

VII.

BAVLI HULLIN CHAPTER SEVEN

FOLIOS 89B-103B

7:1

- A. [The prohibition of] the sinew of the hip [sciatic nerve, Gen. 32:32] applies (1) in the Land [of Israel] and outside of the Land, (2) in the time of the Temple and not in the time of the Temple, (3) to unconsecrated animals and to Holy Things.
- B. It applies (1) to domesticated cattle and to wild beasts, (2) to the right hip and to the left hip.
- C. But it does not apply (3) to a bird, because it has no hollow [of the thigh or spoon-shaped hip socket].
- D. And it applies to the foetus.
- E. R. Judah says, “It does not apply to the foetus.”
- F. And its fat is permitted.
- G. “Butchers are not believed concerning [the claim that they removed] the sinew of the hip,” the words of R. Meir.
- H. And sages say, “They are believed (1) concerning it and (2) concerning the [forbidden] fat (Lev. 3:17, 7:23).”
- I.1** A. [Mishnah states: **The prohibition of the sinew of the hip applies... to] Holy Things [M. 7:1A] — but this is obvious! Might you have assumed that] when it became holy the prohibition of the sinew ceased to apply to it?!**
- B. *And if you maintain that [this item is included in the Mishnah to teach a new concept, namely that] the principle of imparting flavor [as if they were meat] applies to sinews and [accordingly] the prohibition against eating holy [meat] will apply to a sinew, then it should have stated [the reverse in the Mishnah], [The prohibition of] Holy Things applies to the sinew of the hip.*
- C. *Rather it must be that [the Tannaite authority of the Mishnah] reasons in accord with the view that the principle of imparting flavor [as if they were meat] does not apply to sinews. Hence [the sinew of the hip in animals that are] Holy Things are*

prohibited as sinews but not prohibited as Holy Things [because the sanctity of Holy Things does not apply to something that is not deemed to be meat].

- D. *But does our Tannaite authority reason in accord with the view that the principle of imparting flavor [as if they were meat] does not apply to sinews? Lo, was it not taught on Tannaite authority, **A thigh with which the sinew of the hip [that was not removed] was cooked, if it [the sinew] is sufficient to impart a flavor [to the thigh], lo, this is prohibited [M. 7:4 A]?***
- E. *Rather here [in our Mishnah-passage] we must be dealing with a case of the offspring of Holy Things. And [the Tannaite authority] holds the view that [the prohibition] applies to a foetus. And [the Tannaite authority] holds the view that the offspring of Holy Things are themselves holy even while they are in the womb of the mother. Thus the prohibition of the sinew and the prohibition of [the animal as a] Holy Thing simultaneously apply to the foetus [when it develops sufficiently].*
- F. *But is it possible to uphold the view that [the rule of Mishnah] applies to a case of a foetus? But lo does not the fact that the latter text of the Mishnah teaches, **And it applies to the foetus [D]** imply that the former text of the Mishnah does not deal with the case of a foetus?*
- G. *Here is how you should state the matter: This issue [of whether the prohibition applies to a foetus] was the subject of a dispute between R. Judah and the rabbis.*
- H. *But is it possible to maintain that both [the prohibition of the sinew and the prohibition of the animal as a Holy Thing] simultaneously apply [to the foetus when it develops sufficiently]? Lo, was it not taught on Tannaite authority, **On account of what sorts of uncleanness does the Nazir cut his hair [and bring an offering for having become unclean]? (1) On account of a corpse, and (2) on account of an olive's bulk of flesh from a corpse... [M. Nazir 7:2 A-B]?***
- I. *But this poses a difficulty for us. If **on account of [coming in contact with] an olive's bulk of flesh from a corpse** he cuts his hair, then on account of [coming in contact with] the whole corpse is it not certainly logical [that he should cut his hair]? [Indeed it is logical.] And said R. Yohanan, "It was only necessary to state this matter [in M. Nazir of the whole corpse] on account of the [need to include the] case of an abortion whose limbs were not attached together with its sinews." [So on this basis we conclude that the animal is considered formed even before the sinews are formed.] **[90a]** It then seems [logical to conclude] that the prohibition of the animal as a Holy Thing precedes [the other prohibition]. And even though the prohibition of the animal as a Holy Thing precedes [the other], the prohibition of the sinew comes along and applies to it.*
- J. *[But we have a principle that a prohibition cannot apply on top of another prohibition. However here the second prohibition is more inclusive and hence can apply in addition to the first.] For this prohibition [of the sinew] does apply [also] to the descendants of Noah.*
- K. *In accord with whose view do we derive this line of reasoning? It is R. Judah. But our Mishnah-passage cannot accord with the view of R. Judah. For lo it taught on Tannaite authority, **It applies (1) to domesticated cattle and to wild beasts, (2) to the right hip and to the left hip [B].** [And according to Judah it applies to only one hip (Rashi).]*

- L. *[Nevertheless it may be consistent to argue that] this Tannaite authority reasons in accord with R. Judah in one case [i.e., that it applies to the descendants of Noah] and disputes his view in another case [i.e., that it applies to only one hip].*
- M. *You could say that it is consistent according to the view of R. Judah [that the prohibition of the sinew apply] to an unclean beast because that is [subject only to] a [simple] prohibition. [Concerning] Holy Things [which are subject to] a prohibition [punishable by] extirpation, is it consistent according to his view [to say that the prohibition of the sinew apply to those]?*
- N. *Rather here it must be that we are dealing with a the birth of a firstling that is made holy by the womb [as it is born. The prohibition of the sinew either applies to the foetus prior to the time the animal is sanctified as a firstling or it applies to the animal at the moment of birth, simultaneous to its sanctification as a firstling (Rashi).]*
- O. *And [another possibility] if you prefer it makes sense to say [that we hold the principle] that the offspring of Holy Things are holy when they come into existence [at birth and not while they are foetuses].*

- I.2 A.** Said R. Hiyya bar Joseph, “They taught this matter with regard to those Holy Things that are eaten [e.g., the sin-offering]. But with regard to those Holy Things that are not eaten [e.g., the burnt-offering], the prohibition of the sinew does not apply to them.”
- B. And R. Yohanan said, “Both with regard to those Holy Things that are eaten and with regard to those Holy Things that are not eaten, the prohibition of the sinew does apply to them.”
 - C. And said R. Pappa, “*And they do not dispute.* Here [where Yohanan said the prohibition does apply, he means it with regard to the obligation] to administer stripes [to one who eats it]. Here [where Hiyya said the prohibition does not apply, he means it with regard to the permission] to offer it up [on the altar with other meat even though eating the sinew is prohibited (Rashi)].”
 - D. *Others say [an alternative version]:* And said R. Pappa, “*And they do not dispute.* Here [where Hiyya said the prohibition does not apply, he means it with regard to the obligation] to remove it [i.e., the sinew from the thigh]. Here [where Yohanan said the prohibition does apply, he means it with regard to the permission] to offer it up [on the altar by itself because the sinew is prohibited (Rashi)].”
 - E. R. Nahman bar Isaac said, “[With regard to permission] to offer it up *they dispute.*” *For it was taught on Tannaite authority,* “And the priest shall burn the whole on the altar, [as a burnt offering, an offering by fire, a pleasing odor to the Lord]” (Lev. 1: 9). [The term “whole”] includes in the rule the bones, the sinew, the horns and the hooves. You might infer that even if they were separated [from the meat of the animal they may be offered up on the altar]. It comes to teach, “And offer your burnt offerings, the flesh and the blood, [on the altar of the Lord your God; the blood of your sacrifices shall be poured out on the altar of the Lord your God, but the flesh you may eat]” (Deu. 12:27). If [you reason only in accord with this verse that one may offer] “the flesh and the blood,” you might infer that one must remove the sinews and bones and offer up [only] the meat on the altar. It

comes to teach us [to the contrary], “And the priest shall burn the whole on the altar.”

- F. Lo, what is the explanation [for these conflicting verses]? If [the sinews and bones] are attached [to the meat] they may be offered [on the altar]. But if they were separated [from the meat] even if they were up on the altar, they must be taken down.
- G. *And in accord with the view of which Tannaite authority is that which states:* But if they were separated [from the meat] even if they were up on the altar, they must be taken down? It is [the view of] Rabbi.
- H. *For it was taught on Tannaite authority:* “And the priest shall burn the whole on the altar, [as a burnt offering, an offering by fire, a pleasing odor to the Lord]” (Lev. 1: 9). [The term “whole”] includes in the rule the bones, the sinew, the horns and the hooves. [This implies] even if they were separated [from the meat of the animal they may be offered up on the altar]. But lo, how then do I interpret, “And offer your burnt offerings, the flesh and the blood, [on the altar of the Lord your God; the blood of your sacrifices shall be poured out on the altar of the Lord your God, but the flesh you may eat]” (Deu. 12:27)? [It is a case of that which] dropped off [the altar before it was consumed fully in the fire]. Lo, what is the explanation [of the conflicting verses]? You may replace partially incinerated meat [on the altar]. But you may not replace partially incinerated sinews and bones [on the altar].
- I. Rabbi says, “One verse says, ‘And the priest shall burn the whole on the altar.’ This serves as an inclusionary clause. And one verse says, ‘And offer your burnt offering, the flesh and the blood.’ This serves as an exclusionary clause. Lo, what is the explanation [for these conflicting verses]? If [the sinews and bones] are attached [to the meat] they may be offered [on the altar]. But if they were separated [from the meat] even if they were up on the altar, they must be taken down [F].”
- J. *And [what is the view of] our rabbis? For [sinews and bones] that are attached [to the meat of a sacrifice] I do not need a verse to include them [in the rule that permits me to offer them on the altar] because I have [already included them in the rule by analogy with the rule concerning the] head of a burnt-offering. [That part of the animal contains meat, bones and sinews and it must be offered on the altar.] For what case then do I need a verse [to include the sinews and bones in the rule]? For those that were separated [from the meat of the sacrifice].*
- K. And [in light of this argument, what then is the view of] Rabbi? [He would argue that for those sinews] that are attached that are permitted **[90b]** *I do not need a verse to include them [in the rule that permits me to offer them on the altar]. For what then do I need a verse [to include it in the rule]? For the sinew of the hip that is attached [to the meat of a sacrifice].*
- L. *And [in light of this argument, what then is the view of] our rabbis? [They would argue that we exclude the sinew of the hip*

from the rule based on another verse.] “[And one sheep from every flock of two hundred,] from the families [or pastures, lit.: the liquids] of Israel. [This is the offering for cereal offerings, burnt offerings, and peace offerings, to make atonement for them, says the Lord God]” (Eze. 45:15). [This implies that one may offer up only] from whatever is permitted to Israel.

- M. *And [what then is the view of] Rabbi?* [This sinew] is similar to fat and blood [that may not be eaten but may be offered on the altar].
- N. *And [in light of this argument, what then is the view of] our rabbis?* [They would argue that with regard to sacrifices] because their obligation is fulfilled through [offering] them [i.e., the fat and blood, on the altar], they are different [from the case of the sinew and no inference can be drawn by comparing the cases].

