

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Cheilev

Shmuel is cited as ruling that cheilev that is covered by meat is permitted.

This ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Yochanan confirms Abaye's response to the challenge.

Shmuel is cited as ruling that cheilev on the hemses and beis hakosos is Biblically prohibited.

Another fat that is Biblically prohibited is identified by Shmuel.

Shmuel rules that the threads in the foreleg are prohibited.

This last ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

Shmuel identifies the fat that is on the intestines.

Rulings related to the threads are recorded.

2) Membranes

R' Kahana or R' Yehudah state that there are five prohibited membranes.

A related incident is recounted.

R' Hamnuna cites a Beraisa that teaches that the membrane on the spleen and kidney are prohibited but one is not subject to kareis for eating it.

A Beraisa is cited that rules that one is liable for kareis for eating these membranes.

The contradiction is resolved.

3) ביעי חשילתא

R' Ami and R' Assi dispute the permissibility of consuming ביעי חשילתא.

Their respective rationales and the exchange between them is recorded.

R' Yochanan reports that in Bavel the custom was to prohibit their consumption.

Mar bar R' Ashi issues a ruling related to the ביעי of a young goat.

This ruling is further clarified.

4) Blood

The Gemara reports that R' Acha and Ravina disagree about the status of blood in different parts of an animal.

The Gemara comments that generally halacha follows Ravina's lenient rulings but in the three instances in which R' Acha is more lenient halacha follows his opinion.

Two versions are presented of a ruling related to blood contained within the head of a slaughtered animal.

5) Gid Hanasheh

R' Yehudah in the name of Shmuel identifies the two sinews in an animal's leg and which one is Biblically prohibited and which is Rabbinically prohibited.

This ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

6) Negligent butcher

R' Yehudah and R' Yochanan disagree how much cheilev a butcher must leave behind to become subject to punishment.

R' Pappa asserts that they do not argue and merely refer to different penalties.

Mar Zutra adds a further qualification to this ruling and then the Gemara issues a final ruling.

(Overview...continued on page 2)

Distinctive INSIGHT

Arranging that the blood of the head flows out

רישא בכיבשא אותביה אבית השחיטה דייב דמא ושרי

When a person who slaughtered an animal wished to remove the hair from the animal's head, we are told that water was placed on the head, after which the head was placed into a mixture of ashes and warm coals (רמץ, see Rashi, Shabbos 34b). Rashi explains that this was a process of submerging or burying the head in heat, and, as a result of this, the hair would fall off the head. Our Gemara explains that this procedure could be done in a manner whereby the head would remain permitted to be eaten, and it could be done resulting in the head not being prohibited to be eaten.

If, when being placed in the ashes and coals, the part of the head where the shechita was done is placed down, the blood can continue to flow out, and the head is permitted to be eaten. If, however, the head is placed sideways on its cheek, the blood cannot flow freely out of the head and . In this manner, the blood does not drain fully, and it congeals within the head, resulting in the head being prohibited to be eaten. If the head is placed so that the nostrils of the nose are facing down, the head would be permitted only if a sharp stick is inserted between the nose and the brain, so that the blood can flow down and out of the nostrils. If no such object was inserted in the nostrils, the head is prohibited, because we have to assume that the nostrils might become blocked and the flow of blood might have been interrupted. In this case, the blood which remained in the head would have congealed within it.

Tiferes Yaakov explains that placing the head in this blend of ashes and coals is not considered as if the head is fully roasted, so the blood is not drawn out of the head by the heat unless it is oriented with the place of the shechita downward. However, if the head is actually roasted, the head is permitted even if it is placed on its cheek.

Beha"g, however, explains that the process of placing the head in ashes and coals described in this Gemara is a full form of roasting. Accordingly, even when the head is being roasted it is permitted only if it is also placed in a position whereby the blood can flow out freely.

Bac"h writes that the text of the Beha"g probably read "a head in a furnace (כבשן)," not "בכיבשא—which is buried." Bac"h adds that Tur rules in accordance with both views, and that whether an animal's head is placed in a mixture of ashes and coals because he wishes to have the hair of the head fall off, or if the head is roasted in a furnace, the head is only permitted if the area of the shechita is placed downward, in order for the blood to flow out. ■

HALACHA Highlight

Using the back half of an animal

וזהו חלב שעל הקרב

And this is the cheilev that is on the innards

The Gemara elaborates on the different fats and sinews that must be removed from an animal before the rest of the animal may be eaten. Rema¹ writes that the correct procedure for removing the prohibited fats and sinews must be learned by observing someone who is a trained expert at this process since it is impossible to describe clearly in a sefer. The majority of the prohibited fats and sinews are found the back half of the animal. Be'er Heitev² notes that for this reason there are opinions which maintain that one should be stringent and should not eat meat from the back half of an animal since even one who is well versed in halacha will not know how to remove the prohibited fats by studying the topic in a sefer.

