



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

And so it is with a piece of neveilah etc.

The Gemara asks: Why is it not neutralized in the larger quantity [of the other substances in the mixture]? Now this is well according to the one who maintains that we learned in a Mishnah: any item which is commonly counted [and thus sold individually is deemed to be significant and cannot be nullified];¹ but according to the one who says that we learned: that which is exclusively counted, what shall we say?²

The Gemara answers: It is different with a whole piece since it is suitable to be offered to guests.³

The Gemara notes: Now both cases were necessary to be stated [in the Mishnah]. For if we were taught only the case of the gid hanasheh, [we should have said that it is not neutralized] because it is a specific entity, but this is

¹ All things which a man might sell by number, even though this is not the invariable practice with regard to them for a man might sell them by weight or by bulk too, are not neutralized in any quantity. Pieces of meat, too, a man might sell by number, and therefore would come within the category of substances which do not become neutralized in a larger quantity.

² Whatever is more comprehensive than that. According to the former teaching neutralization is not permitted in the case of objects which are regarded as of sufficiently high commercial value to be sold in units rather than in bulk. According to the latter teaching neutralization is permitted in all cases except those where the objects are of such high value as not to be sold save by counting single units. Those things, however, which are

not so with the case of a piece [of meat]; and if we were taught the case of a piece [of meat we should have said that it is not neutralized] because it is a piece suitable to be offered to guests, but this is not so with the case of the gid hanasheh. Therefore both cases were necessary [to be stated].

Rabbah bar bar Chanah stated in a public lecture: A piece of neveilah or a piece of a non-kosher fish⁴ will not render forbidden [the mixture in which it is] until it imparts a flavor to the broth, in the sediments and in the pieces [of the stew]. Rav thereupon appointed a speaker by his side who stated as follows: As soon as it [the piece of neveilah] imparted its flavor to one piece, that piece itself⁵ is

sold by weight as well as by number would be neutralized in the larger mixture. The question therefore remains: why isn't the piece of neveilah neutralized in the larger mixture?

³ Being a piece suitable for presentation it will never lose its identity or be neutralized in any quantity, however large.

⁴ Which was recognizable in the mixture and was removed from it; the only consideration being the essence or flavor that exuded from it.

⁵ The piece which was first in the pot together with the piece of neveilah before the other pieces were put in, or the piece which was nearest the piece of neveilah and which therefore absorbed most of the essence of the latter.

rendered [forbidden] like neveilah,⁶ and it in turn renders all the other pieces forbidden⁷ for they are of like kind.

Rav Safra said to Abaye: Consider, Rav's ruling agrees, does it not, with the opinion of Rabbi Yehudah who maintained that homogeneous substances cannot neutralize each other [in a mixture]? Why then [does he declare]: As soon as it imparted its flavor? Surely even if it did not impart any flavor to it, it would also [render the entire contents of the pot forbidden]?⁸

He replied: We are dealing here with the case where he removed it.⁹

Rava said: You may even say that he did not remove it at once, but this is a case of one kind being mixed with a like kind and also with a different kind,¹⁰ and wherever one

kind is mixed with a like and also with a different kind you must disregard the like kind as if it were not present, and if the different kind is more [than the forbidden substance] it will neutralize it.¹¹

MISHNAH: It [the gid hanasheh prohibition] applies to kosher animals but not to non-kosher animals.¹² Rabbi Yehudah says: even to non-kosher animals. Rabbi Yehudah argued: wasn't the gid hanasheh prohibited from the time of the sons of Yaakov, and at that time non-kosher animals were still permitted to them?¹³ They replied: this law was ordained at Sinai but was written in its proper place.¹⁴

GEMARA. Is Rabbi Yehudah of the opinion that a prohibition can be superimposed upon an existing prohibition?¹⁵ Surely it has been taught: Rabbi Yehudah says: I might have thought that the carcass of a non-kosher

⁶ Since it was not sixty times as large as the piece of neveilah.

⁷ Even though the other pieces in the pot were as much as sixty times the volume of the piece of neveilah plus the one next to it.

