



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**

The Gemora attempts to resolve the inquiry (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) from the following Mishna: If one ate an olive’s volume of this one (the gid hanasheh - sciatic nerve of the right thigh) and another olive’s volume of this one (from the other thigh), he incurs eighty lashes. Rabbi Yehudah says: He incurs only forty lashes. Now, if you say that he was certain about it, then it is well, but if you say that he was uncertain about it, then the warning (with regard to each of them) was an uncertain one, and we have heard that according to Rabbi Yehudah, an uncertain warning is not regarded as a warning, for it was taught in a braisa (regarding intermingled children): If one of the sons struck one of the possible fathers and then he struck the other, or if he cursed one of the possible fathers and then he cursed the other, or cursed them both simultaneously or struck them both simultaneously, he will be liable (since one of the two is certainly his father). Rabbi Yehudah said: If he struck or cursed them simultaneously, he will be liable (the specific warning (hasra’ah) that must precede any forbidden act that is punishable by a court is here effected when the witnesses warned the offender by one statement against the striking or the cursing of the two, e.g., ‘do not strike them’), but if he struck or cursed one and then he struck

or cursed the other, he is exonerated (though he may have been duly warned in each particular case, no penalty can be imposed upon him by any court, since each warning was of a doubtful character since it was unknown in each case whether the particular man he was about to strike or curse was his father or not; a warning of a doubtful character is, in the opinion of Rabbi Yehudah, of no validity, while in the opinion of the first Tanna, it is valid). [Now, since he rules that there are lashes in the case of the two sinews, it must be that he holds with a certainty that it is the right one which is forbidden!]

The Gemora deflects the proof, for this Tanna (who expressed the view of Rabbi Yehudah in the Mishna) is in accordance with a different Tanna who maintains that Rabbi Yehudah holds that an uncertain warning is indeed a warning, for it was taught in a braisa: And you shall let nothing of it (korban pesach) remain until the morning; and that which remains from it until the morning you shall burn with fire. Now, the Torah follows up a negative prohibition (of leaving over) with a positive one (of burning that which is leftover), thereby teaching us that one does not incur lashes for it. This is Rabbi Yehudah’s view. Rabbi Yaakov said: This is not the real reason (that he does not incur lashes), but it is because it is a negative prohibition that involves no action, and one does not incur lashes for violating any negative prohibition that involves no action. [Now, in this case, the warning is obviously an uncertain one, for it is not known if will leave it over until the morning, and nevertheless, it is a valid one.]

The *Gemora* attempts to resolve it from the following *braisa*: If a person ate two *gid hanasheh*'s from two thighs of two animals, he incurs eighty lashes. Rabbi Yehudah says: He incurs only forty lashes. Now since it says 'from two thighs of two animals,' it is obvious that it is referring to the prohibited sinew (*from the same side of each animal*), and the case was necessary to be stated in order to present Rabbi Yehudah's view. It follows, therefore, that he was certain about it (*for otherwise, he could not have imposed lashes in this case*). This indeed is a proof.

The *Gemora* asks: But if he was certain about it (*that the right thigh contains the forbidden gid hanasheh*), why does he incur forty lashes and no more? Surely he should incur eighty!

The *Gemora* answers: It must be referring to a case where there was not as much as an olive's volume in each one (*but together, between the two of them, there was*).

[*Evidently, the Tanna Kamma argues and maintains that one is liable for eating an entire gid hanasheh even if it does not contain a volume of an olive. This is corroborated from the following braisa:*] If a person ate it (the *gid hanasheh*) and it was not as much as an olive's volume, he is nevertheless liable to lashes. Rabbi Yehudah says: He is not liable unless there is as much as an olive's volume of it.

Rava explains Rabbi Yehudah's reason: The verse says: *The thigh*, which implies the most distinguished of the thighs (*the right thigh*). The Rabbis will say that the verse indicates that the prohibited nerve is the one that is spread over the entire thigh (*the inner one*), but not the outer one.

Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: Rabbi Yehudah's reason is from the following verse: *As he wrestled (b'hei'avko) with him*, which implies as well: as when a person embraces (*choveik*) another, and his right hand reaches the haunch of the other fellow. (91a)

### ***Yaakov and the Angel***

Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachmeini said: He (*the angel*) appeared to him (*Yaakov*) as an idol worshipper, and the master has said in a *braisa*: If a Jew is joined by an idol worshipper on the way (*and there exists a suspicion regarding murder*), he should let him walk on his right (*so his right hand will be available to defend himself; accordingly, the angel had attacked Yaakov on his right side, the side which was closest to him*).

Rav Shmuel bar Acha said in the name of Rava bar Ulla in the presence of Rav Pappa: He (*the angel*) appeared to him (*Yaakov*) as a Torah scholar (*for Yaakov made sure that the angel was on his right side*), and the master has said: Whoever walks at the right side of his teacher is a *boor* (*uncultured; doesn't possess proper manners*).

The Rabbis, however, explain that the angel came from behind and dislocated both thighs. And they interpret the verse, '*As he wrestled (b'hei'avko) with him* in accordance with the other statement of Rabbi Yehoshua ben *Levi*, for Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: This verse teaches that they (*during the struggle*) threw up the dust of their feet to the Throne of Glory.

Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi also said: Why is the sciatic nerve called the *gid hanasheh*? It is because it slipped from its place and moved upward.

Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Chanina said: What is the meaning of the verse: *The Lord sent forth something in*

*Yaakov and it befell Israel? The Lord sent forth something in Yaakov is referring to the gid hanasheh, and it befell Israel is referring to its prohibition that has spread throughout Israel.*

Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Chanina said: What is the meaning of the verse (*when Yosef spoke to the person in charge of the house*): *And slaughter the animals and prepare the meat? And slaughter the animals* meant that he should expose for them (*the brothers*) the place that has been slaughtered (*so that they should see it was properly slaughtered*), and *prepare the meat* meant that he should remove the sciatic nerve in their presence.

The *Gemora* notes that this is in accordance with the view that the *gid hanasheh* as prohibited to the Noahites (*for the children of Yaakov were so classified, up until the Giving of the Torah*).

*And Yaakov was left alone.* Rabbi Elozar said: He remained behind for the sake of some small jars. This teaches us that to the righteous, their money is dearer than their body (*she selected wicker because it is inexpensive, although wood would have been a better protection for the child*). And why are they careful about their money? It is because they do not stretch out their hand to robbery (*their money is more precious to them, for it comes through tremendous exertion*).

*And there wrestled a man with him until the break of dawn.* Rabbi Yitzchak said: This teaches us that a Torah scholar should not go out alone at night.

Other *Amoraim* derive this from alternative Scriptural sources.

Rabbi Akiva said: I once asked Rabban Gamliel and Rabbi Yehoshua in the meat market of imma'um, where they

had gone to buy an animal for the wedding feast of Rabban Gamliel's son: It is written: *And the sun rose for him*. Did the sun rise for him only? Did it not rise for the entire world? Rabbi Yitzchak said: It means that the sun which had (*prematurely*) set for his sake now rose for him. For it is written: *Yaakov departed from Beersheva and went to Charan*. And it is written further: *He encountered the place and slept there because the sun had set*. Now, the two verses seem to contradict each other, for the first verse states that Yaakov came to Charan, but the next verse states that he spent the night in Beis El, thus implying that he did not, in fact, travel to Charan!? To answer this apparent contradiction, the *Gemora* introduces a different understanding of the verse: Actually Yaakov did get as far as Charan, but once he reached Charan, he said to himself, "Is it possible that I have passed on my journey the place where my fathers prayed (*Beis El*), and I did not pray there myself? I must go back to Beis El, and fix this! He decided to return to *Eretz Yisroel* and pray at Beis El. As soon as he thought to do this, the ground between Charan and Beis El miraculously contracted for him, and Yaakov found himself instantaneously transported back to Beis El. And this is confirmed by Scripture, for immediately after Yaakov reached Charan, it is written: *He encountered the place (Beis El)*. [*It is from here that we find that the ground miraculously contracted for the patriarch Yaakov. This is also a source which teaches us that a Torah scholar should not go out alone at night.*]

It is written: *And he took of the stones of the place*; but it is also written: *And he took the stone!*? Rabbi Yitzchak said: This teaches us that all the stones gathered themselves together into one place, and each one said, "Upon me shall this righteous man lay his head." It was taught in a *braisa* that all the stones were (*miraculously*) merged into one.

It is written: *And the angel said: Let me go, for dawn has broken.* Yaakov said to him, “Are you a thief or a kidnapper that you are afraid of the dawn?” He replied, “I am an angel, and from the day that I was created, my time to recite song to Hashem has not come until now.”

This, the *Gemora* notes, supports the statement of Rav Chananel in the name of Rav, who said: Three divisions of ministering angels recite song daily; one proclaims: *Holy*; the other proclaims: *Holy*; and the third proclaims: *Holy is Hashem Tzevaos.*

The *Gemora* asks from a *braisa*: The Jewish people are dearer to the Holy One, Blessed be He, than the ministering angels, for the Jews recite song to Hashem at all times, whereas the ministering angels recite song but once a day. Others say: Once a week; and others say: Once a month; and others say: Once a year; and others say: Once in seven years; and others say: Once in a Jubilee; and others say: Once in eternity. And whereas the Jews mention the Divine Name after two words, as it is said: *Hear, Israel, Hashem* etc., the ministering angels only mention the Divine Name after three words, as it is written: *Holy, holy, is Hashem Tzevaos.* Furthermore, the ministering angels do not begin to recite song in heaven until the Jews have sung below on earth, for it is written: *When the morning stars (the Jewish people, who are likened to stars) sing together, then all the Heavenly beings shout for joy!*

The *Gemora* answers: It must be as follows: Three divisions of ministering angels recite song daily; one proclaims: *Holy*; the other proclaims: *Holy, holy*; and the third proclaims: *Holy, holy holy is Hashem Tzevaos.*

The *Gemora* asks: But is there not the praise of ‘Blessed’ (where the Divine Name is mentioned after one word)?

The *Gemora* answers: That is said by the Ophanim (who are above the angels; they are considered part of the Heavenly Throne itself).

Alternatively, once permission was granted, it has been granted. (91a – 92a)

## DAILY MASHAL

### ***Why the Students Were Photographed Separately***

The Zohar explains that the struggle of Yaakov, the pillar of the Torah, against the angel representing Eisav was a battle for upholding the Torah. When the angel harmed Yaakov’s hip, certain harm was done to those who support the Torah and for that reason supporting the Torah is such a difficult task. Once the *roshei yeshivah* of Mir went to the chairman of the Joint to request support for the yeshivah. They showed him a big page with the photographs of the 400 students. He said that it seemed to him that they all had nice hats and fine suits and didn’t need support. Rabbi Avraham Kalmanovitz replied, “You should know that the reason we didn’t photograph all of them together is because we had one hat and one suit for all of them to share...”