



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Chullin Daf Tzaddik

- **R' Chiya bar Yosef** said, when we say that the issur of gid hanasheh applies to kodashim, that is only for kodashim that are eaten. However, it does not apply to kodashim that are not eaten (an olah). **R' Yochanan** said it applies to kodashim that are not eaten as well.
 - **R' Pappa** says they don't argue. **R' Yochanan** is referring to the halacha that if one eats the gid hanasheh of an olah he gets malkus. **R' Chiya bar Yosef** is referring to the halacha that the gid hanasheh of an olah may be burned on the Mizbe'ach.
 - **Some** say that **R' Pappa** said they don't argue. **R' Chiya** is referring to removing the gid hanasheh before putting it on the Mizbe'ach (and he is saying that it need not be removed), and **R' Yochanan** is referring to bringing it on the Mizbe'ach after it was removed (it may not be brought on the Mizbe'ach if it was removed from the thigh).
 - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** says that they do argue in whether the gid hanasheh still in the thigh may be offered on the Mizbe'ach. We find that there is a machlokes Tanna'im regarding this, and so **R' Yochanan** and **R' Chiya** have the same machlokes as the Tanna'im. A Braisa says, the pasuk of "v'hiktir haKohen es *hakol* haMizbeicha" comes to include the bones, sinews, horns, and hooves. We would think that they should be offered even if they were separated from the animal. The pasuk therefore says "v'asisa olosecha habasar v'hadam". Once we have the two pesukim we learn that while they are attached they are offered, and when they are not attached they are not offered and must even be taken off if they were brought up. Who is the Tanna who holds that if they have been separated they must be taken off the Mizbe'ach? It is the view of **Rebbi**, as can be seen in another Braisa. The Braisa says, the pasuk of "v'hiktir haKohen es *hakol* haMizbeicha" comes to include the bones, sinews, horns, and hooves even if they have been separated from the body. The pasuk of "v'asisa olosecha habasar v'hadam" teaches that if these things popped out of the fire they would not be put back into the fire, only meat that popped out would be put back. **Rebbi** says, "v'hiktir haKohen es *hakol*" comes to include and "v'asisa olosecha habasar v'hadam" comes to exclude. This teaches that when they are attached they are brought up onto the Mizbe'ach, but if they are separated they are even taken down from the Mizbe'ach. We see from here that that **Rebbi and the Rabanan** argue whether sinews that have separated from the animal are brought on the Mizbe'ach. The **Rabanan** hold that we don't need the pasuk to include the bones and sinews that are attached, because we can learn that from the head of the animal, which is full of bones and is offered on the Mizbe'ach. Therefore, they say that the pasuk teaches that even when they are separated they are offered. **Rebbi** says, from the head we would only know that attached bones and sinews that are mutar may be brought up. The pasuk is needed to teach that even the gid hanasheh that is attached is brought up on the Mizbe'ach. The **Rabanan** say that the gid hanasheh may not be offered on the Mizbe'ach, based on the pasuk of "mimashkei Yisrael", which teaches that only something that may be eaten by the Yidden may be brought on the Mizbe'ach. **Rebbi** says, the blood and fats are offered even though they are assur for Yidden, and the gid hanasheh is no different. The **Rabanan** say that the mitzvah is to offer the blood and the fats, and that's why they can't be compared to the gid hanasheh. We see from here that whether the gid hanasheh may be brought on the Mizbe'ach when still attached to the thigh is the subject of a machlokes among Tanna'im.
 - **R' Huna** said, the gid hanasheh of an olah is removed and thrown into the pile of ashes on top of the Mizbe'ach (rather than burned). **R' Chisda** said, the pasuk regarding the gid hanasheh says "therefore the Bnei Yisrael may not eat the gid hanasheh", it doesn't

say that the Mizbe'ach may not eat it! **R' Huna** holds it may not be offered based on the pasuk of "mimashkei Yisrael", which teaches that only something that may be eaten by the Yidden may be brought on the Mizbe'ach.

