

27 Kislev 5781  
Dec. 13, 2020



Pesachim Daf 22

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

**Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Rabbi Yitzchak Nafcha objected: But what of the gid hanasheh, though the Divine Law said: Therefore the children of Israel shall not eat not the gid hanasheh, yet we learned: A man may send the thigh [of an animal] to a gentile with the gid hanasheh in it, because its place is distinguishable!<sup>1</sup> — Rabbi Avahu holds, when neveilah was permitted [by the Torah], its forbidden fat, and its thigh sinew were permitted.<sup>2</sup> This is well on the view that the sinews possess the power of imparting a taste.<sup>3</sup> But on the view that the sinews possess no power of imparting a taste,<sup>4</sup> what can be said? — Whom do you know to maintain [that] the sinews have no power to communicate taste? Rabbi Shimon. For it was taught: He who eats of the gid hanasheh of a non-kosher animal, — Rabbi Yehudah declares him liable on two [accounts],<sup>5</sup> while Rabbi Shimon holds him non-culpable.<sup>6</sup> [According to] Rabbi Shimon, It is indeed forbidden for use too. For it was taught: The gid hanasheh is permitted for use; this is Rabbi Yehudah's view; but Rabbi Shimon forbids it. (22a2)

<sup>1</sup> The Jew need not remove the gid hanasheh before sending it, for fear that another Jew, seeing that the gentile had received it from a Jew, may think that the nerve has been removed and that it is all permitted, because one can easily recognize whether the gid hanasheh has been removed or not. Giving anything to a gentile is regarded as benefit, and we thus see that the benefit of this sinew is permitted, which conflicts with Rabbi Avahu.

<sup>2</sup> Therefore benefit from all forbidden fat and all sinews is permitted.

<sup>3</sup> E.g., if forbidden sinews are boiled together with meat, they impart a flavor to the meat, which renders that too forbidden, unless it is sixty times as much as the sinews. On that view the sinews are as flesh, and therefore when neveilah was permitted it included the sinews.

<sup>4</sup> Because they are not flesh, being merely like wood, and nevertheless they are prohibited: hence they cannot be included in the permission granted for neveilah.

<sup>5</sup> (i) Because it is of a non-kosher (i.e., forbidden) animal; (ii) because the thigh sinew itself is forbidden.

But what of blood, of which the Divine Law said: No soul of you shall eat blood, yet we learned: Both these and those<sup>7</sup> mingled in the duct and passed out to the brook of Kidron, and they were sold to gardeners as fertilizers, and is subject to meilah in respect of them?<sup>8</sup> — Blood is different, because it is likened to water, for it is written: You shall not eat it, you shall pour it out upon the earth as water: just as water is permitted, so is blood permitted. Yet say, like water poured out as libations upon the altar?<sup>9</sup> — Said Rabbi Avahu: ‘as water’ [means] like most water. Is then ‘most water’ written? — Rather, said Rav Ashi: ‘as water’ which is poured out, but not as water offered as a libation. Yet say, like water which is poured out in idol worship?<sup>10</sup> — There too it is designated a libation, as it is written: They drink the wine of their drink offering [libation]. Now according to Chizkiyah, in respect of what law is blood likened to water?<sup>11</sup> — For [the law of] Rabbi Chiya bar Abba in Rabbi Yochanan's name. For Rabbi Chiya

<sup>6</sup> He is not culpable on account of the non-kosher animal, because he holds that there is no taste in the sinew. Nor is he liable on account of the sinew, for this involves liability only when the flesh of that animal is permitted, but not when the flesh too is forbidden.

<sup>7</sup> The residues of the blood of the ‘inner’ sin-offerings, which were poured out on the western base of the outer altar, and the residues of the blood of the ‘outer’ sin-offerings, which were poured out on the south base of the altar. These passed out through two small holes and mingled in a duct which ran through the Temple Court.

<sup>8</sup> I.e., one may not benefit from them without paying. — Yet we see that benefit may be derived from blood in general.

<sup>9</sup> Benefit of which is forbidden.

<sup>10</sup> Such water too is forbidden.