I.3 A. Said R. Huna, “The sinew of the hip of the burnt-offering — one removes it to place it on the ash-pile [in the middle of the altar to be burned].”

- B. Said R. Hisda, “*Consider this, master! Is it written, ‘Therefore to this day the altar does not consume [the sinew of the hip]?’ It is written, ‘Therefore to this day the Israelites do not eat...’* (Gen. 32:32).”
- C. And [in light of this argument, what then is the view of] R. Huna?
- D. He derives from the verse, “[And one sheep from every flock of two hundred,] from the families [or pastures, lit.: the liquids] of Israel. [This is the offering for cereal offerings, burnt offerings, and peace offerings, to make atonement for them, says the Lord God]” (Eze. 45:15), that only what is permitted to Israel [may be offered on the altar].
- E. *They raised an objection:* The sinew of the hip of the peace-offering — they sweep it into the sewer. And that of the burnt-offering they offer up. *Is it not the case that they offer it up and burn it?*
- F. No. It is the case that they offer it up and remove it [and place it on the ash-pile].
- G. But as long as he removes it, why does he offer it up [in the first place]? Because it says, “[When you offer blind animals in sacrifice, is that no evil? And when you offer those that are lame or sick, is that no evil?] Present that to your governor; [will he be pleased with you or show you favor? says the Lord of hosts]” (Mal. 1: 8).
- H. *There is a Tannaite teaching that accords with the view of R. Huna:* The sinew of the hip of the peace-offering — they sweep it into the sewer. And that of

the burnt-offering they remove it and place it on the ash-pile.

- I. *It was taught elsewhere on Tannaite authority: There was a ash-pile in the middle of the altar. At times there was piled upon it as much as three hundred kor [of ashes] [M. Tamid 2:2 B-C].*
- J. Said Raba, *"This is an exaggeration."*
- K. **They gave [the lamb which was to be] the daily whole offering a drink from a golden cup [M. Tamid 3:4 B].**
- L. Said Raba, *"This is an exaggeration."*
 - M. *Said R. Ammi, "The Torah exaggerated. The prophets exaggerated. The sages exaggerated."*
 - N. *The sages exaggerated as we just stated. The Torah exaggerated [as in this example]: "[Whither are we going up? Our brethren have made our hearts melt, saying, 'The people are greater and taller than we;] the cities are great and fortified up to heaven; [and moreover we have seen the sons of the Anakim there]'" (Deu. 1:28).*
 - O. *The prophets exaggerated [as in this example]: "[And all the people went up after him, playing on pipes, and rejoicing with great joy,] so that the earth was split by their noise" (1Ki. 1:40).*
 - P. Said R. Isaac bar Nahmani, said Samuel: In three places the sages exaggerated. And they are [with regard to the] ash-pile, the vine and the veil. About the ash-pile, *as we just stated.*
 - Q. About the vine, *as it was taught on Tannaite authority in the Mishnah: A golden vine was standing at the entrance of the sanctuary, trained over the posts. Whoever gave a leaf or a berry or a cluster brings it and hangs it on it. Said R. Eleazar bar Sadoq, "There was an incident, and three hundred*

priests were appointed [to clear it since it was too heavy]" [M. **Tamid 3:8 E-H**].

- R. About the veil, *as it was taught on Tannaite authority in the Mishnah*: Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says in the name of R. Simeon, [son of] the Prefect, "The veil was a handbreadth thick, and was woven on a loom of seventy-two cords, and each cord was made up of twenty-four threads. It was forty cubits long, and twenty cubits broad. It was made by eighty-two young girls [or: it was made up of eighty-two times ten thousand threads]. And they make two a year. And three hundred priests immerse it."

II.1 A. To the right hip and to the left hip [M. 7:1B]: *This Mishnah-passage does not accord with the view of R. Judah. For it was taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says, "It applies only to one, and it seems likely that it is the right one" [T. 7:1 C].*

- B. *They posed a question concerning this: does R. Judah hold the view that is obvious? And what then does it seems likely mean? It means, likely that this is based on the authority of the Torah. Or does R. Judah hold the view that there is some doubt [concerning his opinion]? And what then does it seems likely mean? It means, likely that this is the preferred opinion.*
- C. *Come and take note [cf. b. Pes. 83b]: [It was taught on Tannaite authority in the Mishnah:] Bones, sinews, and that which is left over [and not eaten within the stated limits] are to be burned on the sixteenth of Nissan [M. Pes. 7:10A]. And we bring up the question: Now what can be the character of these sinews? If we say that they are sinews in the category of meat, well, then, let's eat them. If they had been left over, then they fall into the category of remnants of Holy Things. So they must be sinews of the neck. [Now, there is no problem if I say that they fall into the category of meat, and that's why they have to be burned.] But if you maintain that they don't fall into the category of meat, leave them alone [why do they have to be burned?] Said R. Hisda, "The rule is required only to deal with the sinew of the hip, and it is in accord with the position of R. Judah. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says, '[The prohibition of the sinew of the hip] pertains only to one, [and it seems likely that it is the right one].'" [Freedman, Pesahim : thus one of the thigh sinews is permitted; we don't know which, therefore this is classified as left over Holy Things and has to be burned.] [We now answer our question:] If you say it is consistent [for Judah] to hold that there is some doubt, then this makes perfect sense. [Then you have to draw the conclusion that R. Judah is in doubt as to which is forbidden and which is permitted (Freedman)]. But if you say that [Judah holds] that it is obvious that*

it [one of the sinews] is permitted, then let's eat the permitted one and discard [the forbidden one. Why do both have to be burned?]

- D. *Said R. Iqa bar Hinnena, "Invariably it makes sense to maintain that [Judah holds] that it is obvious [that one is permitted]. Here what are we dealing with? It involves a case in which to begin with they were distinguished from one another but later on they got mixed up with one another." [The prohibition applies to the right thigh, but the ones in the Mishnah are mixed up, and we don't know which is which (Freedman).]*
- E. *[We now take a different tack in answering the same question, as though the foregoing had not been set forth:]* **[91a]** *R. Ashi said, "The rule is required to cover the fat [of the sinew of the hip. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: the fat is permitted, but the Israelites are holy and treat it as prohibited.]"*
- F. *Rabina said, "The rule is required to cover [the outer sinew of the hip], in accord with what R. Judah said Samuel said, for said R. Judah said Samuel, 'As to the two sinews, the inner one, near the bone, is prohibited, and one is liable on account of eating it to a flogging; the outer one, near the meat, is prohibited, but one is not liable on its account.'"*
- G. *Come and take note: [If] he ate an olive's bulk from each of two sinews from two thighs from two beasts, he incurs eighty stripes. R. Judah says, "He incurs only forty stripes" [T. 7:5 E-F]. If you say it is consistent [for Judah] to hold that it is obvious [that one of the sinews is permitted] then this makes perfect sense [that he incurs only forty]. But if you say it is consistent [for Judah] to hold that there is some doubt, then this would be a case where he was warned [against performing a prohibited act] subject to a doubt. And we have heard that R. Judah said that any warning that is subject to a doubt is not deemed a valid warning. For it was taught on Tannaite authority: [Concerning a son who is not certain which of two men is his father]: If he struck one [man who might be his father] and then he struck the other [who might be his father]; if he cursed one and then he cursed the other [he is exempt from punishment. But] if he hit them both at the same time; or if he cursed both of them at the same time, he is liable [to the death penalty in accord with Exod. 21]. R. Judah says, "[If he hit them] at the same time he is liable. [If he hit them] one after the other, he is exempt" [cf. T. Yeb. 12:7 H-K, for a variant version].*
- H. *[That proof does not settle matters, for] this Tannaite authority reasons in accord with the view of another Tannaite authority, in accord with R. Judah who said that a warning that is subject to doubt is a valid warning. As it was taught on Tannaite authority: [The verse says:] "And you shall let none of it remain until the morning, anything that remains until the morning you shall burn" (Exo. 12:10). "The verse comes to connect a commandment to a prohibition to tell us that they do not incur stripes for violating it [i.e., for letting it remain past the appointed time],"* the words of R. Judah. *R. Jacob says, "This is not the reason [that they do not incur stripes for violating it]. But it is because [violating] the prohibition [of*

leaving over the sacrifice] does not require an overt act. And [we have a principle that for violating] any prohibition that does not require an overt act, they do not incur stripes.”

- I. *Come and take note: [If] he ate two sinews from two thighs from two beasts, he incurs eighty stripes. R. Judah says, “He incurs only forty stripes” [T. 7:5 E-F]. Since it states, from two thighs from two beasts, it is obvious that both are the prohibited ones. And it was necessary to state this in accord with the view of R. Judah. We derive from this that he holds the view that it is obvious [that one is prohibited, in response to the question posed above].*
- J. *We may derive this conclusion.*
- K. *But if it is obvious [that one is prohibited] why does he incur forty stripes? Why not more? Let him incur eighty stripes! [Forty for the sinew of each animal].*
- L. *In that case what are we dealing with? The case in question may be one where there is less than an olive’s bulk [of sinew]. For it was taught on Tannaite authority: [If] he ate it and it does not contain an olive’s bulk, lo, this one is liable [M. Hul. 3:3B]. R. Judah declares exempt until there will be an olive’s bulk therein [T. 7:5 C-D].*
- M. *And what is the basis for this view? Said Raba, “Scripture stated, ‘The sinew of the hip’ (Gen. 32:32) [meaning] the right hip. And the rabbis’ [interpretation]? This [sinew] is the one whose prohibition extends through the entire hip. This excludes the outer [sinew] that does not [extend that far].”*
- N. *And R. Joshua b. Levi said, “Scripture stated, ‘[When the man saw that he did not prevail against Jacob, he touched the hollow of his thigh; and Jacob’s thigh was put out of joint] as he wrestled with him’ (Gen. 32:25). [The verse implies] this was like a person who clutches his fellow and his [right] hand reaches around to the right hip of his fellow.”*
- O. *R. Samuel bar Nahmani said, “[The angel] appeared to him in the form of an idolater. As the master said: **An Israelite who goes along with an idolater on the road, he puts him at his right hand [and he does not put him at his left hand] [T. A. Z. 3:4 F-G].** [And the angel then struck the hip nearest to him.]”*
- P. *R. Samuel bar Aha [said] before R. Pappa in the name of Raba bar Ulla, “[The angel] appeared to him in the form of a disciple of the sages. As the master said: One who walks along on the right side of his master, lo, he is a boor [b. Yoma 37a]. [He therefore walked on the left side of the angel.]”*

