



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

**Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h**

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

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

### ***Gid Hanasheh of a Sacrifice***

The *Gemora* says that although a sacrifice’s fetus first becomes prohibited due to its sacrificial status, the prohibition of *gid hanasheh* – *sciatic nerve* still takes effect when the nerves are formed, since that prohibition applied before the giving of the Torah, when the children of *Yisroel* had the status of *bnai Noach* – *children of Noah*.

The *Gemora* challenges this reason, since Rabbi Yehudah is the one who says that *gid hanasheh* applied to *bnai Noach*, but this *Mishna* is another opinion, as Rabbi Yehudah does not agree with the subsequent statement that both right and left nerves are prohibited.

The *Gemora* answers that the opinion of the first section agrees with Rabbi Yehudah about *gid hanasheh* applying to *bnai Noach*, but disagrees with him on which of the nerves are prohibited.

The *Gemora* further challenges this reason, as Rabbi Yehudah only used the rationale of *gid hanasheh* applying to *bnai Noach* to argue that it should take effect on a non-kosher animal, which is a standard negative prohibition. He may not use this rationale for it to take effect on a sanctified animal, which is a

prohibition that can lead to the more severe *kares* – *cutting off punishment*.

The *Gemora* instead suggests that the *Mishna* is referring to a *bechor* – *first born animal*, which is brought as a sacrifice, but only becomes sanctified when exiting the womb. Since the prohibition of *bechor* only takes effect later, the prohibition of *gid* is in effect, as it takes effect either before (*in the womb*) or simultaneously (*on exiting the womb*).

The *Gemora* also suggests that the *Mishna* is referring to a sacrifice’s fetus, but it follows the opinion that they do not become sanctified until birth, allowing the prohibition to take effect, either before or simultaneously. (90a)

### ***Gid of an Olah***

Rabbi Chiya bar Yosef says that the prohibition of *gid* only applies to sacrifices that are eaten, but not *olah* (*which is not eaten*), while Rabbi Yochanan says it applies to all sacrifices.

Rav Pappa says that they are not disagreeing, but discussing different aspects of the prohibition of *gid*. The *Gemora* cites two versions of the aspects they are referring to:

1. Rabbi Chiya bar Yosef is referring to offering the *gid* of an *olah* on the altar, and is teaching that the prohibition is only on eating it, but not offering it. Rabbi Yochanan is referring to one who eats the *gid* of an *olah*, and is teaching that he is liable for lashes.
2. Rabbi Chiya bar Yosef is referring to removing the *gid*, and is teaching that one need not remove it before offering it. Rabbi Yochanan is referring to offering the *gid* (*once it became separated*), and is teaching that one may not offer it separately.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak says that they do disagree about whether one must remove the *gid* before offering the limbs on the altar. He cites a *braisa* which states that since one verse states that the *Kohen* should offer the whole *olah*, while another states that you should perform the *olah* with [only] the meat and blood, we learn that one need not remove the bones, sinews, hooves, and horns, but one may not offer them separately if they were already removed.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak says that this *braisa* follows Rebbe, who says that if these parts of the animal were separated, they must be removed from the altar. He cites a *braisa* which teaches the dispute of Rebbe and the Sages about these parts of the animal. The Sages say that these two verses teach that one may offer all these parts of the animal, even if they became separated, but not if they fell off the altar. Rebbe says that they teach that one may offer them, but not if they became separated.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak explains that the Sages say that no verse is necessary for the case when they are

still attached, as that is no worse than the head of an *olah*, which is offered intact on the altar. Therefore, they say the verse teaches that even if they are separated, they may be offered. Rebbe agrees that no verse is needed for the case when they are intact, as long as these elements are permitted. However, the verse is needed to teach that even the *gid hanasheh*, which is prohibited, may be offered when still attached. The Sages say that since the verse only allows us to offer items that are permitted to us, one may not offer the *gid*, even when attached. Rebbe says that the verse only teaches that one may not offer an *animal* which is prohibited (*e.g., a tereifah or neveilah*), but prohibited *parts* of a permitted animal may be offered, just as we offer the prohibited fats and blood. The Sages say that those are different, as they are the essence of a sacrifice's service. Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak says that Rabbi Chiya bar Yosef and Rabbi Yochanan have the same dispute as Rebbe and the Sages.

Rav Huna says that one must remove the *gid hanasheh* of an *olah*, and put it on the mound of ashes in the center of the altar.

Rav Chisda challenges this, as the verse only prohibits the *gid hanasheh* for human consumption, but not consumption of the altar, but Rav Huna says that the verse mandates that we only offer things that we can eat.

The *Gemora* challenges Rav Huna from a *braisa*, which says that the *gid hanasheh* of a *shelamim* is thrown into the stream of the courtyard, while that of an *olah* is brought up to the altar. The *Gemora* assumes that this means it is brought up and offered, but Rav Huna deflects this, saying the *braisa* means that it is brought

up, but then removed. The *Gemora* explains that although it will be removed, it is brought up intact, as this is more respectable than a leg which has been butchered. The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which explicitly says that the *gid hanasheh* of an *olah* is brought up and then removed, supporting Rav Huna. (90a – 90b)

### Hyperbole

The *Gemora* cites a *Mishna* which says that the pile of ashes on the altar was 300 *kur* large. Rava says that this *Mishna* is an exaggeration.