⁸ For the forbidden substance is of the same kind as the rest of the contents of the pot.

⁹ The piece of neveilah as well as the broth in the pot was removed before the other pieces were put in, leaving behind only one piece. If this piece therefore which remained contains the flavor of the neveilah, it is then regarded as neveilah itself and will render forbidden the pieces which are subsequently put in with it.

¹⁰ For the mixture consists of neveilah (a forbidden substance), other pieces of meat (permitted substances of like kind as neveilah), and broth and spices (permitted substances of a different kind).

¹¹ If then the first permitted piece absorbed the flavor of the forbidden piece, although we may disregard all the other pieces in the pot as being of like kind, we must nevertheless be satisfied, in order that the mixture be permitted, that the broth contains sixty times as much as the forbidden piece plus the first

permitted piece, which, as we have seen, is regarded as the neveilah itself.

¹² So that if a person were to eat the gid hanasheh of a non-kosher animal he would not incur liability on account of the gid hanasheh, though he would be liable on account of eating meat of a non-kosher animal (provided, of course, it is held that nerves are edible as meat).

¹³ The gid hanasheh when first prohibited applied to all animals, kosher as well as non-kosher, for in the times before the Torah was given, there was no distinction between the kosher and non-kosher animals, all were permitted. And the prohibition as it was then continued in force even subsequent to the giving of the Torah at Sinai when the distinction was made between kosher and non-kosher animals.

¹⁴ The prohibition was first promulgated at Sinai but was merely recorded in the Torah in connection with the incident of Yaakov's strife with the angel which provided the reason for the subsequent prohibition.

¹⁵ For Rabbi Yehudah states in the Mishnah that it applies even to non-kosher animals, by which he no doubt meant to imply that he who eats the gid hanasheh of a non-kosher animal incurs

bird while in the gullet should render clothes tamei,¹⁶ the verse therefore reads: That which is a neveilah or tereifah he shall not eat to be contaminated through it, that is to say, this¹⁷ applies only to that [carcass] which bears the prohibition of eating neveilah but not to that which does not bear the prohibition of eating neveilah but the prohibition of eating what is non-kosher!¹⁸ Should you, however, say that he [Rabbi Yehudah] is of the opinion that sinews do not impart a flavor, so that in the case [where one ate the gid hanasheh] of a non-kosher animal there is only the prohibition of the gid hanasheh but not the prohibition of [eating] what is non-kosher;¹⁹ but are we right in assuming that Rabbi Yehudah is of the opinion that sinews do not impart a flavor? Behold it has been taught: If a person ate the gid hanasheh of a non-kosher animal, Rabbi Yehudah declares that he has incurred liability twice;²⁰ but Rabbi Shimon holds that he has not incurred guilt at all?

The Gemara answers: In truth he [Rabbi Yehudah] is of the opinion that sinews do impart a flavor, but he also holds that it [sc. the prohibition of the gid hanasheh] applies to a fetus too, so that the prohibition of the gid hanasheh and the non-kosher prohibition come into force simultaneously.²¹

The Gemara asks: But how can you assume [that Rabbi Yehudah holds] it applies to a fetus? Behold we have

liability on two counts, viz., for eating the gid hanasheh and for eating of a non-kosher animal.

¹⁶The carcass of a bird does not render tamei by the usual media of contact or carrying; its only defiling effect is that it renders tamei the clothes of the person who eats of it, and only while he is in the act of swallowing it.

¹⁷ This peculiar and unique form of defilement.

¹⁸ It is thus evident that the prohibition of neveilah cannot be superimposed upon the pre-existing prohibition of a non-kosher bird.

learned: It [the prohibition of the gid hanasheh] also applies to a fetus; but Rabbi Yehudah says: It does not apply to a fetus, and its fat is permitted!

The Gemara answers: That is so only with regard to a kosher animal concerning which the Divine Law declares: Everything . . . in the animal you may eat, but with regard to a non-kosher animal the prohibition of the gid hanasheh applies.