- II.2** A. *And what is the rabbis' [basis for holding the view that both hips are prohibited]? [The angel] came up from behind him and dislocated both of them.*
- B. *And how do the rabbis interpret this phrase: "As he wrestled with him" (Gen. 32:25)? They need it [to support] the other teaching of R. Joshua b. Levi. For said R. Joshua b. Levi, "This teaches us that they kicked dust with their feet up to the Throne of Glory. Here it is written, "As he wrestled (h'bw) with him" (Gen. 32:25). And there it is written, "[The Lord is slow to anger and of great might, and the Lord will by no means clear the guilty. His way is in whirlwind and storm,] and the clouds are the dust of his feet" (Nahum 1: 3).*
- C. *And said R. Joshua b. Levi, "Why is it called the sinew of the hip? Because it was dislocated from its position upward." And so it says [in support of this understanding of the word], "[The warriors of Babylon have ceased fighting, they remain in their strongholds;] their strength has failed (i.e., slipped), they have become women; [her dwellings are on fire, her bars are broken]" (Jer. 51:30).*

Exegesis of the Story of Jacob's Wrestling with the Angel

- II.3** A. *Said R. Yosé b. R. Hanina, "Why is it written, 'The Lord sent a word against Jacob, and it fell on Israel' (Isa. 9: 8). 'The Lord sent a word against Jacob,' this is [the prohibition on account of Jacob's wrestling with the Angel of] the sinew of the hip. 'And it fell on Israel,' its prohibition spread through all of Israel."*
- B. *And said R. Yosé b. R. Hanina, "Why is it written, '[When Joseph saw Benjamin with them, he said to the steward of his house, Bring the men into the house,] and slaughter an animal and make ready, [for the men are to dine with me at noon]' (Gen. 43:16). Show them [the brothers] the place it was slaughtered [so they will know they can eat the meat]. 'And make ready' [means] remove the sinew of the hip in front of them [so they know they can eat the meat]."*
- C. *And this accords with the authority who holds the view that the sinew of the hip was prohibited to the sons of Noah [i.e., and to the Israelites even before the Torah was given at Sinai].*
- II.4** A. *"Jacob was left alone; [and a man wrestled with him until daybreak]" (Gen. 32:24):*
- B. *Said R. Eleazar, "This teaches us that he stayed behind on account of some small jars. This serves as a source of proof [of the maxim] that for the righteous, their material possessions are more dear to them than their own well-being. And why [do they go] to this length [to protect their small possessions]? Because they do not engage in theft [and they are poor]."*

- C. “And a man wrestled with him until daybreak” (Gen. 32:24): Said R. Isaac, “This serves as a source of proof [of the maxim] that a disciple of the sages should not go out by himself at night.”
- D. R. Aha bar Kahana said, “We derive that [maxim] from this [verse]: **[91b]** “[Now is not Boaz our kinsman, with whose maidens you were?] See, he is winnowing barley tonight at the threshing floor” (Rut. 3: 2).
- E. R. Abbahu said [we derive that maxim] from this verse: “So Abraham rose early in the morning, saddled his ass, and took two of his young men with him, and his son Isaac; and he cut the wood for the burnt offering, and arose and went to the place of which God had told him” (Gen. 22: 3).
- F. And our rabbis say [we derive that maxim] from this verse: “So he said to him, ‘Go now, see if it is well with your brothers, and with the flock; and bring me word again.’ So he sent him from the valley of Hebron, and he came to Shechem” (Gen. 37:14).
- G. Rab said [we derive that maxim] from this verse: “The sun rose upon him as he passed Penuel, limping because of his hip” (Gen. 32:31).

II.5 A. Said R. Aqiba, “I asked R. Gamaliel and R. Joshua, at the meat market of Emmaus, where they went to buy an animal for the feast of the son of R. Gamaliel, [about this verse].

- B. “*It is written*: ‘The sun rose upon him.’ But did the sun rise only upon him? The sun rose upon the entire world!”
- C. Said R. Isaac, “[This tells us that] the sun which had set on his account, rose on his account. *For it is written*: “Jacob left Beer-sheba, and went toward Haran” (Gen. 28:10). *And it is written*: “And he came to a certain place, and stayed there that night, because the sun had set. [Taking one of the stones of the place, he put it under his head and lay down in that place to sleep]” (Gen. 28:11).
- D. *When he arrived at Haran*, he said, “Perhaps I passed by the place about which my forefathers had prayed.” *When he decided to go back the earth heaved up [to block his way]*. Right then [the verse tells us], “He came to [lit. touched] a certain place.”
- E. *When he had prayed, he wanted to go back. The Holy One, blessed be He said, “Will this righteous person come to my inn and depart without sleeping over?”* Right then [the verse tells us], “The sun had set.”

II.6 A. *It is written*: “Taking one (lit.: from among) of the stones of the place, [he put it under his head and lay down in that place to sleep]” (Gen. 28:11). *And it is written*: “[So Jacob rose early in the morning,] and he took the stone [which he had put under his head and set it up for a pillar and poured oil on the top of it] (Gen. 28:18).

- B. Said R. Isaac, “This teaches us that all of the stones gathered to this one place. And each one was saying, “Upon me shall this righteous person rest [his head].”
- C. *It was taught*: All of them [miraculously] fused together into one.” [Hence the reference to a single stone in the latter verse.]
- D. “And he dreamed that there was a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven; [and behold, the angels of God were ascending and descending on it!]” (Gen. 28:12):

- E. *It was taught:* How wide was this ladder? Eight thousand parasangs. *For it is written:* “And behold, the angels of God were ascending and descending on it!” [The plural form of] “ascending” denotes there were [at least] two [going up the ladder]. [And the plural form of] “descending” denotes there were [at least] two [going down the ladder]. *And if they encountered one another [at the same place] there would be four [across]. And it is written concerning [the size of] an angel:* “His body was like Tarshish [=beryl], [his face like the appearance of lightning, his eyes like flaming torches, his arms and legs like the gleam of burnished bronze, and the sound of his words like the noise of a multitude]” (Dan. 10: 6). *And we learned that [the city] Tarshish was two thousand parasangs wide.*
- F. *It was taught:* They were “ascending” and looking at the visage above. And they were “descending” and looking at the visage below. [Cf.: “As for the likeness of their faces, each had the face of a man in front; the four had the face of a lion on the right side, the four had the face of an ox on the left side, and the four had the face of an eagle at the back” (Eze. 1:10). Rashi: The face of a man was the visage of Jacob.]
- G. *They were about to imperil him. Right then [so as to protect him the Lord appeared]:* “And behold, the Lord stood above it [and said, ‘I am the Lord, the God of Abraham your father and the God of Isaac; the land on which you lie I will give to you and to your descendants]” (Gen. 28:13).
- H. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “If it were not written in scripture itself we would not be able to say about Him that he acted like a person fanning his son [to make him comfortable in the heat of the day because saying that would be demeaning to God].”
- I. “The land on which you lie I will give to you and to your descendants” (Gen. 28:13): *What does this [promise] include?*
- J. Said R. Isaac, “This teaches us that God folded up the entire Land of Israel and placed it under Jacob our forefather [before issuing this blessing] so that it would be easier for his descendants to subdue it.”
- II.7 A.** “Then he said, ‘Let me go, for the day is breaking.’ But Jacob said, ‘I will not let you go, unless you bless me’” (Gen. 32:26):
- B. He [Jacob] said to him, “Are you a robber or a kidnapper, that you are afraid of the daybreak?”
- C. He said to him, “I am an angel. And from the day I was created, my time did not come to sing praise [to God in the morning service] until now.”
- D. *This supports [the teaching of] R. Hananel in the name of Rab.* For said R. Hananel, said Rab, “Three units of ministering angels sing praise each day. One sings “Holy.” Another sings “Holy.” And another sings “Holy is the Lord of hosts.” [Cf. Isa. 6: 3, “And one called to another and said: ‘Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory’” (Isa. 6: 3). Apparently, one unit invokes God’s name after reciting only one word, “Holy.”]
- E. *They posed an objection:* Israel is more dear to the Holy One, blessed be He, than the ministering angels? For Israel sings praise every hour [of the day]. And the ministering angels sing praise only once each day.
- F. *And some state the matter:* Once each week.

- G. *And some state the matter:* Once each month.
- H. *And some state the matter:* Once each year.
- I. *And some state the matter:* Once each seven years.
- J. *And some state the matter:* Once each Jubilee.
- K. *And some state the matter:* Once ever.
- L. And Israel invokes God's name after reciting two words. As it says, "Hear, Israel: The Lord [our God is one Lord]" (Deu. 6: 4). And the ministering angels invoke God's name only after reciting three words. *As it is written*, "[And one called to another and said:] 'Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts; [the whole earth is full of his glory']" (Isa. 6: 3).
- M. And the ministering angels do not sing praise up above until Israel sings praise down below. As it says, [First] "the morning stars sang together," *then afterward*, "all the sons of God shouted for joy" (Job. 38: 7).
- N. [Rashi explains the objection: *In any event it was taught here* "only after reciting three words." *And you say* (that some angels recited only one word prior to invoking God's name), "Holy is the Lord of hosts."] Rather [you should restate B as follows]: One sings "Holy." Another sings "Holy, holy." And another sings "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts."
- O. *But is there not [another praise where they invoke God's name after reciting two words]? [92a]* "[And the spirit lifted me up, and I heard behind me the sound of loud rumbling;] blessed be the glory of the Lord" (Eze. 3:12) [This is not a valid objection.] *The [higher-ranking] ophanim were the ones who sang that praise.*
- P. *And if you prefer another possibility: [The angels did recite this refrain. But] once permission was granted [to invoke God's name in the first refrain after three words], it was granted [in the subsequent refrains to invoke it after two words].*

II.8 A. "He strove with the angel and prevailed, he wept and sought his favor" (Hosea 12: 4). I do not know who prevailed. Since it says, "For you have striven with God and with humans, and have prevailed" (Gen. 32:28) I would say that Jacob prevailed over the angel. "He wept and sought his favor" — I do not know who wept for whom. Since it says, "Let me go" I would say that the angel wept for Jacob.

- B. "For you have striven with God and with humans, and have prevailed" (Gen. 32:28):
- C. Said Rabbah, "He hinted to him that two princes are destined to be descended from him — the Exilarch in Babylonia and the Patriarch in the Land of Israel. This serves as a source of proof that he hinted to him concerning the exile."

II.9 A. "And on the vine there were three branches (*srygym*); [as soon as it budded, its blossoms shot forth, and clusters ripened into grapes]" (Gen. 40:10):

- B. Said R. Hiyya bar Abba, said Rab, "These are the three princes of distinction that come forth in Israel in every generation. Sometimes two of them are here [in Babylonia] and one is in the Land of Israel. And sometimes two are in the Land of Israel and one is here."

