



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Outside of its Pit

The *Gemora* asks: What does the *Mishna* mean when it says “outside of its pit”?

Rish Lakish says: It means that it (*the red heifer*) is slaughtered outside of the area that was checked (*for any impurity – including grave of the deep, and deemed appropriate*) for its slaughter.

Rabbi Yochanan states: Isn’t all of *Eretz Yisroel* considered checked?

Rather, the case is where he slaughtered it inside of the wall of Yerushalayim (*as opposed to where it was supposed to be slaughtered, which is outside of Yerushalayim*).

The *Gemora* asks: Why don’t we say that the case is where it was slaughtered outside Yerushalayim, but not opposite the entrance of the *Heichal*? This is as Rav Adda bar Ahavah says: If he slaughtered it in a place that was not opposite the opening of the *Heichal* it is invalid, as the verse states: *And he will slaughter...and he will sprinkle*. This teaches that we compare slaughtering to sprinkling. Just as the sprinkling must be done opposite the opening of the *Heichal* or it is invalid, so too the slaughtering must be done opposite the opening of the *Heichal* or it is invalid. If you will say that these *Amoraim* hold that we do not make this comparison, it was taught that in a case where the red heifer was burned in a place that was not opposite the opening of the *Heichal*, Rabbi Yochanan says that it is invalid, while Rabbi Oshaya says it is valid. Rabbi Yochanan says it is invalid due to a comparison of burning to sprinkling. [*Just as the sprinkling must be done*

opposite the opening of the Heichal or it is invalid, so too the burning must be done opposite the opening of the Heichal or it is invalid.] Rabbi Oshaya states that it is valid as the verse states: *al pirshah yisaref (with its dung he shall burn)*. [*One way to understand the word pirshah is separate.*] This teaches us that wherever its life separates from its body (*after it finishes thrashing around*), that is where it can be burned. [*Accordingly, why does Rabbi Yochanan have to say it was slaughtered inside the walls?*]

The *Gemora* answers: Rabbi Yochanan means that certainly the case could be where it was slaughtered outside the walls, very far away from the opening of the *Heichal*. However, it could even be invalid when it was slaughtered inside the walls. (113a)

Corpses in Eretz Yisroel

The master (*Rabbi Yochanan*) had stated: Isn’t all of *Eretz Yisroel* considered checked (*from tumah*)?

The *Gemora* asks: What is the argument between Rish Lakish and Rabbi Yochanan?

The *Gemora* answers: Rish Lakish understands that the great Flood (*of Noach*) went into *Eretz Yisroel (and the bones of the dead settled in the ground, therefore requiring checked areas for the red heifer)*. Rabbi Yochanan understands that it did not.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak states: Both of them derive their positions from the same verse. The verse states: *Son of man, say to her, “You are a land that is not purified, not rained*



upon on the day of anger.” Rabbi Yochanan says: The verse is in the form of a rhetorical question. “*Eretz Yisroel*, are you a land that is not purified?! Did any rain fall on you on the day of anger?!” Rish Lakish says: The verse is as it is simply read. “*Eretz Yisroel*, you are a land that is not pure. Didn’t rain fall on you on the day of anger?”

Rish Lakish asked Rabbi Yochanan a question from a *Mishna*, which states: There were courtyards in Yerushalayim that were built on bedrock (*untouched since Creation, where it would be highly unlikely that a body was buried there*) that had a space (*of at least a tefach*) underneath, in order to contain any impurity from “the grave of the deep.” [*The tefach of airspace blocks the tumah from penetrating the earth above it.*] Pregnant women were brought there, and they would give birth and raise their children in this area in order to be able to draw water for service of the red heifer. When this was ready to be done, they would bring oxen with large doors on their backs upon which these children would sit. The children had stone cups in their hand. They would fill them up, and then go back to their place. [*Doesn’t this indicate that all of Eretz Yisroel is not presumed to be pure?*]

Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua says: This was a special procedure done for the red heifer (*just as many special practices not required by law were done for the red heifer*).

