



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

### Pesachim Daf Chuf Beis

- **R' Avahu** said that whenever the Torah says that "one may not eat" something, the item becomes assur to benefit from as well.
  - **Q: R' Yitzchok Nafcha** asked, the Torah says that one may not eat the "gid hanasheh", and yet a Mishna says that one may benefit from it by giving it to a goy!? **A:** Gid hanasheh is different, because **R' Avahu** holds that when the Torah permitted benefitting from a neveilah, it meant to include all parts of the neveilah (the meat, the fats and the gid hanasheh) as well.
    - **Q:** That is correct according to the shita that says that the gid hanasheh has "flavor" and is considered a piece of meat. However, according to the shita that says that the gid hanasheh is like a "piece of wood", it cannot be said to be included in the permit of the neveilah as a whole!? **A: R' Shimon** is the one who says that the gid is "like a piece of wood", and he also holds that it is assur to benefit from the gid, which is the way it should be according to **R' Avahu**.
  - **Q:** The Torah says that one may not eat blood, and yet a Mishna says that the blood of the korbonos would flow into the Kidron Valley, and would be used as fertilizer!? **A:** The pasuk compares blood to water when it says "ahl ha'aretz tishpichenu kamayim", to teach that just as it is permitted to benefit from water, so too it is permitted to benefit from blood.
    - **Q:** Maybe the pasuk is referring to water used on the Mizbe'ach, which is also assur to benefit from!? **A: R' Avahu** says, the pasuk refers to ordinary water, which is mutar.
      - **Q:** The pasuk doesn't say it is referring to ordinary water!? **A: R' Ashi** says the pasuk refers to water that is "spilled" onto the ground, not water that is "poured" onto the Mizbe'ach.
      - **Q:** Maybe the pasuk refers to water offered for avodah zarah, which is assur to benefit from!? **A:** That would also be water that is "poured" and the pasuk refers to water that is "spilled".
    - **Q:** According to **Chizkiya** (who says the pasuk is not needed to teach that), what does the comparison of blood to water teach? **A:** It teaches the din of **R' Yochanan**, that blood of korbonos is not machshir l'kabel tumah.
  - **Q:** The Torah says that one may not eat "eiver min hachai", and yet a Braisa says that one is permitted to benefit from it!? **A:** The pasuk compares eiver min hachai to blood, to teach that just as it is permitted to benefit from blood, it is permitted to benefit from eiver min hachai.
    - **Q:** According to **Chizkiya** (who says the pasuk is not needed to teach that), what does the comparison of eiver min hachai to blood teach? **A:** It teaches that eating (certain) blood from a living animal is assur and carries the kares penalty.
  - **Q:** The Torah prohibits eating ("lo yei'acheil") from an animal that was stoned by Beis Din, and a Braisa says that the words in the pasuk of "u'bal hashor naki" teach that the animal is assur to benefit from as well. We see that "lo yei'acheil" by itself does not mean a prohibition of benefit!? This is problematic according to **R' Avahu and Chizkiya**!? **A:** The pasuk said "lo yei'acheil es bisaro", so we would have thought that only the meat is prohibited to benefit from. The words "u'bal hashor naki" teach that even the hide of the animal is assur b'hana'ah.
    - **Q:** There are shitos who use "u'bal hashor naki" for different teachings. How do they know that the hide is assur b'hana'ah? **A:** They learn it from "es bisaro".

- The ones who learn it from “u’bal hashor naki” don’t learn anything from the word “es”.
- **Q:** The Torah prohibits eating (“lo yei’acheil”) from the fruits of a tree during its first 3 years (“orlah”). A Braisa says that additional words in the pasuk teach that the fruits are also assur b’hana’ah. We see that “lo yei’acheil” does not mean a prohibition of benefit!?! This is problematic according to **R’ Avahu and Chizkiya**!?! **A:** The reason we need the additional words to teach that is because that pasuk says “lachim”, which seems to say that benefit is permitted. That’s why the pasuk needs a separate teaching that it is not.
  - **Q:** Why does the pasuk need to say the word “lachim” altogether? **A:** There is a machlokes in a Braisa. The **T”K** says “lachim” teaches that even a tree planted for the public is subject to the halachos of orlah. **R’ Yehuda** says “lachim” teaches that the halachos do not apply to trees planted for the public.