

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Eating gid hanasheh from a non-kosher animal

The Gemara relates that according to R' Yehudah one who eats the gid hanasheh of a non-kosher animal receives two sets of lashes, whereas according to R' Shimon he does not receive even one set of lashes.

Rava explains the rationale behind R' Shimon's position.

### 2) Gid hanasheh of a neveilah

R' Yehudah in the name of Rav teaches that there is a dispute between R' Meir and Chachamim whether one who eats gid hanasheh from a neveilah is subject to two sets of lashes or not even one set of lashes.

Rava asserts that Chachamim's position reflects the position of R' Yosi HaGalili.

The rationale behind R' Yosi HaGalili's position is explained.

R' Yosi HaGalili's position is unsuccessfully challenged.

The earlier indication that according to R' Yosi HaGalili a prohibition cannot take effect on an existing prohibition even if the second prohibition is more encompassing is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Yochanan applies R' Yosi HaGalili's position to where Shabbos and Yom Kippur coincide.

Abaye explains why the Shabbos prohibition takes effect rather than the Yom Kippur prohibition.

Rava rejects this explanation and offers an alternative explanation.

### 3) The origin of the gid hanasheh prohibition

A Beraisa records a longer version of the Chachamim's response to R' Yehudah.

The assertion that the Jewish People are not called בני ישראל until Har Sinai is unsuccessfully challenged.

### 4) Limb from a living animal

A Beraisa records a dispute whether the prohibition against eating a limb from a living animal applies to non-kosher animals.

R' Yochanan asserts that both opinions derive their position from the same source. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### *Yom Kippur fell was observed on Shabbos that year*

ושלחו מתם דיומא דכפורי דהא שתא שבתא הוא

The Gemara discusses whether a second prohibition can be compounded upon a situation where a prohibition already exists. For example, a gid hanasheh is prohibited. If the animal dies and becomes a neveilah, R' Meir holds that a person can be liable for two sets of lashes if he eats it unintentionally, once for gid and once for neveilah. Chachamim hold that he is liable only once, as the additional prohibition of neveilah cannot be added to the prohibition of gid which is already in effect. Yet, Chachamim agree that if a second "severe" prohibition is involved, we do allow compounding to occur. Examples of this are if one eats the gid of an animal that was consecrated as an olah, or if the gid is from an ox that had gored and was condemned to die. In these cases, Chachamim agree that a second sets of lashes is given.

Rava identifies R' Yose HaGalili as the one who holds that prohibitions may compound only when the second issue is "severe."

The Gemara then contrasts the view of R' Yose HaGalili with another of his rulings. If Yom Kippur falls out on Shabbos, if someone unintentionally does a prohibited labor on that day, he is liable for two chattas offerings, one for having violated Shabbos and one for Yom Kippur. R' Akiva says that only one prohibition may be counted, and he is liable for only one chattas. This is a case of a "light" prohibition, and we see that R' Yose HaGalili indeed allows compounding. The Gemara answers that we must reverse the opinions as they are reported, and it is R' Yose who says that only one set of lashes is to be administered.

R' Yizchok b. Yaakov, in the name of R' Yochanan explains that in the case of Yom Kippur on Shabbos, if the person forgot it was Shabbos, but realized it was Yom Kippur as he did the prohibited labor, he would be liable for a chattas for his inadvertent violation of Shabbos. But, if he realized it was Shabbos and forgot that it was Yom Kippur, R' Yose would say that he is exempt from a chattas. Abaye explains that the one chattas about which R' Yose spoke was for Shabbos, but here it was Yom Kippur which was inadvertent. Shabbos is set from time immemorial, and Yom Kippur is only set as the calendar is set for Tishrei that year, and the sin of Yom Kippur cannot compound upon that of Shabbos. Rava notes that notwithstanding the difference between Shabbos and Yom Kippur, they both begin at sundown, and they commence simultaneously. Rava explained that the statement of R' Yitzchak that no chattas would be brought was only that year. As Rashi explains, the enemies prevented the observance of Yom Kippur, and the sages of Eretz Yisroel determined that Yom Kippur should be observed as a remembrance on Shabbos that year, although it was not the tenth of Tishrei. This is why no chattas for Yom Kippur would be brought. ■