Rabbi Yochanan asked a question on Rish Lakish from a *braisa*, which states: They once found bones in the chamber where they kept the wood for the Temple service, and therefore wanted to decree that all of Yerushalayim should be considered impure. Rabbi Yehoshua stood up and said: Isn’t this an embarrassment and denigration for us, to declare impurity on the city of our forefathers? Where are the dead of the great Flood or the dead of Nevuchadnetzer? It seems that Rabbi Yehoshua was saying that they (*bones from the dead*) are not present in Yerushalayim!?

The *Gemora* answers: According to this, were the people killed by Nevuchadnetzer not killed in Yerushalayim?! Rather,

they were killed there and the residents cleared them out of Yerushalayim. This must mean that the dead of the great Flood were also cleared out of Yerushalayim.

The *Gemora* asks: But they were cleared away (*so what difference does it make that they were once there*)!?

The *Gemora* answers: While it is possible that they were cleared out of Yerushalayim, they were not removed from all of *Eretz Yisroel* (*which is why Rish Lakish holds that Eretz Yisroel is suspect to impurity*).

Some say Rish Lakish asked this as a question on Rabbi Yochanan: Where are the dead of the great Flood or the dead of Nevuchadnetzer? It seems that Rabbi Yehoshua was saying that just as the dead of Nevuchadnetzer were killed in Yerushalayim, so too there were people killed by the flood in Yerushalayim!

The *Gemora* answers: This is not a proof. The people killed by Nevuchadnetzer were killed in Yerushalayim, but the people killed by the flood were not even in *Eretz Yisroel*.

Rish Lakish asked Rabbi Yochanan a question from the following verse: *From everything that was on dry land, they died*. According to me this is understandable, as I say that the Flood even reached *Eretz Yisroel*. However, according to you, why would the people on land in *Eretz Yisroel* have died?

The *Gemora* answers: They died from the intense heat, as per the statement of Rav Chisda. Rav Chisda says: They sinned with a boiling substance (*semen*), and they were punished with boiling water. The verse says: *And the waters calmed*, and the verse also states: *And the anger of the king subsided*. [*Hashem judged them with hot waters until they were killed, at which time the anger of the King subsided.*]

There were those who reported this discussion as follows: Rabbi Yochanan asked Rish Lakish this question. The verse states: *From everything that was on dry land, they died*.



According to my opinion that the Flood did not reach *Eretz Yisroel* this is understandable, as this was the dry land that remained. [He understands the verse implies that there was some dry land.] However, according to you, where was there dry land?

Rish Lakish answers: The verse is referring to the land that used to be dry.

The *Gemora* asks: Why is it called “*charavah*” – “dry land?” [This is an abnormal word to use for land, which is usually referred to as “*Eretz*” or “*yabashah*.”]

The *Gemora* answers: *Charavah* is used to teach the teaching of Rav Chisda. Rav Chisda states: In the generation of the Flood, the decree was not on the fish. This is as the verse states: *From all that were on dry land, they died*. This indicates that the fish did not die.

The *Gemora* asks: This is understandable if one holds the flood did not reach *Eretz Yisroel*, as this is how the *ri'eim* (massive animals, which could not possibly fit into the Ark) survived. However, if one holds the Flood did reach *Eretz Yisroel*, how did they survive?

Rabbi Yannai answered: They brought *ri'eim* cubs into the Ark.

The *Gemora* asks: Didn't Rabbah bar Chanah say that he saw an *urzila* (sea *ri'eim*) that was one day old and looked like it was as big as Mount Tavor. How tall is Har Tavor? It is four *parsaos* tall. The length of its neck was three *parsaos*. When it laid its head on the ground it needed one and a half *parsaos* of space. When it excreted dung, it stuffed up the Jordan River (until the river slowly ate away at its refuse and kept flowing).

Rabbi Yochanan says: they brought its head into the Ark.

The *Gemora* asks: Didn't Rabbah say that its head was one and a half *parsah* long (which was bigger than the entire Ark)?

Rabbi Yochanan answers: It must be that its nose was brought into the Ark (so that it could breath).

The *Gemora* asks: Didn't Rabbi Yochanan say that the flood did not reach *Eretz Yisroel*?

The *Gemora* answers: He said this answer for according to Rish Lakish.

The *Gemora* asks: Didn't the Ark go up and down in the waves? [Its nose should have gotten dislodged from the Ark, causing it to die!]

