

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Sacred animals (cont.)

The Gemara continues to search for the correct explanation of the Mishnah that rules that the gid hanasheh prohibition applies to sacred animals and concludes with two acceptable explanations.

R' Chiya bar Yosef and R' Yochanan seemingly disagree whether the gid hanasheh prohibition applies to sacred animals that are not eaten.

R' Pappa asserts that there is no disagreement between these two Amoraim and they merely address different circumstances.

A second version of R' Pappa's statement is recorded.

R' Nachman bar Yitzchok maintains that R' Chiya bar Yosef and R' Yochanan indeed disagree with one another and cites Beraisos that demonstrate that there is a dispute between Tannaim about this matter.

The exchange between Rabanan and Rebbi about this matter is recorded.

2) Gid hanasheh of an Olah

R' Huna rules that the gid hanasheh is removed from an Olah and thrown onto the mound of ash on the altar.

R' Chisda argues that it should be burned with the rest of the Olah.

R' Huna explains the rationale behind his position.

R' Huna's position is unsuccessfully challenged.

3) Exaggerations

A Mishnah states that the mound of ash sometimes contained three hundred kor of ash.

Rava states that the Mishnah is exaggerating.

Another Mishnah is cited about which Rava comments that it is an exaggeration.

R' Ami notes that we find exaggerations in the Torah, Prophets and in the writings of Chazal and cites examples of such exaggerations.

R' Yitzchok bar Nachmani in the name of Shmuel cites three examples of exaggerations in the writings of Chazal.

4) Gid hanasheh

It is noted that the Mishnah that rules that the gid hanasheh prohibition applies to both legs is inconsistent with R' Yehudah who asserts that it applies to only one leg and logic indicates that it applies to the right leg.

The Gemara inquires about whether it is the Torah that indicates that it applies to the right leg or whether it is logic that dictates as such.

An unsuccessful attempt to clarify R' Yehudah's opinion is cited. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

The paroches and its exaggeration

ושלש מאות כהנים מטבילין אותה

Rav Huna reported that the gid hanasheh of an olah offering was not burnt together with the rest of the offering, so before the kohen would offer the thigh he would remove the gid and place it on the pile of ashes which was in the middle of the Altar.

The Mishnah in Tamid (2:2) is cited which describes this pile of ashes, and it tells us that the pile sometimes grew to contain more than three hundred kor of ashes, which is more than nine thousand se'ah. This is a huge amount, and Rava states that it is actually an exaggerated number and does not have to be taken literally.

R' Yitzchak b. Nachmeini, in the name of Shmuel, says that this description of the volume of ashes on the Altar is one of three places where our sages spoke in exaggerated terms. A second example is regarding the decorative display of golden grapes which adorned the entrance to the antechamber of the Sanctuary (Middos 3:8). One time it had to be moved, and we are told that it took more than three hundred kohanim to move it due to its massive weight. As Rashi explains, this is clearly an exaggeration, because had it been that large it would have broken while being moved. Finally, the third illustration of hyperbole is found in a Mishnah (Shekalim 8:5) regarding the curtain which divided between the Sanctuary and the Kodosh HaKodoshim. The Mishnah tells us that the curtain was a tefach thick, and its cross sectional measure was forty by twenty amos. It was woven with an intricate weaving loom with over ten-thousand multi-stringed cords. When it became impure, it was so heavy that it took three hundred kohanim to carry it to immerse it in a mikveh. Once again, this is an overstatement, because immersing such a curtain would not have been done using three hundred people.

Tosafos points out that the Gemara in Beitzah (14b) teaches that a curtain used as a room divider is normally considered as one of the walls of a house, and it cannot become tamei. The only time it could become tamei is that the attendant wraps himself in the corner of the curtain and he uses it as a garment to warm himself. However, the paroches in the Mikdash was prohibited for personal benefit, and it was never used in this manner and was not capable of becoming tamei. Why, then does the Mishnah discuss the need to ever have it immersed?