- C. *Our rabbis looked favorably upon the distinguished rabbi Uqba and the distinguished rabbi Nehemiah, the sons of the daughter of Rab [as two princes of distinction of their generation].*
- D. *Raba said, "These [branches represent] the three princes [Rashi: angels] of the gentiles who speak favorably on behalf of Israel in each generation."*
- E. *It was taught [regarding the meaning of the verse]: "The vine" — this represents the world. "Three branches" — this [represents] Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. "As soon as it budded, its blossoms shot forth" — this [represents] the mothers [of Israel]. "Its clusters ripened into grapes" — this represents the tribes."*
- F. *Said to him R. Joshua: [This interpretation is not valid.] Does it make any sense to say that one shows [through symbolism] what already took place? [No.] One only shows [through symbolism] what will take place. Rather [here is how you should interpret the verse:] "The vine" — this represents the Torah. "Three branches" — this [represents] Moses, Aaron and Miriam. "As soon as it budded, its blossoms shot forth" — this [represents] the Sanhedrin. "Its clusters ripened into grapes" — this represents the righteous people of every generation."*
- G. *Said Rabban Gamaliel, "We still need the Modaite. For [his interpretation is better because] it sustains all of them [i.e., the symbolic interpretations] in connection with one place [as follows]."*
- H. *R. Eleazar the Modaite says: "The vine" — this represents Jerusalem. "Three branches" — this [represents] the Temple, the King and the High Priest. "As soon as it budded, its blossoms shot forth" — this [represents] the young priests. "Its clusters ripened into grapes" — this represents the libations."*
- I. *R. Joshua b. Levi sustains [the interpretations in connection] with the gifts [that God gave the Israelites in the desert]. For said R. Joshua b. Levi: "The vine" — this represents Jerusalem. "Three branches" — this [represents] the well, the pillar of smoke and the manna. "As soon as it budded, its blossoms shot forth" — this [represents] the first fruits. "Its clusters ripened into grapes" — this represents the libations."*
- J. *R. Jeremiah bar Abba said: "The vine" — this represents Israel. And so it says, "You brought a vine out of Egypt" (Psa. 80: 8). "Three branches" — this [represents] the three pilgrimages that Israel goes on each year [up to Jerusalem on the festivals]. "As soon as it budded" — [this means] the time has come for Israel to be fruitful and multiply. And so it says, "But the descendants of Israel were fruitful and increased greatly; [they multiplied and grew exceedingly strong; so that the land was filled with them]" (Exo. 1: 7). "Its blossoms shot forth" — [this means] the time has come for Israel to be redeemed. And so it says, "[I have trodden the wine press alone, and from the peoples no one was with me; I trod them in my anger and trampled them in my wrath;] their lifeblood is sprinkled upon my garments, and I have stained all my raiment" (Isa. 63: 3). "Its clusters ripened into grapes" — [this means] the time has come for Egypt to drink the cup of venom [Jastrow: staggering. Cf. "Rouse yourself, rouse yourself, stand up, O Jerusalem, you who have drunk at the hand of the Lord the cup of his wrath, who have drunk to the dregs the bowl of staggering" (Isa. 51:17)].*

- K. And this [accords with] what Raba said, “These three cups that were spoken of [in one verse] with regard to [the nation] Egypt, what do they mean? [‘Pharaoh’s cup was in my hand; and I took the grapes and pressed them into Pharaoh’s cup, and placed the cup in Pharaoh’s hand’ (Gen. 40:11).] One represents the cup [of wrath] it drank in the time of Moses. One represents the cup [of wrath] it drank in the time of Pharaoh-Necho [i.e., ‘The word which the Lord spoke to Jeremiah the prophet about the coming Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon to smite the land of Egypt’ (Jer. 46:13)]. And one represents the cup [of wrath] it will drink in the future along with all the other idolaters.”
- L. Said R. Abba to R. Jeremiah bar Abba, “When Rab expounded these verses in his homily, he expounded them in accord with your views [as in H above].”
- M. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “This nation [Israel] is compared to a vine. Its branches, they are the householder. Its clusters, they are the disciples of the sages. Its leaves, they are the plain folk [*amme ha’ares*]. Its twigs, they are the lowlives in Israel. *And this accords with [the directive] they sent from Israel: Let the clusters pray for the leaves. For if not for the leaves, the clusters could not survive.*

II.10 A. “So I bought her (‘*krh*) for fifteen shekels of silver [and a *homer* and a *letekh* of barley]” (Hosea 3: 2):

- B. Said R. Simeon b. Yosedeq: The first language used in the verse — always implies buying (i.e., pointing out the relationship between *kyrh* and *mkyrh*). As it says, “[My father made me swear, saying, ‘I am about to die:] in my tomb which I bought (*kryty*) [RSV: hewed out] for myself [in the land of Canaan, there shall you bury me.’ Now therefore let me go up, I pray you, and bury my father; then I will return]” (Gen. 50: 5). “Fifteen” — [specified in the verse] this is [a symbolic reference to] the fifteenth day of Nissan on which Israel was redeemed from Egypt. “Shekels of silver” — these are [symbols of] the righteous. And so it says, “He took a bag of money with him; [at full moon he will come home]” (Pro. 7:20).
- C. “And a *homer* and a *letekh* of barley” — [i.e., measures equal to thirty seah and fifteen seah respectively] these are the forty-five righteous people who sustain the world. And I do not know if thirty of them are here [in Babylonia] and fifteen are in Israel, or if fifteen are here and thirty are in Israel. When it says, “So I took the thirty shekels of silver and threw them into the treasury in the house of the Lord” (Zec. 11:13) — I would say [based on that], thirty are in the Land of Israel and fifteen are here.
- D. Said Abbaye, “*And most of these [righteous people] can be found in the synagogue under the side chamber [Cashdan: the last reference is unknown].*” *And this accords with what is written:* “Then I said to them, ‘If it seems right to you, give me my wages; but if not, keep them.’ And they weighed out as my wages thirty shekels of silver” (Zec. 11:12).
- E. R. Judah says, “These [thirty shekels] are [symbols of] the thirty righteous people of the nations of the earth who sustain the nations of the earth.”
- F. Ulla said, “These [thirty shekels] are [symbols of] the thirty commandments that the sons of Noah accepted upon themselves. But they only keep three of them! One is that **[92b]** they do not write a *ketubah* [i.e., marriage contract] for male

partners. One is that they do not weigh flesh of the dead [of either humans or animals] to sell in the market. And one is that they respect the Torah.”

III.1 A. But it does not apply to a bird, because it has no hollow [of the thigh or spoon shaped hip socket] [M. 7:1C]. *But lo, we observe that it does [have a hollow]!*

B. *It has but it is not rounded [Cashdan: convex].*

C. *R. Jeremiah posed a question: If a bird has one [i.e., a hip-socket] that is rounded or if a beast has one that is not rounded, what is [its status with regard to this prohibition]? Do we follow that one [anomaly]? Or do we follow its category?*

D. *The question stands unresolved.*

IV.1 A. And it applies to the foetus. R. Judah says, “It does not apply to the foetus.” And its fat is permitted [M. 7:1 D-F]. Said Samuel, “And its fat is permitted according to all authorities.”

B. *Which fat does he mean? If you maintain [it means the fat] of the foetus, lo they dispute this matter. For it was taught on Tannaite authority: “[The prohibition of the sinew of the hip] applies to the foetus, and its fat is prohibited,” the words of R. Meir [M. Hul 7:1D].* **R. Judah says, “It does not apply to the foetus. Its fat is permitted” [M. Hul. 7:1 E-F].** And said R. Eleazar, said R. Oshaia, “The dispute pertains to a case of a live nine-months’ birth. And R. Meir follows in accord with his view [that it must be slaughtered] and R. Judah with his view.”

C. *Rather [it refers to] forbidden fats of the sinew. [*

D. *But in this too] there is a dispute. For it was taught on Tannaite authority: “As to the sinew of the hip: One digs after it in every place in which it is located and removes it. And he cuts away its fat from its root,” the words of R. Meir [cf. M. 7:2 B].* **R. Judah says, “One removes it [merely] from the cap of the hip bone” [cf. M. 7:2 C and T. 7:4 A-B].**

E. *In point of fact, it means the fat of the sinew. And Samuel agrees that according to R. Meir it is prohibited on the authority of the rabbis. For it was taught on Tannaite authority: And its fat is permitted, but the Israelites are holy and treat it as forbidden [cf. b. Pes. 93b]. Is it not the case that this is in accord with the view of R. Meir who says that it is permitted based on the authority of the Torah but prohibited on the authority of the rabbis?*

F. *Perhaps not and this is in accord with the view of R. Judah. But in accord with the view of R. Meir it is prohibited even on the authority of the Torah.*

G. *No. You cannot have concluded that. For it was taught on Tannaite authority: As to the sinew of the hip: One digs after it in every place in which it is located [and removes it]. And its fat is permitted.*

H. *Who is the authority from whom we heard that, one digs after it? R. Meir. And it was stated [in conjunction with this rule], its fat is permitted.*

IV.2 A. Said R. Isaac bar Samuel bar Marta, said Rab, “The Torah prohibited only the branches [of the sinew].”

B. *Ulla said, “It is [tasteless] like wood, but the Torah made him liable [for eating it anyway].”*

- B. *Said Abbaye, "In accord with the view of Ulla it makes more sense." For said R. Sheshet, said R. Assi, "The veins in forbidden fat are prohibited but they are not liable for [eating] them."*
- C. *It makes sense to maintain that the Torah spoke of fat and not veins. Here too [it makes sense to maintain that] the Torah spoke of the sinew and not the branches.*

IV.3 A. *Reverting to the body of the prior text: Said R. Sheshet, said R. Assi, "The veins in forbidden fat are prohibited but they are not liable for [eating] them." [The veins] of the kidney are prohibited and they are not liable for [eating] them.*

- B. *The white of the kidney: Rabbi and R. Hiyya [disputed the matter]. One prohibited it and one permitted it. Rabbah would scrape it all off. R. Yohanan would scrape it all off. R. Assi would trim it from the surface.*
- C. *Said R. Yohanan, "In accord with the view of R. Assi it makes more sense." For said R. Abba, said R. Judah, said Samuel, [93a] "The fat that is covered by meat is permitted." It makes sense to conclude that [fat which is] 'on them at the loins' the Torah said [is prohibited]. But not the fat that is in the loins." [The verse is: "And the two kidneys with the fat that is on them at the loins, and the appendage of the liver which he shall take away with the kidneys" (Lev. 3: 4).]*
- D. *Here too [it makes sense to conclude that the fat] that is on the kidneys the Torah said [is prohibited]. But not the fat that is in the kidneys.*

IV.4 A. *Reverting to the body of the prior text: Said R. Abba, said R. Judah, said Samuel, "The fat that is covered by meat is permitted."*

- B. *Is that so? For lo, said R. Abba, said R. Judah, said Samuel, "This fat that is under the loins is prohibited."*
- C. *Said Abbaye, "When it is alive an animal moves its joints [and uncovers this fat]."*
- D. *Said R. Yohanan, "I am not a butcher, nor am I the son of a butcher. But I do recall that they used to say this in the house of study: 'When it is alive an animal moves its joints.'"*