Rav Moshe Feinstein³ wrote about a place that generally avoided using meat from the back half of the animal. Occasionally, it was necessary to use the back half of the animal and there happened to be someone who was certified by a reliable rov in removing all the prohibited fats and sinews from an animal. The community wanted to know whether they were allowed to permit this person to remove the prohibited fats and sinews so that the back half of the animal could be consumed or perhaps it would constitute a violation of their custom. Rav Feinstein answered that it appears to him that there is no actual custom for them to avoid eating the back half of an animal

REVIEW and Remember

1. If veins are prohibited how is it permitted to eat meat ?
2. What are the five prohibited membranes ?
3. What is the rule for determining halacha when there is a dispute between Ravina and R' Acha ?
4. Why are we not afraid that a gentile will resell meat as kosher that still has the gid hanasheh inside ?

and there is certainly no prohibition against eating meat from the back half of an animal. Although for a long period of time the butchers did not remove the prohibited fats and sinews, that practice did not rise to the level of a custom. The reason is that since it is difficult to remove those fats and sinews and they were able to easily sell the back half of the animal to gentile butchers there was no need to invest the effort to remove those fats and sinews. However, if someone is prepared to invest the effort to remove those fats and is qualified to do so it is permitted and the meat is kosher without reason to be stringent. ■

¹ רמ"א יו"ד סי' ס"ד סעי' ז'.

² באר היטב שם סק"ז.

³ שו"ת אג"מ יו"ד ח"ב סי' מ"ב. ■

STORIES off the Daf

Forbidden Fats

"ריש מעיה באמתא בעי ברירה..."

Today's daf discusses the obligation to remove an animal's forbidden fats.

Negative character traits are very insidious. As the Vilna Gaon, zt"l, writes, although there certainly is good in this physical world, there are many elements of רע, evil. By our very nature, we are drawn to act based mostly—or only—on material concerns.¹

The Pnei Menachem, zt"l, explains how to properly deal with our tendency to indulge our negative character traits. "The verse in Netzavim states, 'ומל ה' אלקיך את לבבך ואת '—God your Lord will circumcise your heart and the heart of your children.' Negative character traits can be compared to cheileiv, forbidden fats. These fats adjoin kosher organs of the animal and must be expertly removed. Just as it is only possible to remove the cheileiv by vigorously uprooting it

from the rest of the animal, one must seek and uproot the negative character traits and actions and remove them."²

The Otzar HaYirah explains further that one must be very vigorous to remove the negative character traits, the cheileiv which clouds his judgment and makes it difficult to think clearly. Every person tends to fool himself, mistakenly believing that he is rectified. Yet when he sees his own defects are in another, he cannot abide them. Regarding others he can see correctly and understand the terrible repercussions of his bad character traits. But in himself he cannot recognize them. We must reverse this tendency by removing the forbidden fats which cloud our judgment. We should see others the positive and understand that every person faces inner challenges that make it very difficult for him. If we can give him loving rebuke that he will accept, we should do so. If not, why judge him? For ourselves, we should see the negative for what it is and do teshuvah.³ ■

¹ מובא בפתחי שערים, ח"א, ע"י 166

² פני מנחם, נצבים, תשנ"ד, ע"י קס"ח

³ אוצר היראה, ח"א, וחי"ד ■

(Overview...continued from page 1)

7) Butchers

R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan asserts that R' Meir changed his position and agreed that butchers are believed regarding the removal of the gid hanasheh.

R' Nachman expresses surprise at this ruling.

The Gemara clarifies the progression of the Rabanan's position.

A second version of this exchange is recorded.

8) Clarifying the Mishnah

The last line of the Mishnah is clarified.

9) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah rules that it is permitted for one to send a piece of meat to a gentile even though the gid hanasheh is still present.

10) Clarifying the Mishnah

It is noted that the wording of the Mishnah implies that one may only send a whole thigh rather than a cut-up thigh. The Gemara inquires about the circumstances in which this applies. ■