

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Nullification

The Gemara asks why the slice of neveilah referenced in the Mishnah is not nullified.

After further qualifying the question, the Gemara explains why it is not nullified.

The necessity for the Mishnah to teach that the gid hanasheh and meat or fish are not subject to nullification is explained.

2) A prohibited slice

Rabba bar bar Chana rules that a prohibited slice does not prohibit the entire mixture unless it is large enough that it can impart taste to all the different parts of the mixture.

Rav rules that once the prohibited slice imparts taste to another slice the newly-affected item also becomes prohibited and prohibits other slices.

Abaye explains why it was necessary for Rav to mention that the prohibited slice rendered the permitted slice into neveilah.

Rava offers an alternative explanation.

3) **MISHNAH:** Tanna Kamma and R' Yehudah disagree whether the gid hanasheh prohibition applies to a non-kosher animal.

4) Clarifying R' Yehudah's position

The Gemara challenges the implication of the Mishnah that according to R' Yehudah one prohibition can take effect on a pre-existing prohibition.

A circumstance is suggested according to which the gid hanasheh and non-kosher prohibitions take effect simultaneously.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What are some items that are commonly counted?

2. What is the point of dispute between Rabba bar bar Chana and Rav?

3. When was the gid hanasheh prohibition issued?

4. Why is the gid hanasheh prohibition more encompassing?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Nullification of an important piece of meat or fish

שאני חתיכה הואיל וראויה להתכבד בה לפני האורחים

The Mishnah taught that if a piece of neveilah or non-kosher fish falls into a pot, if the piece can be identified and removed we can calculate the contribution of its taste in the remaining food to determine if the combination is prohibited. If the piece cannot be identified and removed, all the pieces are prohibited.

The Gemara asks why we do not use the rule of nullification. The prohibited piece should be nullified among a majority of permitted pieces. The Gemara answers that a full piece of meat or fish is a significant item, and it cannot be nullified. This answer needs to be clarified. We find two views in this regard. One view is that the rules of nullification do not apply to items which are sometimes counted individually due to their importance (כל שדרכו לימנות). Pieces of meat are included in this category of items, and they cannot be nullified. The other opinion holds that nullification is only suspended when we are dealing with items which are always counted individually due to their value (את שדרכו לימנות), and never sold in bulk. According to this view, items which are occasionally sold in bulk are subject to nullification. The Gemara asks why pieces of meat or fish are not subject to nullification according to this second opinion.

The Gemara answers that even according to this second view, a piece of meat or fish is something which can be presented to honor a guest, so the laws of nullification do not apply.

Tosafos explains that this means that although pieces of meat are sometimes sold in bulk, when we include the factor of these pieces being fit for important guests, the meat becomes an item which is "always counted," and it cannot be nullified. Many Rishonim (Rashba and Meiri to Yevamos 81b; Ra"n) explain that the meat does not become an item which is "always counted", but the "important guest" consideration is in and of itself a factor of importance which does not allow the piece to be nullified.

(Continued on page 2)

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
In loving memory of the yahrzeit of our brother
Isaac Yosef ben Shmuel
by Mr. and Mrs. Alan Jay and Helene Gerber

HALACHAH Highlight

Meat fit to be served to guests

הואיל וראויה להתכבד בה לפני אורחים

Since it is fit to be served before guests

The Gemara teaches that a piece of meat that is fit to be served to guests (חתיכה הראויה להתכבד) does not become nullified in a mixture. Rosh¹ cites authorities that maintain that to qualify as a food that is fit to be served to guests it must be fit to be served in its present form. Since a live animal is not fit to be served to a guest in its present form it is subject to the principles of nullification. Therefore, if a live tereifah animal becomes intermingled with other live kosher animals the tereifah animal can become nullified. Another part of the definition of this category is that the meat must also be a size that one would serve to a guest. If the piece of meat is too large or too small to serve to a guest it is subject to the laws of nullification.

Rosh disagrees with the first definition and argues that to qualify as a food one would serve to honor a guest it is only necessary for the meat to be large enough that one would serve it to guests. It is not necessary to be servable in its present form. Accordingly, a live animal would qualify as something that is fit to be served to a guest since it is large enough. Shulchan Aruch² records both definitions of the term and Rema³ adds that practice follows Rosh's opinion that as long as the meat is at least the size that could be served it is considered meat that one would serve to a guest

(Insight...continued from page 1)

The Rishonim note that the piece we are discussing is a piece of neveilah, which cannot be given to a guest. Nevertheless, Tosafos explains that the neveilah could have been given to a non-Jew before it became mixed in the pot of kosher food. If we had been dealing with an item which was prohibited from benefit before it fell into the pot, we cannot say that it was able to be presented to a guest. It would therefore not have this distinction, and it would be able to be nullified. Nevertheless, Tosafos rejects this notion, because the Gemara in Avoda Zara (74a) says that a piece of basar b'chalay (meat and milk) which is prohibited from benefit cannot be nullified. This shows that we are evaluating a piece after it falls into the pot and is ready to be nullified and thereby permitted. It is at that point that we declare that the now-to-be-permitted piece is too important. This applies even to an item whose prohibited status was prohibited from benefit. ■

even though additional preparation is necessary. Rema notes that there is one exception to this rule. A tereifah chicken with its feathers is not considered something that one would serve to honor guests, and it could be nullified. The reason is that the preparation necessary to be able to make the chicken servable to guests is significant and thus too far removed to be considered fit, as is, to be served to guests. ■

1. רא"ש פ"ז ס"י ל"ו.
2. שו"ע יו"ד ס"י ק"א סעי' ג'.
3. רמ"א שם. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Fighting Against the Angel

"והלא מבני יעקב נאסר גיד הנשה..."

As we find on today's daf, gid hanasheh was prohibited since the time of Yaakov Avinu. It is surely interesting that the angel chose to fight specifically with Yaakov. Why don't we find that Avraham or Yitzchak had an altercation with a heavenly representative of evil?

The Vilna Gaon, zt"l, learns a very powerful lesson from this. "Avraham Avinu was especially involved in kindness. And Yitzchak was very focused on avodas Hashem, on prayer and medita-

tion. The first two avos were not attacked by an angel since focusing on doing good deeds or praying is not so threatening to the yetzer hara. As our sages revealed, Hashem said, 'I created the yetzer hara and I created the Torah to temper it.' Yaakov focused on learning Torah. It is clear that this is why he was attacked. The yetzer hara can tolerate anything else. But when it comes to learning Torah he puts up a much greater fight since only Torah is an assault upon its very existence."

The Chofetz Chaim, zt"l, echoed this sentiment in a surprising way. "There is nothing greater than learning Torah. It should be no surprise that the yetzer hara sets himself completely

against learning. The yetzer will even allow one to do other positive things if this will ensure that the person does not learn. He will be able to fast many fasts and even to daven with heartfelt attachment to Hashem. The main thing is ensuring that one does not learn. It is towards this goal that the yetzer applies all of his energies."¹ ■

1. טובך בייעו, ח"ב, ע' רכ"א ■

(Overview...continued from page 1)

This answer is challenged and the Gemara explains why the gid hanasheh prohibition could take effect on the pre-existing prohibition of non-kosher.

Proof to this explanation is presented. ■