- IV.5** A. *Said R. Abba, said R. Judah, said Samuel, "The fat on the omasum and on the reticulum is prohibited and the punishment [for eating it] is extirpation." And this [what the verse refers to as] "the fat that is on the entrails." [The verse is: "And from the sacrifice of the peace offering, as an offering by fire to the Lord, he shall offer the fat covering the entrails and all the fat that is on the entrails" (Lev. 3: 3).]*
- B. *And said R. Abba, said R. Judah, said Samuel, "The fat on the innominate bone is prohibited and the punishment [for eating it] is extirpation." And this [what the verse refers to as] "the fat that is on them at the loins" (Lev. 3: 4).*
 - C. *And said R. Abba, said R. Judah, said Samuel, "The veins in the fore-leg are prohibited."]*
 - D. *Said R. Safra, "By Moses! Did the Torah say not to eat any meat? [This prohibition is too extreme.]"*

- E. *Said Raba, "By Moses! Did the Torah say you should eat blood? [This prohibition is appropriate.] If one cut it and salted it [to remove the blood] then it is perfectly acceptable even to cook it in a stew-pot."*

IV.6 A. *Said R. Judah, said Samuel, "[The fat on] the first cubit of intestines needs to be scraped off." And this is [what they refer to as] "the fat that is on the small intestines."*

- B. *And said R. Judah, "The veins in the rump are prohibited [as forbidden fat (Cashdan)]."*
- C. *There are five veins in the loins. Three are on the right side and two are on the left side. Each of the three branches out to two more. Each of the two branches out to three more. We derive from this that if one removes [the veins] while [the meat] is still warm, they slip right out. But if not, he must dig after it [to get out all of these enumerated veins].*
- D. *Said Abbaye, and some maintain it was R. Judah, "There are five [prohibited] veins. Three [are prohibited] because of fat and two are prohibited because of blood. [The veins] of the spleen, the loins and the kidneys [are prohibited] because of fat. [The veins] of the foreleg and of the cheeks [are prohibited] because of blood. What do we derive from this [is the difference between the prohibited veins]? Those [that are prohibited] because of blood, if he cuts them out and salts them, they are perfectly acceptable. Those [that are prohibited because of fat], there is no redress for them."*
- E. *Said R. Kahana, and some maintain it was R. Judah, "There are five [prohibited] membranes. Three [are prohibited] because of fat and two are prohibited because of blood. [The membranes] of the spleen, the loins and the kidneys [are prohibited] because of fat. [The membranes] of the testicles and of the brain [are prohibited] because of blood."*
- F. *R. Judah bar Oshaia used to peel spleens for Levi the son of R. Huna bar Hiyya. He used to trim it from the top (Cashdan: the thick part where it attached to the rumen). He [Levi] said to him, "[Peel off] further down." His father came and found him. He said to him, "This is what your mother's father said in the name of Rab." And who was that? R. Jeremiah bar Abba: "The Torah prohibited only [the fat] that is on the breast of the spleen (Cashdan: the membrane over the thick part)."*
- G. *Is that so? For lo, What is the circumstance? If you maintain [that it means the membrane] on the breast of the spleen, why is it that they are not liable for [eating] it? Rather it must be [that it means the membrane] of the whole [spleen]." He said to him, "If that was taught on Tannaite authority [then I disagree with what] was taught on Tannaite authority."*

IV.7 A. *Reverting to the body of the previous text [with reference to D, the membrane of the spleen is prohibited:] Said R. Hamnuna, "It was taught on Tannaite authority: The membrane on the spleen is prohibited but they are not liable for [eating] it. The membrane on the kidney is prohibited but they are not liable for [eating] it." But lo it was taught on Tannaite authority: They are liable for [eating] it.*

- B. *From one [ruling regarding the] spleen to the other there is no contradiction. This one [that says he is liable refers to the membrane] at the breast [of the spleen at the top]. This one [that says he is not liable refers to the membrane] not at the breast [of the spleen at the top].*
- C. *From one [ruling regarding the] kidney to the other there also is no contradiction. This one [that says he is liable refers to] the upper part [of the membrane]. This one [that says he is not liable refers to] the lower part.*

IV.8 A. *Defective testicles [of a beast] (Jastrow: mashed, undeveloped; Cashdan: crushed, dislocated):*

- B. *R. Ammi and R. Assi [disputed their status].*
- C. *One prohibited [eating] them.*
- D. *And one permitted [eating] them.*
- E. *The one who prohibited them [did so because he reasoned that] [93b] since they will not heal back, they have the status of a limb torn from a live animal.*
- F. *The one who permitted them [did so because he reasoned that] as long as they do not putrefy, there is life in them [i.e., they are living tissue].*
- G. *And the other [would respond to this point by arguing] these do not putrefy because they are not exposed to the air [but they are not living tissue].*
- H. *And the other would respond [to the first justification by arguing] these do not heal back because they became emaciated.*
- I. *Said R. Yohanan to R. Shaman bar Abba, “These defective testicles are permitted but you may not eat them on account of [the custom of your family based on the verse], “Hear, my son, your father’s instruction, and reject not your mother’s teaching” (Pro. 1: 8).*
- J. *Said Mar bar R. Ashi, “The testicles of a kid up to thirty days old are permitted [for eating] without peeling. After that, if they contain semen, they are prohibited [Rashi: because of the prohibition of blood]. If they do not contain semen, they are permitted. And how do we know if they contain [semen]? If they have red striations [in the membrane], they are prohibited. If they do not have red striations, they are permitted.”*
- K. *[Regarding] red meat, testicles and neck-arteries there was a dispute between R. Aha and Rabina. Regarding all of the rest of [the rules of] the Torah, Rabina held the more lenient view and R. Aha held the stricter view. And the law accords with the more lenient view of Rabina. The exception is these three [items] where R. Aha holds the more lenient view and Rabina holds the stricter view. And the law accords with the more lenient view of R. Aha.*
- L. *[Regarding] bruised red meat [where there was congealed blood from an injury] — if he cut it and salted it [to remove the blood] it is perfectly acceptable even to cook it in a stew-pot. One also may suspend it on a spit [and roast it over a fire] so the blood exudes. [One who put it] on the coals [to barbecue] — R. Aha and Rabina disputed this case. One said that it draws [the blood] out of it. And one said it draws [the blood] into*

it. And the same rules apply to testicles and the same rules apply to neck-arteries.

IV.9 A. *A head put on hot ashes — if he put it down on the neck opening where it was slaughtered, the blood exudes and it is permitted. [If he put it down sideways, [the blood] congeals inside it and it is prohibited. If he put it down on its nostrils, if he stuck something into them [so the blood would flow out] it is permitted. If he did not, it is prohibited.*

B. *There are those that state the matter [in another version]: [If he put it down] on its nostrils or on the neck opening where it was slaughtered, the blood exudes [and it is permitted]. If he put it down sideways, if he stuck something into it [so that the blood exudes] it is permitted. And if not, it is prohibited.*

IV.10 A. Said R. Judah said Samuel, “As to the two sinews, the inner one (Cashdan: the great sciatic nerve), near the bone, is prohibited, and one is liable on account of eating it to a flogging; the outer one (Cashdan: the common peroneal, the longest branch of the nerve), near the meat, is prohibited, but one is not liable on its account.”

B. *But lo it was taught on Tannaite authority: The inner one is near the meat.*

C. *Said R. Aha, said R. Kahana, “[At one point the sinew] disappears in the meat (so Jastrow: it goes in like a key).”*

D. *But lo it was taught on Tannaite authority: The outer one is near the bone.*

E. *Said R. Judah, “Where the butchers cleave it [so as to remove the sinew it is near the bone].”*

IV.11 A. *It was stated: A butcher who was found after [cutting the meat] to leave fat on [it through negligence] —*

B. *R. Judah said, “The bulk of a barley-corn.”*

C. *R. Yohanan said, “An olive’s bulk.” [Explained in the next paragraph.]*

D. *Said R. Pappa, “And they do not dispute [regarding this matter of the butcher’s negligence]. This one [Yohanan] states the minimum he must leave if we are to administer stripes to him. This one [Judah] states the minimum he must leave if we are to remove him [as a butcher].”*

E. *Said Mar Zutra, “The bulk of a barley-corn [of fat] must be in one place. The olive’s bulk [can be comprised by combining the quantity of the remaining fat] in two or three places.”*

F. *And the law is: if we are to administer stripes to him [he must leave fat in the quantity of] an olive’s bulk; if we are to remove him [as a butcher he must leave fat in the quantity even of] a barley-corn.*

V.1 A. **“Butchers are not believed concerning [the claim that they removed] the sinew of the hip,” the words of R. Meir [M. 7:1 G].**

B. *Said R. Hiyya bar Abba, said R. Yohanan, “They reverted to say they are believed.”*

C. *Said R. Nahman, “Have the generations become more proper?”*

D. *[No, the reason they said this is] originally when they reasoned in accord with the view of R. Meir, they did not believe them. Finally they reasoned in accord with the view of R. Judah.*

- E. *There are those who teach this matter with regard to the latter text of the Mishnah: And sages say, “They are believed (1) concerning it and (2) concerning the [forbidden] fat (Lev. 3:17, 7:23)[M. 7:1 H].”*
- F. *Said R. Hiyya bar Abba, said R. Yohanan, “They reverted to say they are not believed.”*
- G. *Said R. Nahman, “Nowadays they are believed.”*
- H. *Have the generations become more proper?*
- I. *[No, the reason they said this is] originally when they reasoned in accord with the view of R. Judah, [they did believe them]. Later they reasoned in accord with the view of R. Meir.*
- J. *As long as they remembered the view of R. Judah, they still did not believe them. But now that they have forgotten the view of R. Judah, they believe them.*

VI.1 A. *Concerning the [forbidden] fat (Lev. 3:17, 7:23) [M. 7:1 H]: Where was fat mentioned earlier? [In G it is not the subject of the dispute.]*

- B. *Here is how you should state the matter: “Butchers are not believed (1) concerning [the claim that they removed] the sinew of the hip, or (2) concerning the [forbidden] fat” [the words of R. Meir]. And sages say, “They are believed (1) concerning it and (2) concerning the [forbidden] fat.”*

7:2 A

A. *A man sends to a gentile a thigh in which the sinew of the hip [is located], because its place [presence] is known.*

- I.1 A.** *[A man sends] a whole one, yes; a cut-up one, no. What circumstance are we dealing with? If you maintain [that we deal with] a place where they do not publicize it [in the event that an animal was found to be terefah] [94a] one should be permitted to send to him also a cut-up thigh [with the sinew in it because] lo, they [i.e., Jews] would not buy any meat from him [i.e., from a gentile since they suspect it is terefah (Rashi)].*
- B. *Rather, [maintain that we deal with] a place where they publicize it [that an animal was found to be terefah].*
- C. *[If so] even a whole one they should not send to him [i.e., a gentile]. For he may cut it up and sell it [to a Jew].*
- D. *If you prefer [we can explain the case] in a place where they do publicize it. And if you prefer [we can explain the case] in a place where they do not announce.*
- E. *If you prefer [we can explain the case] in a place where they do publicize it — cuts [of meat] made by a gentile are easy to recognize [so you could send a whole thigh to a gentile who will cut it up to sell it].*
- F. *And if you prefer [we can explain the case] in a place where they do not publicize it — they decreed [against sending a cut thigh to a gentile] lest he give it to him in the presence of another Israelite [who may assume that the sinew was removed and that he could eat the meat].*
- G. *And if you prefer [here is another explanation]: [they prohibit giving the thigh to a gentile] because he is misleading him [to think that he did him a favor by already removing the sinew from the thigh]. For Samuel said, “It is forbidden to mislead any person, including a gentile.”*