Rish Lakish says: Its horns were tied to the Ark (causing it to stay fastened to the Ark).

The *Gemora* asks: Didn't Rav Chisda say that they sinned with a boiling substance (*semen*), and they were punished with boiling water!? [The *ri'aim* should have died from the water!?!]

The *Gemora* asks: If this is so, the Ark also should have had its coating melt away (and subsequently sunk)!? Additionally, how could Og, king of Bashan, have survived?

Rather, a miracle occurred that the water near the Ark cooled down. This also allowed the *ri'eim* and Og to survive.

The *Gemora* asks: According to Rish Lakish, even if the Flood was in *Eretz Yisroel*, wouldn't the bodies have washed away to Babylon (being that *Eretz Yisroel* is high up, the bodies would have washed down)!? This is as Rish Lakish himself says that Babylon is called Metzulah (the Deep) as all of the bodies floated down there. Rabbi Yochanan similarly says that Babylon is called Shinar, as all of the bodies were moved there (by the waters).

The *Gemora* answers: It is not possible that there were not some corpses that got stuck in the mud in *Eretz Yisroel*.

Rabbi Avahu says: Why is it called *Shinar*? This is because it throws its rich down (to *Gehinom*, as they do not give charity).

The *Gemora* asks: We see that there are still rich people there!?

The *Gemora* answers: Rich families do not last three generations there.

Rabbi Ami says: Whoever eats from the ground of *Babylon* is like one who eats from the flesh of his forefathers.

The *braisa* also states: Whoever eats from the ground of *Babylon* is like one who eats from the flesh of his forefathers. Some say: He is like one who is eating creepy and crawly creatures. (113a – 113b)

Azazel

The *Mishna* says that if one offered outside the Temple the goat sent to *Azazel*, he is exempt.

The *Gemora* asks a question from a *braisa*, which states: *Or a sacrifice* indicates that one is even liable for sacrificing animals outside the Temple that were dedicated to *hekdesh*. This is as the verse states: *And we will offer the sacrifice of Hashem (and this seemingly is called the sacrifice of Hashem)*. This is why the verse states: *And to the entrance of the Tent of Meeting he did not bring it*. This refers to a sacrifice that is supposed to be brought to the Tent of Meeting, and excludes an animal merely dedicated to *hekdesh* which does not go there. One would think we should exclude *hekdesh* animals, but not the *Azazel* goat, which is supposed to be brought to the Tent of Meeting (*and only after it is chosen it is sent out to Azazel*). This is why the verse states: *To Hashem*, excluding the goat to *Azazel*, which is not

offered in the Temple to Hashem. [*The question is regarding our Mishna's statement that the verse, And to the opening of the Ohel Moed he did not bring it excludes an azazel. Yet, the braisa states that the Azazel is excluded from the verse To Hashem. Which is it?*]

The *Gemora* answers: One verse is for before the lottery, and one is for after the lottery. [*Two goats are taken on Yom Kippur to the Temple. A lottery is performed to see which one is offered as a sacrifice, and which one is the Azazel goat. Before the lottery is done, we require the verse "to Hashem" to exclude this goat. After it is done, the verse, "And to the opening of the Tent of Meeting he did not bring it" excludes it, as it is no longer fit to go to the Temple.*]

The *Gemora* asks: Even after they drew lots, the *Azazel* goat still needs to be in the Temple for the confession said on it!?

Rather, Rav Mani states: One verse is for before the confession, and one is for after the confession. (113b)

DAILY MASHAL

All (the creatures) that were on the land died, but not the fish in the sea

R' Yosef, the son of R' Michel of Zlotchov, once traveled to his Rebbe, R' Yisroel of Ruzhin for a Shabbos. During his stay, he observed that when the Rebbe ate the fish, he was particular to first eat the eyes of the fish. He speculated the reason for this was based on the Chazal that the reason why the fish were the only species not destroyed in the Flood was that they were the only species that remained pure and did not breed with other species. The Talmud Yerushalmi (Brachos 1:5) says that sins of desire always start with the eyes – the eyes see, the heart desires, and the body acts upon those desires. If the fish remained pure, it must be that they were careful to guard their eyes, and this is why his Rebbe ate from their eyes before anything else. His Rebbe then confirmed this has been the meaning behind his actions.