The *Mishna* continues to say that they used to give the sheep offered as a tamid – daily sacrifice a drink out of a golden cup, and Rava says that is also an exaggeration. Rabbi Ami says that the Torah, the prophets, and the Sages all use hyperbole, and offers examples of each:

1. The Torah refers to the cities in Eretz *Yisroel* as “cities, big and fortified up to the sky.”
2. The *Mishnayos* cited above.
3. The verse in *Nevi'im* describes the celebration at Shlomo’s coronation as so powerful, that the “ground broke, from the sound.”

Rabbi Yitzchak bar Nachmeini quoted Shmuel saying that the Sages used hyperbole in three instances:

1. The pile – the *Mishna* cited earlier about the size of the pile of ashes on the altar.
2. The vine – the *Mishna* says there was a golden vine on top of the door to the sanctuary of the Bais Hamikdash, strung on poles, and whoever would donate a grape or cluster of gold would put it on top. Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Tzadok says that one time they had to remove it, and they needed 300 kohanim (an exaggeration)

3. The *paroches* curtain – the *Mishna* cites Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel in the name of Rabbi Shimon HaSegan saying that the *paroches* was a *tefach* – hand breadth wide, and was woven on 72 strings, each one of which was spun from 24 threads. It was 40 *amos* long, and 20 *amos* wide, and contained 820,000 threads. Two were made each year, and 300 *Kohanim* were needed to put in the *mikveh* (an exaggeration). (90b)

### Right and/or Left?

The *Mishna* said that both the right and left *gid* are prohibited. The *Gemora* says that this *Mishna* is not the opinion of Rabbi Yehudah, who says in a *braisa* that it only applies to one, and understanding concludes that it is the right one.

The *Gemora* asks whether Rabbi Yehudah is referring to the “understanding” of the Torah, and is therefore certain that only the right one is prohibited, or if he is referring only to our “understanding” of what would be more reasonable, and is therefore uncertain which one is prohibited.

The *Gemora* cites a *Mishna* which says that the bones, sinews, and any leftover meat of the Pesach offering are burnt on the morning of the 16<sup>th</sup> of Nissan.

The *Gemora* asks which sinews the *Mishna* is referring to. If they are those of the meat, they can be eaten, and if they weren’t, they are included in the category of leftover meat. If they are the sinews of the neck, which are harder and may not be considered meat, they should be thrown away, as they are not considered leftovers which must be burnt.



Rav Chisda explains that the *Mishna* is referring to the *gid hanasheh*, and follows Rabbi Yehudah, who only prohibits one, but allows the other. Since one is permitted, it is considered leftovers, and must be burned.

Rav Chisda's answer implies that Rabbi Yehudah is uncertain, as otherwise, the right one should be thrown out, and the left one should be eaten.

Rav Ika bar Chanina deflects this, as Rabbi Yehudah may be certain, but the case of the *Mishna* is that the left and right ones got mixed up. Therefore, one may not eat either one, as it may be the right one, but each one must be burned, as it may be the left one.

Rav Ashi says that the *Mishna* is referring to the fat near the *gid*, which is permitted from the Torah, but which we have a custom not to eat.

Ravina answers that the *Mishna* is referring to the outer *gid*, near the flesh, as Rav Yehudah says in the name of Shmuel that the outer *gid* is only prohibited Rabbinically, as the Torah only prohibited the inner one, near the bone. (90b – 91a)

## DAILY MASHAL

### *Hyperbole*

The *Gemora* (90b) says that the Sages and the Torah use hyperbole in their descriptions, and cites various examples. Rava cites a *Mishna* which states that the pile of ashes on the altar was 300 *kur*, and one which states that the sheep of the tamid sacrifice was given a drink

in a golden cup, both of which are exaggerations. Shmuel is quoted as citing three Mishnayos: the pile of ashes, the vine at the entrance of the Bais Hamikdash, and the *paroches* curtain.

Rashi explains that Shmuel does not cite the example of the golden cup, as he maintains that this is literal, in order to ensure that the service be done in a wealthy manner. Rashi says that the exaggeration of the *paroches* was the *Mishna's* statement that 300 *Kohanim* were necessary to take it to the *mikveh*.

Rabbi Ami says that Torah uses hyperbole, and cites as an example a verse that refers to cities, big and fortified up to the sky. The verse cited is in Devarim (1:28), which is quoting the report of the spies, who referred to these cities.

The Torah Temimah on this verse (note 35) cites the Sifri, which says that the Torah speaks in hyperbole, citing a verse later in Devarim (9:1), which refers to cities, big and fortified up to the sky. He quotes the Gra, who amends the Sifri, to say, "and an additional verse with hyperbole is," before citing the later verse.

The Torah Temimah disagrees, since the true proof that the Torah uses hyperbole is actually from the later verse. The verse in Devarim (1:28) is a quote of the spies, while the later verse is Moshe telling the Jews about what they will encounter when crossing into *Eretz Yisroel*. The first verse does not prove that the Torah itself uses hyperbole, as it was simply quoting a person speaking, but the second verse, said directly by Moshe, is indicative of the language of the Torah itself, and therefore is the only verse cited by the Sifri.