- H. *And this [principle] of Samuel is not explicitly stated by him. Rather it is stated as a principle derived from the following [incident]: Samuel was traversing the river on a ferry. He said to his servant, "Tip the ferryman [who was a gentile]."*
- I. *He tipped him. But Samuel became angry.*
 - J. *Why did he get angry?*
 - K. *Said Abbayye, "[He tipped him with] a terefah-chicken. And he gave it to him under the pretense that it was a validly slaughtered one."*
 - L. *Raba said, "He told him to give [the ferryman] a drink of strong wine. Instead he gave him diluted wine."*
 - M. *And what does it matter whether [Samuel stated the principle explicitly or] it was a principle derived [from this incident]?*
 - N. *In accord with the view of the authority who holds that [he got angry over] the terefah-chicken, [Samuel would have] said to him, "Why do you keep prohibited food around?"*
 - O. *In accord with the view of the authority who holds that [he got angry over] the wine, [Samuel would have] said to him, "Give him strong wine, means give it to him undiluted." [In neither case was he angry that the servant deceived the gentile. How then do you maintain that we derive Samuel's principle from this incident?]*

On Authentic Generosity, and the Sending of Gifts

- I.2 A.** *It was taught on Tannaite authority: R. Meir used to say, "A person should not implore his friend to dine with him if he knows that he will not dine with him. And one should not proffer him favors if he knows that he will not accept. And one should not open for him casks of wine [whose remains] were already sold to a merchant without apprising him of the arrangement" [T. B.B. 6:14 A-E]. And one should not suggest [to his friend] that he anoint himself with oil if the flask is empty. [In each case he misleads the friend into thinking that he is willing to do something special for him]. But if [he does any of these things] as a sign of respect for him, it is permitted."*
- B. *Is that so? Lo, Ulla came to the house of R. Judah. He opened for him casks of wine [whose remains] were already sold to a merchant. He must have apprised him of the arrangement. And if you prefer you can maintain that [this incident concerning R. Judah and] Ulla is an exception. He was so beloved to R. Judah that he surely would have opened them for him even without [the arrangement with the merchant].*
- C. *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority: A person should not go to a house of mourning [or a house of rejoicing] with a wine flagon that resonates [from its emptiness] and he should not fill it with water [and go to a house of mourning] because he misleads him [i.e., the mourner or celebrant to think that he is doing something special for him]. But if there is a fellowship of the city [there], he is permitted [to do this out of respect] [T. B.B. 6:13].*
- D. *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority: A person should not sell to his fellow a sandal [made from the hide] of an animal that died as if it came from a live animal that had been slaughtered for two reasons. One, because he misleads him. And the other, because of the danger [that the hide is tainted in some way].*

- E. A person should not send to his fellow a cask of wine with oil floating at the opening. And once a person sent his fellow a cask of wine with oil floating at its opening. And he went and invited guests [thinking it was a barrel of oil]. And they came. When he found out that it was wine he hanged himself.
- F. And guests are not permitted to give from what is brought before them to the son or the daughter of the householder unless they asked for permission from the householder. And once a person invited three guests during a year of famine and he had only three eggs to serve them. The son of the household came in. One of the guests took his portion and gave it to him [i.e., the son]. And so did the second [guest] and so did the third. The father of the child came and found him with one egg gorged in his mouth and one in each hand. [Enraged] he threw him to the ground and he died. When his mother saw what happened she went up to the roof and jumped off and died. Then even he went up to the roof and jumped off and died.
- G. Said R. Eliezer b. Jacob, “On account of this matter, three souls of Israel were killed.”
- H. *What novel point does he [Eliezer] make? [It just tells us that] the whole story is to be attributed to R. Eliezer b. Jacob.*

Sending the Gift of a Hip to an Israelite

- I.3 A.** *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority [variant of T. 7:3 A-B]:* **He who sends a whole hip to his fellow, he does not have to separate from it the sinew of the hip. [He who sends] a cut-up hip [to his fellow] must separate from it the sinew of the hip.**
- B. And [he who sends] to an idolater either a cut-up hip or a whole hip does not have to separate from it the sinew of the hip.
- C. **[Variant of T. 7:3 H-J]: And on account of two considerations did they say, They do not sell carrion-meat and *terefah*-meat to a gentile: First, because it may cause him to err. And further, lest he go and sell it to another Israelite. And for two considerations did they state: an Israelite person should not say to a gentile, “Buy me meat”: [94b] First, because of the possibility of thugs [who may not pay the butcher and may just steal the meat]. And further, lest they sell him carrion, or *terefah*-meat.**
- D. *Said the master:* And [he who sends] to an idolater either a cut-up hip or a whole hip does not have to separate from it the sinew of the hip. *What case are we dealing with? If you maintain [that we deal with] a place where they do publicize it [in the event that an animal was found to be terefah], why does he not have to separate from it the sinew of the hip. Since they do not publicize it, they may come to buy it from him.*
- E. *Rather it is obvious [that we deal with] a place where they do not publicize it [when a terefah-animal is on the market]. Consider then the middle text [of the Tannaite passage in C]:* **And on account of two considerations did they say, They do not sell carrion-meat and *terefah*-meat to a gentile: First, because it may cause him to err. And further, lest he go and sell it to another Israelite. But if [we deal with] a place where they do not publicize it [when a terefah-animal is on the market], they will not come to buy from him.**

- F. *Rather it is obvious [that we deal with] a place where they do publicize it [when a terefah-animal is on the market]. Consider then the latter text [of the Tannaite passage in C]: And for two considerations did they state: an Israelite person should not say to a gentile, “Buy me meat”: First, because of the possibility of thugs [who may not pay the butcher and may just steal the meat]. And further, lest they sell him carrion, or terefah-meat. But if [we deal with] a place where they do publicize it [when a terefah-animal is on the market], if it occurs that there is a terefah-animal on the market, they will surely publicize that [and an Israelite will not come to buy it].*
- G. *Rather it is obvious [that we deal with] a place where they do not publicize it [when a terefah-animal is on the market]. The first and middle texts [of the passage refer] to a place where they do not publicize. And the latter text refers to a place where they do publicize it.*
- H. *Said Abbaye, “Yes. The first and last texts refer to a place where they do not publicize it. The middle text [refers] to a place where they do publicize it.”*
- I. *Raba said, “The whole text refers to a place where [as a general rule] they do publicize it. The first and last texts [deal with an instance where] they publicized it. The middle text [deals with an instance where] they did not publicize it.”*
- J. *R. Ashi said, “The whole text refers to a place where [as a general rule] they do not publicize it. The middle text [prohibits] based on a decree lest he sell it [to the gentile] in front of an Israelite.”*
- K. *In what manner do they publicize it?*
- L. *Said R. Isaac b. Joseph, “[They would announce:] Meat is available for the soldiers [i.e., gentiles].”*
- M. *And why not maintain that they announced: Terefah-meat is available for the soldiers? Then they would not buy it. But lo, then they are misleading them. [No.] They are misleading themselves.*
- N. *As in this [incident]: Mar Zutra the son of R. Nahman was going from Sikara to Mehoza. And Raba and R. Safra were going to Sikara. They met each other.*
- O. *He [Zutra] thought they had come out to greet him. He said to them, “Why did the rabbis go to such trouble and come this far [to greet me]?”*
- P. *Said to him R. Safra, “We did not even know that the master was coming. Had we known, we would have come even further [to greet you].”*
- Q. *Said to him Raba, “Why did you tell him this? You only disillusioned him.”*
- R. *He said to him, “Lo, we would have misled him [if I was not honest].”*
- S. *[Raba said], “[No.] He would have misled himself.”*
- I.4 A.** *A certain butcher said to his fellow [with whom he was feuding], [95a] “If you had appeased me I would have provided you with meat from the fatted ox I processed yesterday.”*
- B. *He said to him, “I ate from its choicest cut.”*

- C. *He said to him, "Where did you get it?"*
- D. *He said to him, "So-and-so the idolater bought it and provided it to me."*
- E. *He said to him, "I processed two and that one was terefah."*
- F. Said Rabbi, "On account of this one idiot who acted improperly should we prohibit all of the stalls [of the gentiles from selling meat]?"
- G. *And Rabbi is consistent with his own view elsewhere. For he said, "[Where there are gentiles who sell in the] stalls, and the butchers are Israelites, the meat that is found in the hand of an idolater is permitted."*
- H. *Another version: Said Rabbi, "On account of this one idiot whose intention was to irritate his fellow should we prohibit all of the stalls [of the gentiles from selling meat]?"*
- I. *The basis for this argument is that he wanted to irritate his fellow [so we do not prohibit the meat on that account]. If it were not for that, would we prohibit it?*
- J. *But lo, it was taught on Tannaite authority: "[Where there are gentiles who sell in the] stalls, and the butchers are Israelites, the meat that is found in the hand of an idolater is permitted."*
- K. *But here the case is different. The presumption was established of the [prevalence in the marketplace of meat that was] prohibited.*

I.5 A. Said Rab, "[Valid] meat that vanished from sight [for any time at all] is prohibited [because it could have been switched with carrion-meat]."

