not find it necessary to include a wood coal, he answered him; a verse is necessary only in respect of a coal of metal. Then aren’t coals of metal fire? Surely in respect of a Kohen's daughter [who committed adultery], though it is written: she shall be burnt with fire, Rav Masneh said: They made a lead wick for her? — There it is different, because the Divine Law said, ‘she shall be burnt with fire’: ‘she shall be burnt’ is to include all burnings which come from fire, then all the more fire itself! [If so] let us surround her with bundles of branches and burn her? — The meaning of

<sup>1</sup> Where it is not first swept out. Here, however, there is no improvement of the fuel in the loaf; hence the question.

<sup>2</sup> The repetition emphasizes that it must be roast actually over the fire itself.

<sup>3</sup> Hence in the present case as there is no Biblical intimation, we should regard it as though the fire itself were present, and by corollary, as though, the oven were unswept.

<sup>4</sup> Since the heat was the result of fire.

<sup>5</sup> he pesach-offering; not actually dividing it, but making a number of deep cuts, so that it should roast more quickly.

<sup>6</sup> That it falls within this particular category of tzaraas?

'burning' is learnt from the children of Aaron: just as there it was a burning of the soul while the body remained intact, so here burning of the soul while the body remains intact [is meant]. Then let us prepare for her boiling water [heated] by the fire? — [That is ruled out] on account of Rav Nachman' [s dictum]. For Rav Nachman said, Scripture said: but you shall love your neighbor as yourself: choose an easy death for him. Now, since there is Rav Nachman [s deduction], what is the purpose of the gezeirah shavah?<sup>7</sup> — I will tell you: But for the gezeirah shavah, I would say [that] the burning of the soul while the body remains intact is not burning,<sup>8</sup> while as for Rav Nachman's [teaching], let us use many bundles of branches for her, so that she should die quickly. Therefore it [the gezeirah shavah] informs us [that it is not so]. Then what is the purpose of 'she shall be burnt] with fire'?<sup>9</sup> — It is to exclude [boiling] lead [drawn straight] from its source. (75a1 – 75a3)

Rabbi Yirmiyah said to Rabbi Zeira: Then wherever 'she shall be burnt with fire' is written, it is to include all burnings which are produced by fire? Surely in respect to the [sacrificial] bullocks which were burnt, though it is written, and he [the Kohen] shall burn it on wood with fire, it was nevertheless taught: 'With fire,' but not with boiling lime or boiling gypsum? — Said he to him, How compare! There 'with fire' is written [first] and 'she shall be burnt' after: [hence] it is to include all burnings which are produced by fire;<sup>10</sup> [whereas] here is written, and he shall burn it on wood with fire,' 'with fire' being at the end, to intimate that fire only [is permitted], but not anything

<sup>7</sup> I.e., the derivation from the sons of Aaron.

<sup>8</sup> So that the only alternative left is burning by branches.

<sup>9</sup> Since after all the verse is taken to include all burnings which come from fire.

<sup>10</sup> Since the addition of 'she shall be burnt', after 'with fire' has already been stated, it is superfluous.

<sup>11</sup> Yet he must not leave it until the whole is burning. This is deduced because 'it shall be burnt' is repeated at the end of the sentence, which emphasizes that it is to be entirely burnt in all cases.

else. But there too burning is written at the end, for it is written: where the ashes are poured out shall it be burnt?<sup>11</sup> I will tell you: that 'shall it be burnt' is required for what was taught: 'It shall be burnt': even if no ashes are there; 'it shall be burnt', even if he made the fire catch on to the greater part of it.<sup>11</sup> (75a3 – 75b1)

Ravina said:<sup>12</sup> Unite them and learn: 'A burning by fire': I know it only if it was burnt by fire or with a coal;<sup>13</sup> if it was burnt with hot ashes, boiling lime, boiling gypsum or with anything produced by fire, which includes hot water [heated] by the fire, how do we know it? Therefore 'a burning' is stated twice as an amplification. (75b1)