The Gemara asks: But again how can you assume that both [prohibitions] come into force simultaneously? Behold we have learned: By reason of tumah contracted from the following sources the Nazir must shave [his head]: a corpse, an olive's bulk of [the flesh of] a corpse, [etc.] And the question was asked: If he must shave [his head] on account of an olive's bulk of a corpse, then surely he must shave [his head] on account of an entire corpse! And Rabbi Yochanan answered that it was only necessary [to mention the corpse itself] for the case of an abortion whose limbs were not yet knit together by sinews. Hence we see that the non-kosher prohibition comes first!²²

The Gemara answers: Notwithstanding the fact that the non-kosher prohibition comes first the prohibition of the

¹⁹ The gid hanasheh of a non-kosher animal is only forbidden on account of gid hanasheh and not as non-kosher meat, for the gid hanasheh is tasteless and hard as wood.

²⁰ Obviously because by eating the gid hanasheh he has also eaten of the meat of a non-kosher animal.

²¹ At the time of the formation of the embryo in the womb. As both prohibitions come into force simultaneously one is liable for the transgression of both.

²² For the abortion is forbidden as a non-kosher animal before the formation of the sinews.

gid hanasheh can indeed be superimposed, because this latter prohibition is binding even upon the sons of Noah.²³

The Gemara proves this: And this is precisely implied [in the teaching of the Mishnah]: Rabbi Yehudah argued: wasn't the gid hanasheh prohibited from the time of the sons of Yaakov, and at that time non-kosher animals were still permitted to them?

The [above] text [stated]: If a person ate the gid hanasheh of a non-kosher animal, Rabbi Yehudah declares that he has incurred liability twice; but Rabbi Shimon holds that he has not incurred guilt at all.

The Gemara asks: But whatever you think is the opinion of Rabbi Shimon [there is always a difficulty]! If he holds that one prohibition can be superimposed upon a pre-existing prohibition, then he should have incurred guilt on account of the gid hanasheh too; and if he holds that one prohibition cannot be superimposed upon a pre-existing prohibition, then he should have incurred guilt on account of the non-kosher prohibition, for that came first; and if he holds that sinews do not impart a flavor, then he should have incurred guilt [at least] on account of the gid hanasheh!

Rava answered: In truth he holds that sinews do not impart a flavor, but it is different in that case for the verse says: Therefore the children of Israel do not eat the gid hanasheh, that is, the gid hanasheh is forbidden but the flesh permitted; this case therefore must be excluded since the gid hanasheh would be forbidden and the flesh forbidden too.

²³ Where the later prohibition is more stringent in that it applies to a larger number of people than the existing prohibition, it can be superimposed upon the latter. And the gid hanasheh (as stated by Rabbi Yehudah in the Mishnah) was forbidden to all

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: If a person ate the gid hanasheh of a neveilah he has, according to Rabbi Meir, incurred guilt twice; but the Sages hold that he has incurred guilt once only. The Sages, however, agree with Rabbi Meir that if a person ate the gid hanasheh of a burnt-offering or of an ox that was condemned to be stoned he would have incurred guilt twice.

DAILY MASHAL

Dust and Ashes: Past and Future

The *Gemora* says that "in reward for that which Avraham said – "...and I am dust and ashes" – his children merited two *mitzvos*: the ashes of the red heifer and the dust of the wayward wife (*sotah*)." Dust, earth, has no form but something can be created therefrom, such as a utensil, by mixing dust with water, or sowing in it fruit or vegetables. In the past it was nothing. Ashes are the opposite: in the past it may have been glorious but its future is utterly useless. In his humility, Avraham said that he never had any worth, like dust, and that he will always remain so, like ashes. Therefore, measure for measure, his children merited the ashes of the red heifer, which serve to purify from now on, and the dust of the *sotah*, which serves to ascertain purity in the past (*Beis HaLevi, Vayeira*).

the sons of Noah, for it was declared forbidden even before the giving of the Torah at Sinai to the sons of Yaakov who at that time were deemed sons of Noah.