- B. *They raised an objection to this:* Rabbi said, "[Where there are gentiles who sell in the] stalls, and the butchers are Israelites, the meat that is found in the hand of an idolater is permitted." [Presumably this meat had been out of sight].
- C. [This is not a valid objection.] What is found in the hand of an idolater *is a different case*. [It does not have the same status of meat that had been out of sight.]
- D. *Come and take note:* If there were nine stores, all of them selling properly slaughtered meat, and one of them selling carrion-meat, and one purchased meat from one of them and does not know from which of them he has made the purchase — his doubt is resolved in favor of a prohibition. But if the meat is found [in the inventory of a stall], then one follows the status of the majority [of the stalls, and it is permitted] [cf. b. Pes. 9b].
- E. *Here too* [we presume] it is found in the hand of an idolater [supporting the preceding. But what about the following?]
- F. *Come and take note: [If] one found in it meat, they follow the status of the majority of the butchers. If it was cooked, they follow the status of the majority of those who eat cooked meat [M. Maksh. 2:9].*
- G. *And if you wish to maintain that here too* [we presume] it is found in the hand of an idolater, [why does it specify], **If it**

was cooked, they follow the status of the majority of those who eat cooked meat? *Let us just take a look. Does an idolater have it [then he cooked it]? Or does an Israelite have it [then he cooked it]?*

- H. *In that case, what are we dealing with? [With a piece of meat dropped by the owner and the one who finds it] was standing and watching it [from the time it was dropped].*
- I. *Come and take note: [If] it is found out in the provinces, [if it is in] limbs, it is deemed to be carrion. [If it is in] pieces, it is permitted. [M. Sheq. 7:3 F-H]. And if you wish to maintain that here too [the case deals with a piece of meat dropped by the owner and the one who finds it] was standing and watching it [from the time it was dropped], then why say [if it is in] limbs, it is deemed to be carrion?*
- J. *There is no basis for this except in accord with the view of Rab [who deals with a case of meat that vanished from sight, II.3 A].*
- K. *Lo, it was stated concerning this: Rab said, “They [the pieces] are permitted [for benefit and do not render unclean] on account of carrion [but one may not eat them].” And Levi said, “They are permitted for eating.”*
- L. *And this [principle] of Rab was not stated by him explicitly. Rather it was stated as a principle derived from the following [incident]: For Rab was once sitting at the ford of the Ishtatit canal [Cashdan: near Sura, cf. Obermeyer, p. 300]. He saw a certain man [95b] washing an animal’s head. He dropped it [into the canal]. He went and brought a basket [to retrieve it]. He cast it [into the canal] and brought up two [heads]. Said Rab, “Did others also do this here?” He prohibited them both to him.*
- M. *Said R. Kahana and R. Assi to Rab, “Are prohibited ones more typical and permitted ones not typical?” He said to them, “Prohibited ones are more typical.”*
- N. *And what does it matter whether [Rab stated the principle explicitly or] it was a principle derived [from this incident]? [In this case they were at] an embankment of an idolater’s market. And you know this because it was stated that prohibited ones are more typical [in that place].*
- O. *But [if he was so strict] how did Rab ever eat meat? [He ate it] right after [an animal was slaughtered] when it*

had never been out of sight. And if you prefer [another possibility]: where [the meat was] wrapped and sealed. And also [another possibility]: where there was some sign [in the meat itself that it was valid].

P. *This accords with that [practice] of Rabbah b. R. Huna who would cut [his meat] in the shape of a triangle.*

I.6 A. *Rab was once going to the house of R. Hanan, his son-in-law. He saw a ferry coming toward him. He said, "A ferry is coming towards me. It will be a good day." He went on his way and came to the gate [at his destination]. He looked in through a crack in the door and saw an animal hanging there. He knocked on the door. Everyone came out to greet him. The butchers came too. Rab did not let it [the meat] out of his sight. He said to them, "If this is how [you watch the meat] you will end up feeding my daughter's children prohibited food." Rab did not eat this meat.*

B. *On what basis [did he refuse to eat the meat]? If it was on account of concern that it was out of sight, lo, he did not let it out of his sight. Rather it was on account of his premonition.*

C. *But lo said Rab, "Any omen that is not consistent with that of Eliezer the servant of Abraham or that of Jonathan the son of Saul is not a valid*

omen.” [The verses are: “Let the maiden to whom I shall say, ‘Pray let down your jar that I may drink,’ and who shall say, ‘Drink, and I will water your camels’ — let her be the one whom thou hast appointed for thy servant Isaac. By this I shall know that thou hast shown steadfast love to my master” (Gen. 24:14) and, “If they say to us, ‘Wait until we come to you,’ then we will stand still in our place, and we will not go up to them. But if they say, ‘Come up to us,’ then we will go up; for the Lord has given them into our hand. And this shall be the sign to us” (1Sa. 14: 9-10).]

D. *Rather [the basis for Rab’s decision was] that it was an elective meal [not an obligation]. And Rab did not want to derive benefit from an elective meal.*

I.7 A. *Rab scrutinized a ferry [for an omen]. Samuel scrutinized [the recitation of a passage from] a book [for an omen]. R. Yohanan scrutinized [the saying of] a child [for an omen].*

B. *All the years that Rab was [in Babylonia] R. Yohanan*

would write to him [with the salutation]: "To the attention of our master in Babylonia." When he [Rab] passed away, he [Yohanan] would write to him: "To the attention of our colleague in Babylonia." He [Samuel] said, "Do I not know of anything concerning which I am his master!" So he [Samuel] wrote down and sent to him the calendar calculations for the next sixty years. He [Yohanan] said, "Look at this. So all he knows is calculations." He [Samuel] wrote down and sent to him thirteen camels [var.: scrolls] loaded with questions of doubts concerning [the rules of law for] terefah-animals. He [Yohanan] said, "I really do have a master in Babylonia. I will go and see him."

C. He said to a child, "Recite for me your verse." He said to him, "Now Samuel had died, [and all Israel had mourned for him and buried him in Ramah, his own city. And Saul had put the mediums and wizards out of the land]" (1Sa. 28: 3). [Yohanan] said, "We may derive from this the conclusion that Samuel passed away."

D. But it was not so. Samuel had not died. Rather this came about so as not to put R. Yohanan to the trouble [of taking a trip to Babylonia to see Samuel].

E. *It was taught on Tannaite authority: R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, "[Building] a house, [the birth of] a child, or [marrying] a woman — even though it may not be scrutinized as an omen, it may be interpreted as a sign."*

F. *Said R. Eleazar, "Only if it recurred three times." As it is written: "[And Jacob their father said to them, 'You have bereaved me of my children:] Joseph is no more, and Simeon is no more, and now you would take Benjamin; [all this has come upon me']" (Gen. 42:36).*

G. *R. Huna posed a question to Rab, "What is the status of strings of meat? [Are they omens or not?]" He said to him, "Don't be an idiot. Meat strung together, behold, is an omen."*

H. *Another version: Said R. Huna, said Rab, "Meat strung together, behold, it is an omen."*

I.8 A. *R. Nahman [var.: Hanan] from Nehardea came upon R. Kahana at Pum Nahara [the mouth of the Tigris] on the eve of the Day of Atonement. Ravens came and dropped pieces of liver and kidneys. He [Kahana] said to him, "You may take them and eat them. Nowadays permitted [meat] is more common."*

B. *R. Hiyya bar Abin once lost an animal's intestine among the barrels. [After finding it] he came before R. Huna [to inquire as to the status of the meat]. He [Huna] said to him, "Do you have some sign on it?" He said to him, "No." [Huna said to him,] "Do you recognize it?" He said to him, "Yes." [Huna said to him,] "If so then go and take it [to use]."*

C. *R. Hanina of Hozae [Cashdan: Khuzistan] lost a side of beef. [After finding it] he came before R. Nahman [to inquire as to the status of the meat]. He [Nahman] said to him, "Do you have some sign on it?" He said to him, "No." [Nahman said to him,] "Do you recognize it?" He said to him, "Yes." [Nahman said to him,] "If so then go and take it [to use]."*

D. *R. Nathan bar Abbaye lost a ball of blue yarn [that was to be used for fringes]. [After finding it] he came before R. Hisda [to inquire as to the status of the yarn]. He [Hisda] said to him, "Do you have some sign on it?" He said to him, "No." [Hisda said to him,] "Do you recognize it?" He said to him, "Yes." [Hisda said to him,] "If so then go and take it [to use]."*

- E. *Said Raba, "At first I thought that [with regard to the legal status of an object] a sign is preferable to recognition. Because we return a lost object [to its owner] based on [his knowledge of] a sign. [96a] But we do not return it to him if he just recognizes it [without producing a sign]. Now that I have heard these traditions [i.e., B-D] I reason that recognition is preferable [to a sign]. For if you did not maintain this position how would a blind person be permitted to [have relations with] his wife? And how would any person be permitted to [have relations with] his wife at night? It is only by virtue of the recognition of her voice. Here too, recognition [has validity for a legal claim]."*
- F. *Said R. Isaac the son of R. Mesharshayya, "You should know [that recognition is stronger than a sign]. For if two [witnesses] came and said that so-and-so, with this sign and that sign killed a person, we do not execute her [on the strength of that testimony]. But if they said we recognize her [as the killer], they execute her [on the basis of that testimony]."*
- G. *Said R. Ashi, "You should know [from everyday experience that recognition is stronger than a sign]. For if a person tells his messenger to go and call so-and-so, with this sign and this sign, there is some doubt as to whether or not he will know [if he is the right person]. But if he recognizes him [to begin with], when he sees him he will know [that he is the right person]."*

7:2 B-C

- B. He who removes the sinew of the hip must remove the whole of it.**
- C. R. Judah says, "[He must remove only enough] to carry out therewith the requirement of removing [the sinew of the hip]."**

7:3

- A. He who eats an olive's bulk of the sinew of the hip incurs forty stripes.**
- B. [If] he ate it and it does not contain an olive's bulk, he is [nonetheless] liable.**
- C. [If] he ate an olive's bulk of [the sinew of] this [hip] and an olive's bulk of that one, he incurs eighty stripes.**
- D. R. Judah says, "He incurs only forty stripes."**
- I.1 A.** *Bar Piyuli was attending before Samuel and removing the sinews from [Cashdan: porging] a side of beef by scraping off the top layer. He [Samuel] said to him, "Dig in deeper. Now if I had not seen you [doing this incorrectly] you would have provided for me prohibited meat."*
- B. His hand trembled and he dropped the knife. He [Samuel] said to him, "Do not tremble. The one who taught you [to remove the sinews in this manner] taught you in accord with the view of R. Judah."*
- C. Said R. Sheshet, "What Bar Piyuli removed [was what had to be removed] in accord with the authority of the Torah according to the view of R. Judah." May we derive from this that what he left [was prohibited] in accord with the authority of the rabbis according the view of R. Judah? Then the one who taught him [i.e., Bar Piyuli, to remove the sinews in this manner], in accord with whose views did he teach him?*
- D. Rather [it must be that] said R. Sheshet, "What Bar Piyuli had removed [was what had to be removed] in accord with the authority of the Torah. And what he*

left [was prohibited] in accord with the authority of the rabbis according to the view of R. Meir. For if [we inquire as to the view of] R. Judah [regarding what was left in, he would say that is] permitted, even in accord with the authority of the rabbis.” [He acted completely in accord with Judah as stated at A.]