Rava pointed out a contradiction: Did then Rebbe say [that] coals are designated fire? But the following contradicts it: [And he (the Kohen Gadol) shall take a shovelful of] coals [of fire]: you might think [that] quenched [shouldering] coals are meant;<sup>14</sup> therefore 'fire' is stated. If 'fire', you might think [that] a flame [must be brought]; therefore 'coals of' is stated. How then [is it to be understood]? He must bring of the brightly-burning [coals].<sup>15</sup> Now this is self-contradictory: you say: "'coals," you might think [that] smoldering coals [are meant],' which proves that brightly-burning [coals] are [termed] fire. Then consider the second clause: 'if "fire", you might think [that] a flame [must be brought]; therefore "coals of" is stated,' which proves that even brightly-burning [coals] are not fire? Whereupon Rav Sheishes answered, This is what he teaches: coals: you might think, both smoldering and brightly-burning [can be taken]; therefore

<sup>12</sup> In reply to the contradiction pointed out by Rav Achadvoi.

<sup>13</sup> Coal is included as implied by the term 'fire', and not derived from the repetition of 'a burning', as stated in the original version.

<sup>14</sup> I.e., without a flame, for otherwise they are simply called 'fire'.

<sup>15</sup> Lit., 'whispering,' for when coals are burning brightly they make a slight hissing noise something like a sibilant whisper.

'fire' is stated. if 'fire,' you might think [that] a flame [must be brought]; therefore 'coals of' is stated. How then [is this to be understood]? He must bring of the brightly-burning [coals]. Yet at all events coals are not called fire, which is a difficulty according to Rebbe? — Said Abaye, Explain it thus: *coals of*; you might think smoldering, but not brightly-burning; therefore 'fire' is stated; if 'fire,' you might think, he can bring a flame or a coal, whichever he desires; therefore 'coals of fire' is stated. How then [is it meant]? He must bring of the brightly burning [coals]. Rava asked: [You say] 'He can bring a flame or a coal, as he desires.' [But] how is a flame without a coal possible? [Only] if one smears a vessel with oil and lights a fire in it! [Then] why do I need a verse [to exclude] that? Seeing that you do not do thus before a king of flesh and blood, is it not all the more [forbidden] before the Holy One, Blessed be He! Rather said Rava, Explain it thus: '*coals of*': you might think, smoldering but not brightly-burning; therefore 'fire' is stated; if fire, you might think, let him bring half coal and half flame,<sup>16</sup> so that by the time he carries it within [the Holy of Holies] it is all a coal; therefore it is stated, 'And he shall take a shovelful of coals of fire from off the altar': at the very time of taking they must be coals. (75b1 – 75b2)

The Scholars asked: [Is the word] *omemos*<sup>17</sup> [smoldering] or *omemos*<sup>18</sup>? Rabbi Yitzchak quoted: *The cedars in the garden of God could not hide his [splendor] amamuhu*.<sup>19</sup> (75b2)

<sup>16</sup> E.g., a piece of wood part only of which is well alight.

<sup>17</sup> With an alef.

<sup>18</sup> With an ayin.

<sup>19</sup> *Amamuhu* is with an ayin, and the root really means to dim, darken; similarly, here, smoldering means that the coals are dimmed from their previous radiance.

<sup>20</sup> I.e., the part on to which it dripped. 'Peel' denotes a very thin strip; 'to remove,' the thickness of the finger. The reason is explained in the Gemara.

<sup>21</sup> *Ma'aser sheini* – the second tithe, was brought to Jerusalem and eaten there by its Israelite owners; if it was too

MISHNAH: If it [the pesach offering] touched the earthen[ware] of the oven, he must peel off its place; if some of its gravy dripped on to the earthen[ware] and dripped back on to it, he must remove its place.<sup>20</sup> If some of its gravy fell on the flour, he must take a handful away from its place. If he basted it [the pesach offering] with oil of terumah - if they who registered for it are a company of Kohanim, they may eat [it]; but if Israelites, if it is [yet] raw, let him wash it off; if it is roasted, he must peel off the outer part. If he anointed it with oil of *ma'aser sheini*<sup>21</sup> he must not change its value to the members of the company, because *ma'aser sheini* must not be redeemed in Jerusalem.<sup>22</sup> (75b2 – 75b3)

GEMARA: It was stated: [If] hot matter [falls] into hot,<sup>23</sup> all agree that it is forbidden;<sup>24</sup> cold into cold, all agree that it is permitted.<sup>25</sup> [If] hot [falls] into cold, or cold into hot, — Rav maintained: The upper prevails;<sup>26</sup> while Shmuel maintained: The lower prevails. (75b3 – 76a1)

### INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

The Gemora quotes both Rav Nachman's teaching to choose the best possible death for someone who the Torah says must be put to death, and the *gezeira shaveh* from the sons of Aharon that teaches that the body of someone who is put to death by burning is not consumed by fire. The Gemora explains that we need both teachings

burdensome, they redeemed it and expended the redemption money in Jerusalem.