# HALACHA Highlight

*Does the gid hanasheh possess taste?*

לעולם קסבר אין בגידין בנותן טעם

*In fact, he holds that sinews do not impart taste*

The Gemara once again brings up the issue of whether the gid hanasheh has a taste. Rashba explains that the gid hanasheh imparts a weak taste and the disagreement as to whether the gid hanasheh imparts taste relates to whether the small taste that it imparts is comparable to a food that it would prohibit foods with which it is cooked. For this reason it would not be effective to have a gentile professional cook taste the mixture containing gid hanasheh since the disagreement is a halachic one rather than one of whether the taste is detectable.<sup>1</sup>

Our Gemara presents a disagreement whether one who eats the gid hanasheh of a neveilah is liable. According to R' Meir one is liable for two violations, neveilah and gid hanasheh, whereas according to Chachamim one is only liable for the prohibition of gid hanasheh. Rambam<sup>2</sup> rules that one who eats the gid hanasheh of a neveilah is liable for the two violations of neveilah and gid hanasheh. This implies that the gid hanasheh has taste, for if the gid hanasheh does not have taste one would not be liable for eating neveilah since that prohibition is violated when one eats an edible part of a neveilah rather than something that has no taste. The difficulty with this ruling is that in another ruling Rambam indicates that the gid hanasheh does not have taste. Rambam<sup>3</sup> rules that one who eats the gid hanasheh of a non-kosher animal is not even liable for eating

# REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the punishment for eating gid hanasheh of a neveilah ?

---

2. What is the point of dispute between Rabbanan and R' Yosi HaGalili ?

---

3. What is the difference between the establishment of Shabbos and the establishment of Yom Kippur ?

---

4. When did Hashem begin to refer to the Jewish People as בני ישראל ?

---

non-kosher meat. The rationale behind this ruling is that since the gid hanasheh does not possess taste it is not considered as though one ate prohibited meat. Rosh Yosef<sup>4</sup> answers that generally the gid hanasheh is assumed to not have taste, however, when the prohibition of gid hanasheh is in force it is treated as food. The Torah prohibited the gid hanasheh of a kosher animal, so obviously it is treated as food. Accordingly, the gid hanasheh of a neveilah is treated as meat since it is derived from a kosher animal. The gid hanasheh of a non-kosher animal is not prohibited, and as such, it is not treated as food since it does not have taste. ■

<sup>1</sup> ע"י ספר יוסף דעת לריש פירקין.  
<sup>2</sup> רמב"ם פ"ח מהל' מאכלות אסורות ה"ו.  
<sup>3</sup> רמב"ם שם ה"ה.  
<sup>4</sup> ראש יוסף לסוגייתינו. ■

# STORIES off the Daf

*The Sanctity of Shabbos*

"שבת קביעה וקיימא..."

On today's daf we find that the holiness of Shabbos is fixed and permanent. Rav Gedalyah Shcorr, zt"l, explain what this means for us personally. "On Shabbos 10 we find that Hashem tells Moshe Rabbeinu: 'I have a good gift in my treasury: its name is Shabbos. I wish to give it to Yisrael. Go and tell them.' This does not mean that Shabbos is lowered from Hashem's treasury to our level each week. On the contrary, on Shabbos Hashem lifts up Jewish souls and depos-

its them within His treasury."<sup>1</sup>

Once, the Kedushas Tzion of Bobov, zt"l, had to undergo surgery on his ear. The best place to do the surgery was very far from any Jewish community. When the Kedushas Tzion was finally allowed out of the hospital, it was too late to go home or even to a city that had a Jewish community before Shabbos. They were forced to stay in that forlorn town, with no mikveh, no minyan and only the kosher cheese they had brought along, bread and whatever didn't require a hechsher for their Shabbos meal.

On Shabbos the Kedushas Tzion said to his son Rav Shlomo, zt"l, who had accompanied him, "Listen, my son. Even though we are bereft here, far from any fellow Jews, without a mikveh or

minyan and with inferior food, you can still recognize the holiness of Shabbos in every corner. One who understands a little can see that the very walls of our hotel bear witness that today is Shabbos, set aside for Hashem."

After recounting this story, Rav Shlomo added, "The meals on Shabbos and lechem mishneh teach that Shabbos is blessed with abundant holiness. One who has illuminated eyes can feel the light of Shabbos at every step. The holiness of Shabbos—which is fixed and permanent—can be discerned by anyone who merits this, even if he does not have lechem mishneh or rich meals."<sup>2</sup> ■

<sup>1</sup> מגדל עוז, ע"י ק"מ  
<sup>2</sup> קדושת ציון, בשלח, ע"י ק"ט ■

