



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

1. One could use metal rods to help roast the korban pesach if it is placed far away from the actual korban.

We explained earlier that the korban pesach has to be roasted by fire, not other things heated by fire. This is why a metal spit cannot be used, as the metal itself will heat the korban pesach. However, the Gemora says that if metal rods are used to hold up the wooden spit (of pomegranate), and the metal is far away from the body of the korban pesach, this is permitted.

2. The Gemora explains the source of the law that a fire has to roast the korban pesach, and not merely heat that came from a fire.

The Gemora says that if someone would make a fire in an oven, and then put it out and stick his korban pesach in the oven, it is not considered “tzli aish” -- “roasted by fire” despite the fact that the oven is extremely hot. Being that the Torah twice said the words “tzli aish,” the emphasis implies that the fire must be present and directly roasting the korban, as opposed to a fire that was put out and the heat remains (or a metal bar that was heated by fire).

3. When the Torah says that someone must be burned, it does not mean that his body should be enveloped in fire.

The Gemora says that we derive this from the sons of Aharon HaKohen. Just as the Torah states that they were burned, when it is clear from the verses that their insides were burned but their body remained intact, also when the Torah mandates that a person be killed by burning, it means that they should be burned in a way that leaves their body outside intact. [They are made to swallow a burning hot piece of metal.]

4. When deducing from the Torah methods of capital punishment, we always try to understand that it is an easier form of death rather than a more difficult form of death.

Rav Nachman derives this from the verse “And you should love your friend as yourself.” This indicates, he maintains, that when we have to put someone to death, we should still try to choose the one that causes the least suffering. Accordingly, if the Torah would indicate that many ways are acceptable, we should choose the most painless method possible that first the Torah’s guidelines.

5. Rava pointed out the following contradiction: Did Rebbe in fact say that coals are designated as “fire”? But the following *braisa* contradicts it: [And he (the Kohen Gadol) shall take a shovelful of fiery coals from atop the Altar.] Now, if the Torah would have merely

stated 'coals,' you might then think that smoldering coals are meant; therefore 'fiery' is stated. If 'fire' was stated, you might have thought that a flame must be brought; therefore 'coals' were stated. How then is it to be understood? He must bring of the flickering coals.

Now this is self-contradictory: You said: If the Torah would have merely stated 'coals,' you might then think that smoldering coals are meant, which proves that flickering coals are regarded as 'fire.' Then consider the second clause: If 'fire' was stated, you might have thought that a flame must be brought; therefore 'coals' were stated. This proves that even flickering coals are not regarded as 'fire.' Whereupon Rav Sheishes answered: This is what he teaches: If the Torah would have merely stated 'coals,' you might then think that smoldering or flickering coals may be taken; therefore 'fiery' is stated. And 'fire' was stated, you might have thought that a flame must be brought; therefore 'coals' were stated. How then is it to be understood? He must bring of the flickering coals.

Yet, at any rate, Rava concludes, coals (even if they are flickering) are not regarded as 'fire,' which is a difficulty according to Rebbe!?

Abaye said: Explain it as follows: If the Torah would have merely stated 'coals,' you might then think that smoldering coals must be taken but not flickering ones; therefore 'fiery' is stated. And if 'fire' was stated, you might have thought that if he wants he may bring a flame, or, if he wants he may bring coals; therefore 'coals' were stated. How then is it to be understood? He must bring of the flickering coals.

[Accordingly, the *braisa* is in agreement with Rebbe that flickering coals are regarded as 'fire.']

Rava said: You said: You might have thought that if he wants he may bring a flame, or, if he wants he may bring coals. But how is it possible for a flame to exist without a coal? It must be where 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 like this before a king of flesh and blood, is it not all the more forbidden before the King of kings, the Holy One, Blessed be He!?

Rather, Rava said: Explain the *braisa* as follows: If the Torah would have merely stated 'coals,' you might then think that smoldering coals must be taken but not flickering ones; therefore 'fiery' is stated. And if 'fire' was stated, you might have thought that he may bring half coal and half flame, so that by the time he enters the Holy of Holies, it will be completely coal; therefore it is stated: And he shall take a shovelful of coals of fire from atop the Altar. At the very time of the taking they must be coals.

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.*

6. Mishna: If it (the korban pesach) touched the earthenware of the oven, he must peel off its place. [Rashi explains that this is because that area is not considered to be "tzli aish," as it was not directly

roasted by the fire, but rather was probably heated by the wall of the oven.] If some of its gravy dripped onto the earthenware and dripped back on to it, he must remove its place (for it absorbed deeply into the meat). If some of its gravy fell on the flour, he must take a handful away from its place.

If he smeared (the korban pesach) with oil of terumah, then if they who registered for it are a company of Kohanim, they may eat it; but if they are Israelites, if it is still raw, let him rinse it; if it is roasted, he must peel off the outer part. If he smeared it with oil of ma'aser sheini, he must not charge its value to the members of the company, because ma'aser sheini must not be sold in Jerusalem.

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 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 Maharshal 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 this “bikta” and the “bikta” meaning “field”, from which the ‘ayin also disappeared, but differently: from “bik’ata” to “bikta”.