<sup>22</sup> Even to eat it in Jerusalem as holy food. If the owner of this oil charges the other members for their share, he virtually redeems or sells it as far as he is concerned.

<sup>23</sup> E.g., hot milk into hot meat, or hot forbidden flesh into hot permitted flesh, or vice versa. By 'hot', boiling is meant.

<sup>24</sup> Because each absorbs from the other.

<sup>25</sup> Because they do not absorb from each other.

<sup>26</sup> Thus: if hot falls into cold, the upper heats the lower, and it is tantamount to hot into hot: while if cold falls into hot, it is as cold into cold.

to conclude that we make such a person swallow a burning hot piece of metal. Rashi seemingly understands that the Gemora means that while the gezeira shaveh teaches that despite the fact that one's body is not burned it can still qualify as burning, Rav Nachman was needed to teach that this is the method of death that should be used. Otherwise, other methods would be acceptable.

The Maharshah asks on Rashi that this explanation seems difficult. The Gemora earlier asked that burning the entire person should be acceptable, and answered with the gezeira shaveh above. According to Rashi, how is this an answer? The gezeira shaveh just means that this is also an acceptable method of burning, not that burning the entire person should be excluded!

The Maharsha answers that when the Gemora gave its answer, it thought the one asking the question already knew Rav Nachman's derivation about picking the best mode of death. It thought that the question was merely how we can say that making someone swallow a burning piece of metal fits the definition of burning. This is why the Gemora merely answered with the gezeira shaveh, which is the source that it is called burning.

## DAILY MASHAL

### ***Alef or 'Ayin?***

The scholars asked: *'Omemos' (with an 'alef'), or 'omemos' (with an 'ayin')?* [This refers to coals that have been extinguished but are still glowing.]

Rabbi Yitzchak cited the following verse (as proof): *The cedars in the garden of God could not dim ('amamuhu' with an 'ayin') his splendor.*

"All the letters derived from the same place are interchangeable" (Rashi, Vayikra 19:16). Because of the similarity between alef and 'ayin, Chazal warned soferim

"not to write alefin as 'aynin or 'aynin as alefin" (Shabbos 103b). The similarity of these consonants is the basis for Chazal's derashos based on the interchangeability of alef and 'ayin, as the Gemara says (Berachos 32a): "...And Moshe prayed to Hashem'. Don't read 'to Hashem' ("el Hashem"-אל ) but 'for Hashem' ("al Hashem"-על ), as the yeshivah of Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov read alefin as 'aynin and 'aynin as alefin."

Concerning other consonants derived from the same place (such as gimel and kaf), the distinction between them has been preserved but the distinction between alef and 'ayin faded in Chazal's era so that among some Jews alef and 'ayin became identical in their pronunciation (apparently because of speaking Greek). Therefore Chazal warned that the people of Beis Shean, Beis Chaifah and Tivon should not pronounce the blessing of the kohanim and not serve as shelichei tzibur "because they pronounce alefin as 'aynin and 'aynin as alefin" (Megilah 24b; see Rashi, ibid).

In Chazal's era, most people still distinguished between alef and 'ayin but the great similarity between them sometimes caused doubts, as in our sugya which clarifies how we should learn the word in the mishnah and they had to prove from verses that we should learn "chalav kedai gemiah" (with an alef), "chutz miklipasan vegar'ineihen" (with an 'ayin) and the like.

The confusion between the guttural consonants also influenced Aramaic. In a nearby sugya (77b), the explanation is mentioned for the origin of the word "bikta" (Rashi: "a small, narrow house") as a contraction of the words "bei 'akta" (Rashi: "a narrow house"; see Radak, Amos 2:13). When the two words were combined, the 'ayin in "'akta" disappeared. We should distinguish between between this "bikta" and the "bikta" meaning "field", from which the 'ayin also disappeared, but differently: from "bik'ata" to "bikta".