

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Nullification (cont.)

Rava's explanation of the halacha of the foreleg as the source for the laws of nullification is unsuccessfully challenged.

Ravina offers a third explanation of the use of the foreleg as the source for nullification.

The Gemara records a debate between R' Dimi and Abaye regarding R' Assi's ruling that prohibited substances are nullified in a ratio of one hundred to one.

It is noted that a previously cited ruling of R' Yehudah is contradicted by another ruling of R' Yehudah.

The contradiction is reconciled.

2) Clarifying the Mishnah

R' Huna further clarifies how we determine whether the gid hanasheh imparts taste into the meat.

It is noted that the Mishnah that assumes that gid hanasheh imparts taste is inconsistent with R' Yishmael the son of R' Yochanan ben Berokah who contends that gid hanasheh does not impart taste.

A related incident is recounted.

The Gemara rules that gid hanasheh does not impart taste.

The reason the gid hanasheh is not nullified is explained. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is derived from the words כל אשר יגע בבשרה יקדש?
2. What is R' Dimi's position regarding the necessary ratio for a prohibited substance to be nullified?
3. What is the significance of the fact that fish brine is "sweat" rather than from the fish itself?
4. Does sinew possess flavor?

Distinctive INSIGHT

What precisely is it that the Torah prohibits?

מתניתין דלא כהאי תנא, דתניא רבי ישמעאל בנו של ר' יוחנן בן ברוקה אומר אין בגידין בנותן טעם

We find in our Gemara that there is a disagreement between Tannaim whether a gid has a taste or not. The Tanna of the Mishnah holds that a gid does have a taste, while R' Yishmael the son of R' Yochanan b. Berokah holds that a gid has no taste, and cannot contribute a taste to meat with which it is cooked.

Rashba explains that this difference of opinion hinges upon the views of Rav and Ulla on 92b regarding the basic understanding of the prohibition of gid. Rav holds that the Torah only prohibits the soft, edible offshoots of the gid (קנוקנות). Rav holds that the gid itself is hard and inedible, and the prohibition does not apply to it. Ulla holds that although the gid is indeed hard and like wood, the Torah's command is that it is prohibited to eat it. Although the offshoots are edible, these are not included in the prohibition.

Rashba explains. The Mishnah which says that the gid has a taste follows the view espoused by Rav, that it is the offshoots which the Torah prohibits, as these do have taste. R' Yishmael the son of R' Yochanan b. Berokah holds according to the opinion voiced by Ulla, that it is the tasteless and inedible gid itself which the Torah prohibits, and this gid contributes no taste when it is eaten. According to Rashba, there is no disagreement in fact whether a gid has a taste, as all agree that the gid itself has no taste and that its offshoots do have taste. What we do have is a disagreement regarding the exact item that the Torah prohibits – is it the gid itself or its offshoots?

Rashba registers several concerns regarding this explanation. First of all, it is remote to say that the Amoraim, Rav and Ulla, disagreed in their own names regarding an issue that is already disputed by Tannaim. Rather than voicing what seems to be their own opinions, they should have argued whether the halacha is according to the Mishnah or according to R' Yishmael in the Baraisa. Furthermore, on 92b Abaye responds to the discussion between Rav and Ulla by stating that "Ulla's view is more reasonable." This would mean that Abaye is ruling according to R' Yishmael, against the Mishnah. It is also surprising that Abaye would not simply make his statement in reference to R' Yishmael himself, rather than attributing credit to

HALACHAH Highlight

Is the gid hanasheh prohibited for benefit?

והלכתא אין בגידין בנותן טעם

Halacha is that sineus do not impart flavor

The Gemara in Pesachim (22a) records a dispute between R' Avahu and Chizkiyah. According to R' Avahu whenever the Torah says, "Do not eat" – לא יאכל – the Torah prohibits not only the consumption of that food but benefit from that food as well. Chizkiyah disagrees with R' Avahu and contends that the prohibition, "Do not eat" is limited to eating and does not generate a prohibition against benefit. R' Avahu's position is challenged from the Gemara earlier (93b) that rules that one is permitted to give a gentile the thigh of an animal even though the gid hanasheh is still present. The Gemara answers that when the Torah permits one to derive benefit from a neveilah included in that allowance is deriving benefit from the gid hanasheh. As the Gemara there continues its discussion it emerges that there is a disagreement between Tannaim as to whether the gid hanasheh has taste and consequently whether it is prohibited for benefit or not. R' Yehudah maintains that the gid hanasheh does have taste, therefore the prohibition of לא יאכל, according to R' Avahu, is limited to eating the gid hanasheh. R' Shimon disagrees and maintains that the gid hanasheh has no taste and as such when the Torah writes לא יאכל in reference to the gid hanasheh the intent must have been to prohibit it from ben-

(Insight...continued from page 1)

Ulla.

Rashba explains that the discussion between Rav and Ulla took place in order to elaborate and explain the reasons for the Mishnah and for R' Yishmael. They wished to point out that the Tannaim do not argue about the nature of the gid, agreeing that it itself has no taste, and all agree that the offshoots do have taste. They only argue regarding which specific item it is that the Torah prohibits. ■

efit.

Tosafos¹ writes that since our Gemara states that the gid hanasheh has no taste it would emerge that according to R' Avahu the gid hanasheh is prohibited for benefit as well in accordance with R' Shimon's position. Rosh² disagrees and contends that halacha does not follow R' Avahu's position; rather it follows Chizkiyah's opinion that prohibitions against eating do not include a prohibition against deriving benefit. Tur³ mentions the stringent position of Tosafos but rules in accordance with Rosh that the gid hanasheh is permitted for benefit. Shulchan Aruch⁴ records only the lenient position of Rosh. Beis Yosef⁵ and Darchei Moshe⁵ disagree whether one should be stringent in accordance with Zohar's indication that the gid hanasheh is prohibited for benefit. ■

1. תוס' ד"ה והלכתא.

2. רא"ש פ"ז סי' י"ז.

3. טור יו"ד סי' ס"ה.

4. שו"ע שם סעי' י'.

5. ב"י ודרכי משה שם. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Absorbing the Flavor

יקדש להיות כמוה

The Chazon Ish, zt"l, would say that one cannot learn how to learn Torah on his own. "You need to speak to those who know how to learn to get a feel for it."

He said a similar thing about attaining genuine fear of heaven. "Attaining yir'as shamayim can be compared to lighting a candle. You do this by putting it to a fire. Similarly, you cannot just get yir'as shamayim on

your own. It needs to be imparted to you from those who already have it. True yir'as shamayim is very complex. We need to cultivate the proper feeling and understand when and how to act and think to achieve this important goal."¹

Rav Chaim Chaikel of Hamdurah, zt"l, expended great efforts to fix his soul before finally becoming a student of the Maggid of Mezritch, zt"l. He fasted many days, did various self-mortifications and even stayed up one thousand nights in a row learning Torah diligently. Nevertheless, he felt that his soul lacked completion until he met the Maggid.

When someone asked him to explain this apparently strange phenomenon, he did so using a statement brought on today's daf. "In Chullin 99 we find that the taste of something is like its essence. Therefore, anything that absorbs the flavor of a chatas becomes like it. This statement explains how to attain completion: the flavor that a tzaddik puts into a person who draws near to him is the main thing. 'יקדש להיות כמותו' — In this manner one will become sanctified and ascend in the merit of the tzaddik."² ■

1. כן שמעתי מדודי, הרב שמחה גולשביסקי, ז"ל

2. תפארת שלמה, פרשת צו ■