



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

### Pesachim Daf Pey Daled

#### MISHNA

- Whatever is considered edible in a mature ox is considered edible in a young goat, including the ends of the shoulder blades and other cartilage.

#### GEMARA

- **Q: Rabbah** asked, the beginning of the Mishna seems to say that something not eaten from a mature ox is not considered edible in a young goat (and is not included in the meat to be divided among the owners of a Pesach), but the Mishna then says that the ends of the shoulder blades and other cartilage, which are not edible from a mature ox, are considered edible from a goat!? **A:** It is a machlokes in the Mishna. The **T"K** says that only things edible in a mature ox are considered edible in a young goat, and the Mishna then brings another shita that says that even the ends of the shoulder blades of a young goat are also considered edible. **A2: Rava** said, the Mishna means to say, anything that is eaten from a mature ox, even if only eaten after much cooking, is considered edible to be eaten from a young goat, even if only roasted. The Mishna then explains, this is referring to the ends of the shoulder blades, etc.
- Regarding the sinews of the neck of a young sheep or goat, that are soft and will ultimately harden if left to mature: **R' Yochanan** says they may be divided as meat of the Pesach, since in their current state they are soft and edible, and **Reish Lakish** says they may not be divided as meat of the Pesach, because in their final, mature state they are hard and inedible.
  - **Q: Reish Lakish** asked, the Mishna says that the ends of the shoulder blades may be eaten. This seems to exclude sinews which will eventually harden!? **A: R' Yochanan** said, the Mishna merely gives an example of something which becomes edible after much cooking. The same halacha would therefore apply to sinews.
  - **Q: R' Yirmiya** told **R' Avin**, when you go to **R' Avahu**, ask him how **R' Yochanan** could say that the sinews are considered edible, because we follow the current state. We find that **R' Yochanan** says, the soft skin of the head of a calf cannot become tamei as food because it will eventually harden and become inedible. We see that he does not follow the current state!? **A: R' Avahu** answered, **R' Yochanan** retracted his shita and said that we do not follow the current state. One statement was made before the retraction and one was made after.

#### MISHNA

- One who breaks a bone of a valid Pesach gets malkus. One who leaves meat of a Pesach overnight, and one who breaks the bone of a Pesach that is tamei does not get malkus.

#### GEMARA

- One who leaves meat of a Pesach overnight does not get malkus according to **R' Yehuda** because the Torah connects the lo sasei to an assei ("lo sosiru mimenu ahd boker, v'hanosar mimenu ahd boker b'ais tisrofu"), which results in there being no malkus penalty on the lo saasei. According to **R' Yaakov** the reason is because it is a lav that is not brought about through an action, and therefore does not carry a malkus penalty. The reason one who breaks the bone of a tamei Pesach does not get malkus is because the pasuk says "v'etzem lo sishbiru vo", which teaches that the issur only applies to a valid Pesach.

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “v’etzem lo sishbiru vo”, which teaches that the issur of breaking bones only applies to a valid Pesach. **Rebbi** says, the same pasuk tells us that the Pesach must be eaten in one house, and therefore teaches that only a Pesach that is fit to be eaten is included in the issur of breaking bones.
  - **Q:** What is the point of difference between the **T”K** and **Rebbi**?
    - **R’ Yirmiya** said, the difference would be a Pesach that is brought in tumah. Since tumah of the tzibbur is not an all-out permit, but only overrides the tumah prohibition, it is not considered “valid” and according to the **T”K** would not be subject to the issur of breaking bones. According to **Rebbi**, since it is fit to be eaten, bones may not be broken.
    - **R’ Yosef** said, the difference would be a Pesach that had a time when it was valid before becoming invalid. According to the **T”K** it would be considered “valid”. According to **Rebbi**, since it is not fit to be eaten, its bones may be broken.
    - **Abaye** said, the difference would be whether bones may be broken on Erev Pesach. According to the **T”K** they may not. According to **Rebbi**, since it is not yet fit to be eaten, its bones may be broken.
      - **Q:** A Braisa says that the marrow of the thigh bone of a Pesach is not among the meat to be divided. If the bones may be broken on Erev Pesach, why can’t the bone be broken then and the marrow removed and eaten!? **A:** We don’t do that as a gezeirah that it may lead one to break the bones at night.
    - **R’ Pappa** said, the difference would be regarding a limb that has partially left Yerushalayim. The **T”K** would say that since part of the limb is still valid, its bones may not be broken. **Rebbi** would say that the part that has left is not fit to be eaten and therefore its bones may be broken.
    - **R’ Sheishes the son of R’ Idi** said, the difference would be regarding breaking the bone of a Pesach that is only partially roasted. According to the **T”K**, the Pesach is valid and therefore it is assur to break its bones. According to **Rebbi**, it may not be eaten in that state and the issur of breaking bones therefore does not apply.
    - **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, the difference would be regarding breaking the bone of the tail of a sheep. According to the **T”K** it would be assur, because the korbon is valid. According to **Rebbi**, since the tail may not be eaten, the issur of breaking bones does not apply.
    - **R’ Ashi** said, the difference would be regarding a bone that has less than a kezayis of meat on it. It is part of a valid korbon and the issur of breaking bones would therefore apply according to the **T”K**. According to **Rebbi**, since there is less than a kezayis of meat (which is the minimum required amount that must be eaten of the Pesach) on it, the issur of breaking bones does not apply.
    - **Ravina** said, the difference would be regarding a bone that has less than a kezayis of meat on the part of the bone that he wants to break, but has a kezayis of meat on another part of the bone. According to the **T”K**, it is part of a valid korbon and therefore may not be broken. According to **Rebbi**, the issur only applies to a part of the bone that has a kezayis of meat on it.
- **R’ Yochanan** said, a bone that does not have a kezayis of meat on it in one place, but has it in another, is subject to the issur of breaking bones. **Reish Lakish** said, it is not.
  - **Q:** **R’ Yochanan** asked, a Braisa says, the pasuk of “v’etzem lo sishbiru vo” teaches that the issur applies whether there is a kezayis of meat on the bone or not. Now, the Braisa cannot be referring to a bone with absolutely no meat on it, so it must be referring to a bone that does not have a kezayis in one place, but has it in another place, and we see that it is subject to the issur!? **A:** **Reish Lakish** answered, the Braisa means to say that whether there is a kezayis of meat on the outside, or a kezayis of meat on the inside (i.e. marrow) at the place of the breaking, it is subject to the issur of breaking bones.