



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

### Pesachim Daf Nun Beis

KAYOTZEI BO HAMOLEICH PEIROS SHEVI'IS...

- **Q:** The Gemara understands that **R' Yehuda** is saying, if one goes from a place in which the fruits are still in the field to a place in which they are no longer in the field, he may still store the fruits in his house, because he can tell the people to go to the place that he came from and get fruit over there. How does **R' Yehuda** allow that? Doesn't he agree that one must follow the stringencies of the place he is going to!? **A: R' Shisha the son of R' Idi** said, the Mishna is discussing a case where he went from a place that had fruit in the field to another place that had fruit in the field. After arriving in the new place, the old place no longer had fruit remaining in the field. The **T"K** says that the traveler must therefore return the fruit to the field (based on the place that he left). **R' Yehuda** says that he may tell them, you can come to where I am now and take fruit as well, and he therefore need not return the fruit to the field.
  - **Q:** We find that **R' Elazar** says that **R' Yehuda** is stating a chumra, not a kulah, so this can't be the proper explanation of the Mishna!? **A:** Reverse the shitas so that the **T"K** said he need not return the fruit to the field, and **R' Yehuda** says that he must.
  - **A: Abaye** said, the Mishna is discussing a case where he went from a place that had fruit remaining in the field to a place that did not, but he then went and returned to the place that he left, with the fruit. The **T"K** says he need not return the fruit to the field. **R' Yehuda** says, he must return the fruit to the field, because the people can tell him, you are returning from a place that had no fruit remaining in the field.
  - **Q: R' Ashi** asked, the fruit is from the first place, and now it is back in the first place. Just because it passed through the second place (which doesn't have fruit in the field) it must now be put into the field!? **A:** Rather, **R' Ashi** said, the **T"K and R' Yehuda** are arguing in the machlokes of Tanna'im of a Mishna. The Mishna says, if one soaks (to preserve) 3 different vegetables together on shmita, **R' Eliezer** says, as soon as one of those vegetables can no longer be found in the field, all 3 being soaked may no longer be kept and eaten. **R' Yehoshua** says, as long as one of the 3 is still found in the field, all of the 3 may be stored and eaten. **R' Gamliel** says, each species is viewed separately, and as long as it is available in the field, that species may be eaten. This is the subject of our Mishna as well. The **T"K** of our Mishna is meikel like **R' Yehoshua**, and **R' Yehuda** is machmir like **R' Gamliel**.
  - **A: Ravina** said, the machlokes in our Mishna is regarding the subject of a machlokes in another Mishna. The Mishna says, one may store and eat dates as long as it is available in the fields somewhere in the region (the 3 regions are Yehuda, the other side of the Yarden, and the Galil). **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, one may eat dates only if it is available among the branches of the tree in a field, not based on it being available among the thorns of the tree trunk. The **T"K** of our Mishna holds like the **T"K** of that Mishna, that even availability among the thorns allows for storing and eating of the dates. **R' Yehuda** is machmir like **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**, and allows storing based on availability among the branches only.
- A Mishna says, there are 3 regions for the "biur" obligation – Yehuda, the other side of the Yarden, and the Galil. Each region may store and eat produce during shmita if that species still remains in a field of that region. **R' Chama bar Ukva in the name of R' Yose bar Chanina** said, we learn this from the pasuk that says "b'artzecha", which teaches that since the animals from one region would not travel to another region to look for food, the "biur" obligation is only based on the availability within one's region.

- A Braisa says, fruits that were taken out of Eretz Yisrael on shmita, but are no longer available in that region, may be placed back into the field outside of Eretz Yisrael. **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says they must be returned to Eretz Yisrael, based on the pasuk of “b’artzecha”.
  - **R' Safra** took wine from Eretz Yisrael on shmita, and was unsure whether it needed to be returned to Eretz Yisrael to be placed back into a field or whether that was allowed to be done where he was (it was no longer available in the fields). He asked **R' Huna the son of R' Ika** and **R' Kahana** whether they had heard how **R' Avahu** had paskened regarding the above Braisa. **R' Kahana** said that **R' Avahu** paskened like **R' Shimon ben Elazar** and the wine must be returned to Eretz Yisrael. **R' Huna** said that **R' Avahu** paskened like the **T”K** and the wine need not be brought back to Eretz Yisrael. **R' Safra** said, we will follow **R' Huna**, because he is more particular about being exact with his rebbi’s words.
- **R' Illai** chopped down a palm tree that had tiny, unripe dates on it, during shmita (thereby destroying the fruit), for its wood.
  - **Q:** The Torah says that shmita fruit may not be destroyed!? We can’t answer that these unripe dates are not called “fruit”, because we find that **R' Nachman** says regarding “orlah” that the small fruit that accompany the actual fruit are considered to be fruit!? **A: R' Nachman** follows **R' Yose**, but the **Rabanan** argue and say that it is not considered to be a fruit.
    - **Q: R' Simi from Neharda’ah** asks, we see in a Mishna that the **Rabanan** only argue regarding the tiny fruits of grapes, carobs, and olives. However, they would agree that these tiny dates are considered fruit!? **A: R' Illai** chopped down a male date tree, whose fruits never fully ripen and are therefore not considered to be fruit.