Tosafos answers that the paroches did not only serve as a wall between the Sanctuary and the Kodosh HaKodoshim, but it also reached over as a roof over the Aron. It therefore was susceptible to being tamei as a tent (ohel). Tosafos in Beitzah answers that when the paroches was transported (as in the Mishkan) it was used to carry utensils, so it had the status of a utensil, which can become tamei. ■

HALACHA Highlight

Using exaggerated language and descriptions

דברה תורה לשון הבאי

The Torah speaks using exaggerated language

R' Ami relates that there are times when the Torah, the Prophets and Chazal use exaggerated language. Rashi¹ explains that at times we find the Torah, Prophets and Chazal using terminology that is not precise and describes things that did not actually occur but the speaker does not intend to lie; he is merely not using precise language. Sefer Orach Meisharim² deduces from this that it is permitted for one to use exaggerated language as he speaks and such language does not constitute a lie. The reason is that using exaggerated language does not mislead the listener and the listener realizes that the speaker is exaggerating. As long as the listener is not misled the prohibition against lying does not apply. Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach³ is also cited as ruling that regarding matters about which it is common for people to exaggerate it is permitted for one to use exaggerated terms and descriptions.

Teshuvos V'Darashta V'chakarta⁴ was asked whether one violates the prohibition against lying if no one is harmed by an exaggeration that is used to illustrate one's point. An example of this type of exaggeration is what one finds when talking about someone at a wedding or a funeral. He answered that since everyone knows that the speaker uses exaggerated language and descriptions it is permitted even l'chatchila and is not prohibited as a falsehood and he refer-

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why is the gid hanasheh prohibition able to take effect on the prohibition of kodoshim ?
2. When are inedible parts of an animal burned as a korban ?
3. In what manner did Chazal exaggerate about the paroches ?
4. What is the point of dispute between the Tanna of our Mishnah and R' Yehudah?

ences our Gemara to prove his point.

It seems, however, from the Yerushalmi⁵ that the only allowance to use exaggerated language is when necessary to maintain peace between two or more parties but to use it just as a means of making a story or point more dramatic would be prohibited. This is based on Yerushalmi's statement that the brothers exaggerated what their father had told them regarding Yosef before his death and yet there is no indication that Yaakov had this conversation with them. The reason it was permitted was to maintain a peaceful relationship with Yosef. This indicates that were it not for this goal it would be prohibited. ■

¹ רש"י ד"ה לשון הואי.
² ספר אורח מישרים פ"ט סעי' י"א.
³ ספר שלמי מועד עמי תקל"ו.
⁴ שו"ת ודרשת וחקרת ח"ג יו"ד סי' מ"ח.
⁵ ירושלמי פאה פ"א ה"א. ■

STORIES off the Daf

"Cities Fortified to the Skies"

”דברה תורה לשון הבאי ערים גדולות
 ובצורות בשמים...”

The Ramchal, zt”l, the Vilna Gaon, zt”l, and the Baal Shem Tov, zt”l, all hold that there are no errors in Torah. Even the most apparently trivial statements which appear to contradict science or even common sense mean something deeper which is significant. Many people wonder how to reconcile this with a fairly common expression brought on today's daf: “The Torah

spoke **בלשון הבאי**.”

When someone asked the Rama MiPano, zt”l, about this, he gave an astounding explanation, “The very word **הנה ברכו** is an acronym for **הנה ברכו** **את ה'**. This alludes to a deeper meaning hidden in the apparent exaggeration. For example, in Chulin 90 we find that the verse, **ערים גדולות, ובצורות בשמים** —Big cities, fortified until the heavens,’ is an example of **הבאי**. Although the cities were not physically fortified to the skies this statement bears a deeper meaning. As we find in the Ramban in Chumash, no angel or heavenly officer rules over Eretz Yisrael. In that sense, the cities

are protected from meddling on high. In this sense they are fortified until the heavens since the seventy officers of the nations of the world have no jurisdiction over Eretz Yisrael.”¹

The Imrei Emes, zt”l, taught a different lesson from this statement. “In Chulin 90 we find that the Torah spoke in a language of **הבאי**. It is worth noting that in the verse quoted, Moshe Rabbeinu is the speaker. This teaches that our teacher Moshe and the Torah are one and the same.”² ■

¹ שו"ת רמ"ע מפאנו, סי' ע"ג
² אמרי אמת, ליקוטים, דף פ"ח ■

