



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

MISHNAH: When a person removes the gid hanasheh he must remove all of it.<sup>1</sup> Rabbi Yehudah says: Only so much as is necessary to fulfill the mitzvah of removing it.<sup>2</sup> If a person ate an olive's bulk of the gid hanasheh, he incurs forty lashes. If he ate the whole of it and it was not as much as an olive's bulk, he is nevertheless liable.<sup>3</sup> If he ate an olive's bulk of it from one thigh and another olive's bulk of it from the other thigh, he incurs eighty lashes. Rabbi Yehudah says: he incurs only forty lashes.<sup>4</sup>

GEMARA: Bar Piyuli was standing in the presence of Shmuel and was excising (the gid hanasheh) a side of meat. He was only cutting away the surface [of the gid hanasheh], so Shmuel said to him: Go down deeper; had I not seen you, you might have given me forbidden meat to eat. He was alarmed at this, and the knife fell out of his hand. Shmuel said to him: Don't be alarmed, for he who taught you this taught you according to the view of Rabbi Yehudah.

Rav Sheishes said: That part which Bar Piyuli had removed, is according to Rabbi Yehudah forbidden by the Torah.

<sup>1</sup> This is the view of Rabbi Meir, that one must follow up the tracks of the sinew in all its ramifications.

<sup>2</sup> It is sufficient if one removes the upper part of the nerve, i.e., that part which is visible at the hip-joint.

<sup>3</sup> Although the minimum quantity for constituting eating is an olive's bulk, where the thing prohibited by the Torah is in its entirety less than the size of an olive, e.g., an ant, one incurs the penalty for eating the whole of it.

<sup>4</sup> Because the prohibition according to Rabbi Yehudah applies only to one thigh, the right thigh.

The Gemara asks: Then it follows, does it not, that the part which he [Bar Piyuli] did not remove, is according to Rabbi Yehudah forbidden Rabbinnically? If so, according to whose view was he [Bar Piyuli] taught this?<sup>5</sup>

Rav Sheishes therefore said: That part which Bar Piyuli had removed, is [according to Rabbi Meir] forbidden by the Torah, but that part which he did not remove, is forbidden Rabbinnically, only according to Rabbi Meir, for according to Rabbi Yehudah it is permitted even Rabbinnically.<sup>6</sup>

The Mishnah had stated: If a person ate an olive's bulk of the gid hanasheh etc.

Shmuel said: The Torah forbade only that part [of the gid hanasheh] which is on the spoon,<sup>7</sup> for it is written: Which is upon the spoon of the thigh.

Rav Pappa said: This [statement of Shmuel] is the subject of dispute between Tannaim; for it was taught: If a person ate [the whole of] it and it was not as much as an olive's bulk, he is nevertheless liable. Rabbi Yehudah says: [He is not liable] unless it was as much as an olive's bulk. What is the reason

<sup>5</sup> For it is clear that the whole of the nerve must be removed if only by Rabbinic injunction. The question therefore is: Whose view did Bar Piyuli adopt by cutting away only the surface?

<sup>6</sup> So that Bar Piyuli acted entirely in accordance with Rabbi Yehudah's view.

<sup>7</sup> The muscles at the proximal end of the thigh are rounded and convex like the back of a spoon. Only that part of the gid hanasheh which runs in these muscles, says Shmuel, is prohibited.

of the Rabbis? — Because it is a complete entity in itself.<sup>8</sup> And what does Rabbi Yehudah [say to this]? — The term ‘eating’ is used in connection with it.<sup>9</sup> And the Rabbis? — The term ‘eating’ is to teach that if [the gid hanasheh] consisted of four or five olives’ bulk and he ate from it the size of one olive, he is liable.<sup>10</sup> And Rabbi Yehudah? — That is derived from the expression: Which is upon the spoon of the thigh.<sup>11</sup> And the Rabbis? — This verse is required for Shmuel’s teaching, for Shmuel said: The Torah forbade only that part [of the gid hanasheh] which is on the spoon. And Rabbi Yehudah? — It is written ‘the thigh’, that is, the entire thigh.<sup>12</sup> And the Rabbis? — That is to indicate that the prohibited gid hanasheh is the one that is spread over the whole of the thigh, [namely the inner one], and not the outer one; but of course only [so much of it is prohibited as is] upon the spoon.

The Gemara asks: But isn’t the expression ‘spoon’ required to teach that [the prohibition of the gid hanasheh] does not apply to birds as they do not have a spoon-shaped hip?

The Gemara answers: The word ‘spoon’ is written twice [in the verse].

MISHNAH: if a thigh was cooked together with the gid hanasheh and there was so much [of the gid hanasheh] as to impart a flavor [to the thigh], it is forbidden. How does one measure this? As if it were meat [cooked] with turnips.<sup>13</sup> If the gid hanasheh was cooked with other (permitted) sinews

[in a broth] and it can still be recognized,<sup>14</sup> then it depends whether it imparted a flavor or not;<sup>15</sup> but if it can no longer [be recognized] then all [the sinews] are forbidden;<sup>16</sup> and as for the broth it depends whether it [the gid hanasheh] imparted a flavor or not. And so it is with a piece of neveilah, or a piece of nonkosher fish that was cooked together with other pieces of flesh [or fish]: if it can still be recognized, then it depends whether it imparted a flavor or not; and if it can no longer [be recognized], then all pieces are forbidden; and as for the broth it depends whether it imparted a flavor or not.

#### DAILY MASHAL

#### The *Gid Hanasheh* and Tishah B’Av

HaGaon Rav Chayim Kanievski related: The holy *sefarim* say that someone who eats the *gid hanasheh* is as though he ate on Tishah B’Av. I asked my father, the author of *Kehilos Ya’akov*, to explain this and he replied: There are 365 negative mitzvos like the days of the solar year. Each negative mitzvah corresponds to a certain day. The prohibition of *gid hanasheh* corresponds to Tishah B’Av and therefore they were compared (*Peninei Rabeinu Kehilos Ya’akov*, 92).

<sup>8</sup> And this was prohibited by the Torah even though the whole of it is not as large as an olive.

<sup>9</sup> And the minimum quantity for constituting ‘eating’ is an olive’s bulk.

<sup>10</sup> For it might have been thought that only the eating of the whole of it renders one liable to lashes.

<sup>11</sup> For eating the portion which is upon the spoon of the thigh, even though it is not the whole, one is liable, provided always it consisted of an olive’s bulk.

<sup>12</sup> And the prohibition applies even to that part which is not upon the spoon, unlike Shmuel.

<sup>13</sup> If when meat and turnips are cooked together, in the same proportions as here the gid hanasheh and the thigh respectively,

the meat imparts its flavor to the turnips, then the thigh would be forbidden on account of the taste of the forbidden gid hanasheh. It is estimated by the Rabbis that meat cannot impart its taste to any substance that is cooked with it if the latter is sixty times as large in bulk as the meat.

<sup>14</sup> It must then be removed, and the only consideration is with regard to the flavor that has remained in the pot.

<sup>15</sup> Whether the other sinews were sixty times as large in bulk as the forbidden gid hanasheh or not. In the former case they would be permitted, in the latter they would not.

<sup>16</sup> For each sinew might be the forbidden gid hanasheh.