<sup>11</sup> Since he holds that only the passive form, ‘shall not be eaten’, implies a prohibition of all benefit, but not the active ‘you shall not eat’, benefit from blood is permitted in any case, for the prohibition is not expressed in the passive. Then what is the purpose of assimilating blood to water?

bar Abba said in Rabbi Yochanan's name: How do we know that the blood of sacrifices does not make [anything] fit [to become tamei]? Because it is said, you shall pour it out upon the earth as water: blood which is poured out as water renders fit; blood which is not poured out as water does not render fit. (22a3 – 22b1)

But what of the limb of a living animal, though it is written, you shall not eat the life with the flesh, yet it was taught. Rabbi Nassan said: How do we know that a man must not hold out a cup of wine to a nazir or the limb of a living animal to the children of Noach?<sup>12</sup> Because it is stated: you shall not put a stumbling-block before the blind.<sup>13</sup> This implies that [giving] to dogs is permitted? — The limb of a living animal is different, because it is assimilated to blood, as it is written: Only be steadfast in not eating the blood; for the blood is the life. - Then according to Chizkiyah, in respect of what law is the limb from a living animal assimilated to blood? — He can answer you: It is blood which is assimilated to the limb from a living animal: just as a limb from a living animal is forbidden,<sup>14</sup> so is the blood from a living animal forbidden,<sup>15</sup> and which [blood] is that? The blood of arteries with which life goes out. (22b1 – 22b2)

But what of the ox that is stoned, though the Divine Law said: its flesh shall not be eaten, yet it was taught: From the implication of the verse, the ox shall be surely stoned, do I not know that it is neveilah, and neveilah is forbidden as food? Why then is it stated, 'and its flesh shall not be eaten'? The Torah informs us that if it was [ritually] slaughtered after its trial was ended, it is forbidden. I only know this in respect of eating; how do we know it in respect of benefit? From the verse: but the owner of the

ox shall be clear. How is this implied? Shimon ben Zoma said: As a man may say to his friend, 'So-and-so has gone out clear from his property, and has no benefit whatsoever from it.' Thus the reason is that 'but the owner of the ox shall be clear' is written; for if [we deduced] from 'it shall not be eaten' [alone], that would imply a prohibition of eating, but not a prohibition of benefit? — In truth 'it shall not be eaten' implies a prohibition of eating and a prohibition of benefit, and as to 'but the owner of the ox shall be clear,' that is stated in respect of the use of its skin; and it is necessary: you would think that I might argue, 'his flesh shall not be eaten' is written, [thus] only his flesh [is forbidden], but not his skin; therefore we are informed [otherwise]. But according to those Tannaim who employ this verse for a different exegesis, [viz..] for half ransom and damages for children,<sup>16</sup> how do they know [that] the use of the hide [is forbidden]? They infer it from 'es besaro' - [his flesh], meaning, that which is joined to its flesh. And the other? — He does not interpret 'es'. As it was taught, Shimon Haamsoni — others state, Nechemiah Haamsoni — interpreted every 'es' in the Torah, [but] as soon as he came to, you shall fear [es] Hashem your God, he desisted.<sup>17</sup> Said his disciples to him, 'Master, what is to happen with all the 'esin' which you have interpreted?' 'Just as I received reward for interpreting them', he replied, 'so will I receive reward for retracting'. Subsequently, Rabbi Akiva came and taught: You shall fear [es] Hashem your God is to include scholars. (22b2 – 22b3)

But there is orlah, whereof the Merciful One said: Three years shall it be forbidden unto you: it shall not be eaten; yet it was taught: 'It shall be as forbidden unto you: it shall not be eaten'. [Thus] I only know the prohibition of eating;

<sup>12</sup> The technical designation for all but Jews. A nazir must not drink wine, nor may non-Jews eat of the limb of a living animal.

<sup>13</sup> This is understood metaphorically: do not lead anyone to sin.

<sup>14</sup> With the prohibition that is stated in its case, i.e., for eating only.

<sup>15</sup> With the prohibition relevant to blood, viz., an injunction which involves kares.