- **Q:** A Braisa says that the gid hanasheh of an Olah is brought up onto the Mizbe'ach. Presumably this means it is offered!? **A:** It means it is brought up in the thigh, removed on the Mizbe'ach from the thigh, and thrown into the pile of ashes.
 - **Q:** If it is removed, why do we bother to bring it up? **A:** It is not proper and nice to bring up a thigh that has already been cut up and dissected.
 - There is a Braisa that says like **R' Huna**.
- A Mishna says, there was a pile of ashes on the Mizbe'ach, and there were times when there were about 300 kor of ashes on it. **Rava** said, this is an exaggeration.
 - A Mishna says that they would give the Korbon Tamid lamb to drink from a golden cup. **Rava** said, this is an exaggeration.
 - **R' Ami** said, there are times when the Torah uses exaggerated language like people do, there are times when the Nevi'im did this, and there are times when the **Chachomim** did this. An example of the **Chachomim** doing this is the two Mishnayos quoted above. An example of the Torah doing this is the pasuk of "arim gedolos uvitzuros bashamayim". An example of the Nevi'im doing this is "vatibakah haaretz bikolam".
 - **R' Yitzchak bar Nachmeini in the name of Shmuel** said, there are 3 places where the **Chachomim** used exaggerated language. They are regarding the mound of ashes, regarding the grapevine, and regarding the paroches.
 - The case of the mound of ashes was discussed above.
 - The case of the grapevine is a Mishna which says that there was a golden grapevine at the entrance to the Heichal and people would donate golden grapes or clusters of golden grapes to it. **R' Elazar the son of R' Tzadok** said, it once happened that they needed 300 Kohanim to remove all the golden grapes.
 - The case of the paroches is a Mishna in which **R' Shimon ben Gamliel in the name of R' Shimon ben Hasgan** says, the paroches was a tefach thick, and was 20x40 amos in size. The Mishna describes how many hundreds of thousands of threads were used for it. The Mishna then says that they made 2 of them each year and 300 Kohanim were needed to be toivel it.

BAYAREICH SHEL YEMIN UBAYAREICH SHEL SMOL

- The Mishna does not follow **R' Yehuda**, because in a Braisa **R' Yehuda** says that the issur of gid hanasheh only applies to the gid hanasheh of one of the thighs, and logic tells us to say that it is the gid hanasheh of the right thigh that is assur.
 - **Q:** Does this mean that **R' Yehuda** is certain that it is only the right thigh, and the "logic" he refers to is the logic of the Torah, or is he uncertain and he means that logic leans us to say it is the right thigh, but we don't know for certain? **A:** Maybe we can answer from a Mishna. The Mishna says, the bones, "gidin" (sinews) and nossar meat of the Pesach must be burned on the 16th of Nisnon. The Gemara there says, the Mishna can't be referring to the regular gidin, because if they must be burned for having been left overnight, they would fall under the "nossar" category and shouldn't be mentioned separately by the Mishna. It also can't be referring to the gidin of the neck, which people don't eat, and will therefore have to be burned in the morning, because if these giddin do not have the status of meat, why do they have to be burned at all!? **R' Chisda** said, the Mishna is referring to the "gid hanasheh" according to **R' Yehuda**, who says that only the gid hanasheh of one side is assur, and although we are not certain which side is assur, it is likely the right side. Now, this must mean that we are uncertain according to **R' Yehuda**, and therefore both gid hanasheh may not be eaten – one as a true issur D'Oraisa and the other because we are unsure which one is the true issur. The gid hanasheh that is actually mutar and is not eaten due to the uncertainty must be burned when it is left overnight and becomes nossar. Since it is never eaten, the Mishna mentions it separately as needing to be burned. We see that **R' Yehuda** is uncertain as to which gid hanasheh is the one that is assur.

- The Gemara says, this is not a valid proof. Even if one says that **R' Yehuda** is certain that only the right one is assur, the Mishna may be discussing where the 2 gid hanasheh became mixed up, in which case neither may be eaten. **R' Ashi** said, the Mishna's mention of "gidin" refers to the fats around the gid hanasheh, which a Braisa says is mutar but which Klal Yisrael has accepted upon themselves the custom of not eating it, and therefore there is no proof to what **R' Yehuda** holds. **Ravina** said the Mishna is referring to the gid that is near, but on the outside of the gid hanasheh, which **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** says is assur D'Rabanan, and therefore there is no proof as to what **R' Yehuda** holds.