



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Pesachim Daf Ayin Hey

EIN TZOLIN ESS HAPESACH...

- **Q:** Why is the Mishna bringing a story that refutes the halacha it just stated!? **A:** The Mishna should say, if the grill has large spaces so that the animal can be hung over the open fire without touching the metal grates, it is mutar to roast the Pesach on it. The story was also with such a grill and therefore acts as a proof to the halacha.
- **Q: R' Chinina bar Idi** asked, if one heats an oven with peels of "orlah", but then sweeps out all the coals and bakes bread with the heat remaining in the oven, according to the shitah who holds that bread baked when those coals are present would be assur (because it is made by benefitting from orlah), would this bread be mutar? **A: R' Ada bar Ahava** said, it would be mutar.
 - **Q: R' Chinina bar Idi** asked, it was said in the name of **R' Yochanan**, if one roasts a Pesach in the heat of an oven of which the coals have been removed, it is passul because it was not "roasted by fire". The Torah teaches this to us by writing "tzli aish" twice in the pasuk. It would seem from here, that elsewhere (other than Pesach) the heat of an oven from which the coals have been removed would be considered as coming "from the fire", and the bread should be assur as having been baked by orlah!? **A: R' Ada bar Ahava** said, we learn from the psukim by Pesach to all other cases that this is not considered to be "of the fire". **A2:** Regarding Pesach, where the concern is that it must be roasted by fire, the Torah has to tell us that heat without coals is not considered "fire". Regarding orlah, the concern is the benefitting of the assur coals, and they are no longer here.
- A Braisa says, if one cut the Pesach (leaving it attached but facilitating quicker roasting) and placed it over coals, **Rebbi** says that is considered to be "roasted by fire".
 - **Q: R' Achdivoi bar Ami** asked, a Braisa says, regarding tzara'as the Torah says "a burn from fire" is subject to its own set of halachos. How do I know that a burn from coals, ashes, lime, or boiling water is also included in this? The Torah says the word "michva" twice. It seems, if not for the pasuk we would say that coals are not considered "fire"!? **A: R' Chisda** answered, **Rebbi** was discussing wood coals, which are certainly considered to be "fire". The pasuk stated "michva" twice to include even metal coals, which we would not know are considered "fire" (because they do not actually burn in the fire).
 - **Q:** When the daughter of a Kohen is sentenced to burning, the pasuk says "ba'aish tisareif", and **R' Masnah** explains that she is burned by putting boiling metal down her throat. We see that metal is considered "aish"!? **A:** The word "tisareif" teaches that all methods of burning are considered "fire" in that case.
 - **Q:** That would mean that actual fire can surely be used to burn her. Why do we use liquid metal!? **A:** We learn a gezeirah shava from the sons of Aharon, which teaches that just like they were only burned on the inside, but their bodies remained intact, so too the daughter of a Kohen must be burned in the same way.
 - **Q:** Why not use boiling water? **A: R' Nachman** teaches that we must pick the kindest method of death. Liquid metal kills faster and less painfully.

- **Q:** If we have **R' Nachman's** halacha, why do we need the gezeirah shava? **A:** We would not have known that a burning of only the insides is considered to be "burning".
- **Q:** What does "ba'aish" in the pasuk teach? **A:** That the metal must be heated in fire, not just naturally hot.
- **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked, how can we say that "ba'aish tisareif" includes all forms of burning? The pasuk says that certain chataos must be burned "v'saraf oso ahl eitzim ba'aish", and a Braisa says this means that it must be burned by fire, not by other methods of burning!? **A: R' Zeira** said, when the pasuk says "ba'aish tisareif", the "tisareif" is adding methods onto the "aish". By the chataos, where the pasuk says "aish" at the end, it is saying that only fire is permissible.
 - **Q:** By the chataos the pasuk ends off "ahl shefech deshen yisareif", so it includes all forms of burning!? **A:** That word "yisareif" is used by a Braisa for another drasha, and is therefore not available to teach that.
- **Ravina** says, the Braisa regarding tzara'as should be read to group a burn by coals with a burn by fire. According to that reading, the Braisa agrees with **Rebbi**.
- **Q: Rava** asked, how can **Rebbi** say that coals are referred to as "aish"? A Braisa, which discusses the "gachalei aish" that must be brought by the Kohen Gadol into the Kodesh Hakadashim says, if the pasuk were to just say "gachalei" we would think that coals with a small flame and even those without may be used. The pasuk therefore says "aish" – they must be fiery. If the pasuk were to just say "aish" we would think that even a plain flame may be brought in. The pasuk therefore says "gachalei". We see from here that coals are not included in "aish"!? **A: Abaye** said, the Braisa means to say, if the pasuk would just say "gachalei" we would think that only coals without a flame may be used. If the pasuk would just say "aish" we would think that coals with a flame, or a plain flame may be used. The pasuk says both to teach that it should be a flaming coal, not a plain flame. We see that "aish" does include coals.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, a plain flame means that one would grease a piece of a keili, set it on fire, and bring it in. Why would we need a pasuk to teach us that it shouldn't be done in that way? One wouldn't present in that way to a human king, surely it shouldn't be done for Hashem!? **A: Rava** said, we would have thought that the Kohen Gadol can take a piece of wood that is half coal and half plain flame, so that by the time he enters it will be all coal. The pasuk teaches that it must be all coal at the time the Kohen Gadol takes it, not only when he brings it in.