<sup>16</sup> It might be thought, by comparing these verses, that half ransom is payable in this case. I might think that the same holds good when the damage is done by a man's ox; therefore 'but the owner of the ox shall be clear teaches that he is free from both.

<sup>17</sup> Holding it impossible that this fear should extend to another.



from where do we know that a man may not benefit from it, that he may not dye or light a lamp with it? From the verse: then you shall count [its fruit] as forbidden: [three years shall they be] as forbidden [unto you]: it shall not be eaten; which is to include all of them. Thus the reason is that Scripture wrote, 'then you shall count its fruit as forbidden . . . they shall be as forbidden; but if it were not so, I would say, it implies a prohibition of eating, [but] it does not imply a prohibition of benefit? — In truth 'it shall not be eaten' implies both a prohibition of eating and a prohibition of benefit, but there it is different, because it is written, 'unto you', and thus it is necessary: I might argue, since it is written, 'unto you,' [that implies] it shall be yours; hence we are informed [that it is not so]. Then now that these verses<sup>34</sup> are written, what is the purpose of 'unto you'? - For what was taught: 'unto you': this is to include what is planted for the public. Rabbi Yehudah said: It is to exclude what is planted for the public. What is the reason of the first Tanna? Because it is written, 'and you shall have planted;' [this] implies [a law] to the individual, but it does not imply [a law] for the public; [therefore] the Merciful One wrote, 'unto you', to include what is planted for the public. While Rabbi Yehudah [argues]: 'and you shall have planted' implies [a law] both to the public and to the individual, and 'unto you' [too] implies both for the public and for the individual: thus it is an extension after an extension, and an extension after an extension has no [other significance] save to limit. (22b3 – 23a1)

## DAILY MASHAL

### Titles of Honor For *Talmidei Chachamim*

Our *daf* relates that Shimon HaAmsoni would expound on all verses in the Torah that contain the word *es*. He assumed that every time the word appeared, it came to include additional information. When they reached the verse (*Devarim* 6:13), "*Es Hashem, your G-d, you shall fear,*" Shimon HaAmsoni did not expound on the verse, since he maintained that nothing should be feared besides

Hashem. R. Akiva, however, maintained that *talmidei chachamim* could be included in the commandment to fear Hashem.

According to the *Zohar* (*Parshas Bo*, pg. 38) the verse, "Three times during the year shall all of your menfolk appear before the Lord, Hashem" (*Shemos* 23:17) is a reference to R. Shimon Bar Yochai. Yet how could the *talmidim* of R. Shimon Bar Yochai take a *pasuk* written about *HaKadosh Baruch Hu* and suggest that it is an allusion to their Rav?

The Ya'avetz (cited by the *Chida* in *Nitzotzei Oros* on the *Zohar*) explains that the *Zohar* is based on our *sugya*, which teaches that the honor of *talmidei chachamim* is compared to the honor of Hashem. The *Zohar* is not saying that R. Shimon Bar Yochai is equal to Hashem, *chas veshalom*. The *Zohar* means that just as we should do an *aliyah leregel* [pilgrimage to Yerushalayim on *yom tov*] before Hashem, so, too we should do an *aliyah leregel* to *talmidei chachomim*, such as R. Shimon Bar Yochai.

The Ya'avetz (*She'elas Ya'avetz* I, at the end of §170) voiced his opposition to the practice of giving people titles normally used in reference to Hashem in his censure of the admirers of R. Eliezer Rokeach, who showered him with praises and superlatives when he was appointed the Av Beis Din of Amsterdam. They even used words of praise from *Kaddish*, such as, "beyond any blessing and song." In his statement of protest he cites R. Yehudah HaChassid's remarks (§936) made in reference to a famous philanthropist, "May the glory of my lord endure forever" (based on the *pasuk* in *Tehillim* 104:31). R. Yehudah HaChassid writes that it is forbidden to confer titles of honor referring to Hashem on mortal men.

The *Chida* (*ibid.*) also refers to a similar case where a letter to an esteemed minister was addressed to "the king who sits on the throne of mercy." He writes that he was deeply grieved to hear about the letter.