- II.1 A. He who eats an olive’s bulk of the sinew of the hip incurs forty stripes [M. 7:3 A]:** Said Samuel, “The Torah prohibited only that part [of the sinew] on the spoon-socket [of the thigh, i.e., the sinew that runs through the muscles at the proximal end of the thigh (Cashdan)].” As it says, “[Therefore to this day the Israelites do not eat the thigh muscle that is on the hip socket, because he struck Jacob at the hip socket at the thigh muscle” (New RSV, Gen. 32:32).
- B. *Said R. Pappa, “[This matter parallels a dispute of] Tannaite authorities: [If] he ate it and it does not contain an olive’s bulk, he is [nonetheless] liable [M. 7:3B].* R. Judah says, “[He is not liable] until it contains an olive’s bulk.”
- C. *What is the basis for the view of our rabbis? It is another category unto itself [of substance, i.e., not food, and thus not subject to the minimum quantity of an olive’s bulk].*
- D. **[96B]** And [what is the basis for the view of] R. Judah? *It is written concerning [the sinew that] eating [it is prohibited: “the Israelites do not eat” and it is subject to the minimum quantity for prohibited foods of an olive’s bulk].*
- E. *And [what is the response to this point by] our rabbis? This language “eating” [implies] that if [the sinew] was four or five olive’s bulks in all and he ate one olive’s bulk, he would be liable [for violating the prohibition].” [But where it was smaller than an olive’s bulk in all and he ate the whole thing he also would be liable according to this view (Rashi).]*
- F. *And [on what basis would] R. Judah [derive this last inference]? He would derive it from, “That is on the hip socket.” [If he ate only the sinew that is at this place it would suffice as a violation.]*
- G. *And [what inference do] our rabbis [draw from that language in the verse]? This is needed in accord with the view of Samuel [at A]. For said Samuel, “The Torah prohibited only that part [of the sinew] on the spoon-socket [of the thigh].”*
- H. *And [on what basis does] R. Judah [derive this]? “The thigh muscle” is written. It is all called thigh [and subject to the prohibition].*
- I. *And [what inference do] our rabbis [draw from that language in the verse]? [The following, cf. b. 91a:] This [sinew] is the one whose prohibition extends through the entire hip. This excludes the outer [sinew] that does not [extend that far].*
- J. *Invariably, what “is on the hip socket” [is prohibited].*
- K. *But is not [the language] “hip socket” needed to exclude a bird that does not have a hip socket [from the prohibition of the sinew]?*
- L. *Two times “hip socket” is written in the verse [one for the former inference and one for the latter exclusion].*

7:4

- A. A thigh with which the sinew of the hip [which was not removed] was cooked, if it [the sinew] is sufficient to impart a flavor [to the thigh], lo, this is prohibited.**

- B. How do they estimate the matter?
- C. Like meat [cooked] with turnips.

7:5

- A. The sinew of the hip which was cooked with [other] sinews, and one recognizes it — [it must be removed, and the remainder is prohibited if there is enough] to impart a flavor.
- B. And if [one does] not [recognize the presence of the sinew of the hip], all of them are prohibited [for any one might be the sciatic nerve].
- C. As to the broth, [it is prohibited if] it imparts a flavor.
- D. And so with a piece of carrion, and so with a piece of unclean fish which were cooked with [other] pieces:
- E. When one recognizes their [presence], [they must be removed and the rest are forbidden if there is enough] to impart flavor.
- F. And if [one does] not [recognize their presence] they are all forbidden.
- G. As to the broth, [it is forbidden only if the carrion or unclean fish] imparts a flavor.

- I.1 A. Said Samuel, "They taught the matter only if [the sinew] was cooked in it [i.e., the thigh]. But if it was roasted in it, one may trim off meat and eat it until he reaches the sinew."
- B. *Is that so?* But lo, said R. Huna, "A kid that was roasted with its own fat — it is prohibited to eat [any part of] it, even from the tip of its ear."
- C. **[97a]** *[This is not a valid objection.] Fat is different because it permeates [all the meat].*
- D. *But is it prohibited [to roast a kid with its] fat? For lo, said Rabbah bar bar Hannah, "An incident occurred in the presence of R. Yohanan in the synagogue at Ma'on. There was a kid that was roasted with its own fat. And they went and asked R. Yohanan [concerning its status as to the law]. And he said, 'One may peel trim off meat and eat it until he reaches its fat.'"*
- E. *This one [was an exceptional case because] it was lean [and therefore did not permeate the meat. Therefore no proof can be adduced from this incident.]*
- F. *R. Huna bar Judah said, "That was a kidney [roasted] in its own fat. And [R. Yohanan] permitted it."*
- G. *Rabin bar R. Ada said, "There was a stickleback [Cashdan, a small fish that may not be eaten that was] cooked in a pot of stew [with meat]. And they went and asked R. Yohanan [concerning its status]. And he said to give it to a gentile chef [to taste it to see if the flavor of the fish is present in the stew]."*
- H. *Said Raba, "At first I had a problem with this that was taught on Tannaite authority: [As regards] a pot in which one cooked meat — he should not [thereafter] cook in it dairy. (Text here omits: [If he cooked in it] dairy, he should not [thereafter] cook in it meat.) [Text here adds:] But if one cooked [food in any of these prohibited ways] — lo, this [i.e., what has been cooked second] is prohibited if [the food that was cooked first] imparted to it flavor. [If he cooked in it] heave-offering, he should not [thereafter] cook in it unconsecrated produce. But if one cooked [food in any of these prohibited*

ways] — lo, this [i.e., what has been cooked second] is prohibited if [the food that was cooked first] imparted to it flavor [T. Ter. 8:16].

- I. *“It makes perfect sense that regarding [a mixture of] heave-offering one may give it to a priest to taste it. But who can taste [a mixture of] meat and milk? And we said regarding this that one may give it to a [gentile] chef to taste it. Now [I know that] it was concerning this that R. Yohanan said that we rely on a gentile chef [to taste it].”*

I.2 A. *For said Raba, “Our rabbis have said [that one operative criterion to determine whether a component of a mixture imparts its status to the whole is by] its taste. And our rabbis have said [that another operative procedure to determine whether a component of the mixture imparts its status to the whole is by giving it to taste to] a [gentile] chef. [97b] And our rabbis have said [that a third operative criterion to determine whether a component of a mixture imparts its status to the whole is to see if, in the mixture, it constitutes more than one part] in sixty.*

B. *“Where you have some permitted thing mixed with some permitted thing not of its own kind, [then the operative criterion for determining the status of the mixture is which component of the mixture imparts to the whole] its taste.*

C. *“[Where you have some] prohibited [thing mixed with some prohibited thing not of its own kind, then the operative procedure for determining the status of the mixture is to give it to a gentile] chef [to taste see which components of the mixture impart to the whole its taste]. [Cf. b. Zeb. 79a.]*

D. *“And where you have one kind mixed with its own kind, where you cannot employ taste [as a criterion], and also in the case where you have some prohibited thing mixed with something not of its own kind, where there is no available [gentile] chef [to taste it, then the operative procedure for determining the status of the prohibited substance in the mixture is to see if, in the mixture, it constitutes more than one part] in sixty.”*

I.3 A. *These sides of beef that the Exilarch salted with the sinews of the hip in them — Rabina prohibited them; R. Aha bar R. Ashi [var.: R. Aha the son of Rab, Cashdan: probably R. Aha b. Raba] permitted them.*

B. *They went and posed the issue to Mar bar R. Ashi. He said to them, “My father permitted them [in such a case].”*

C. *Said R. Aha bar Rab to Rabina, “What is your opinion on this matter? For said Samuel, ‘[With regard to the rules of mixtures of foods] salting is equivalent to scalding and pickling is equivalent to boiling.’ But lo, said Samuel [I.1 A above], “They taught the matter only if [the sinew] was cooked in it [i.e., the thigh]. But if it was roasted in it, one may trim off meat and eat it until he reaches the sinew. And if you wish to maintain that what does ‘equivalent to scalding’ that was stated [in B] mean? It means ‘equivalent to the scalding of cooking.’ But since it states, ‘and pickling is equivalent to boiling (with the same root as cooked)’ we may derive [from that the conclusion that the former clause means] ‘equivalent to the scalding of roasting’ [and permitted in accord with Samuel’s statement at C*

contrary to Rabina's ruling at A]." [Var.: we may indeed derive this conclusion.]
This is a valid challenge [to the view of Rabina].

- I.4 A.** Said R. Hanina, "When evaluating [the quantities in a mixture of a prohibited substance with a permitted substance of the same kind] they include in the evaluation the gravy, the froth, the pieces and the pot."
- B. Some say: the [bulk of the] pot itself.
- C. And some say: what was absorbed [of the foods] by the pot.
- D. Said R. Abbahu, said R. Yohanan, "[With regard to] all of the prohibited substances of the Torah, they may evaluate a mixture [to see if they impart flavor to it by substituting in an equivalent mixture for the prohibited substance] onions or leeks [and taste-tasting that mixture]."
- E. *Said R. Abba to Abbaye, "Why not evaluate [the equivalent mixture using] pepper or spices [whose flavors] even in the quantity of one in a thousand are not rendered null?"*
- F. He said to him, "The sages evaluated [mixtures and found] that prohibited substances do not impart flavor [to a mixture with intensity greater than] onions and leeks [would impart in the same mixture]."
- G. Said R. Nahman, "A sinew is [nullified] in [a mixture equivalent to] sixty [times its quantity]. And you do not count the sinew itself in the quantity. [The milk in] an udder is [nullified] in [a mixture equivalent to] sixty [times its quantity]. And you do not count the udder itself in the quantity. An egg [of an unclean bird] is [nullified] in [a mixture equivalent to] sixty [times its quantity]. And you do not count the egg itself in the quantity."
- H. Said R. Isaac the son of R. Mesharshayya, "And the udder itself [in the mixture] is prohibited, and if it fell into another stew-pot, it renders [the stew] prohibited."
- I.5 A.** *Said R. Ashi, "When we were at the house of R. Kahana he posed a question to us: Do you evaluate the [quantity prohibited substance] itself, or do you evaluate the [quantity of the substance that] came forth from it [into the mixture]?"*
- B. *Obviously, you evaluate the substance itself. For if [you evaluated] what came forth from it, how would you know [how much came forth]?*
- C. *But on this basis [we should infer] that if [that the prohibited item was removed from the original mixture and] fell into another stew-pot it should not render prohibited that [second mixture because all that could come forth from it was nullified in the first mixture].*
- D. [This is not the case.] Since, said R. Isaac the son of R. Mesharshayya, "And the udder itself [in the mixture] is prohibited [and if it fell into another stew-pot, it renders the stew prohibited]" — *[this means that] our rabbis equated the piece [of prohibited substance] itself to a piece of carrion-meat. [And even though the piece had given forth of its essence into the first mixture, it renders the second mixture prohibited as if it were carrion-meat.]*
- I.6 A.** "An egg [of an unclean bird] is [nullified] in [a mixture equivalent to] sixty [times its quantity]. And you do not count the egg itself in the quantity" [I.4 E above].

- B. *Said R. Idi bar Abin to Abbaye, “Does this mean that it imparts flavor [in a mixture]? But lo, people say [to make the point that an item has no flavor], ‘It is like the ordinary water of eggs.’”*
- C. *He said to him, “In that case [of the mixture] what are we dealing with? [98a] With an egg containing an embryo. But the egg of an unclean bird [that does not contain an embryo] does not [give forth flavor into a mixture in accord with the saying].”*
- D. *They raised an objection: [As regards] clean eggs that one boiled with unclean eggs — if [the unclean eggs] are of sufficient quantity to impart flavor [to the clean eggs, those eggs are] prohibited [T. Ter. 9:5 D-E]. Here too it means an egg containing a fledgling. But why does it call it “unclean”? When it has a fledgling in it, they call it “unclean.”*
- E. *But lo, consider that since the latter text of the passage teaches: [As regards] eggs that one boiled and [later] found a fledgling in one of them — if it is of sufficient quantity to impart flavor [to all the eggs, they are] prohibited [T. Ter 9:5 G-H]. — we may derive from this that the former text of the passage deals with a circumstance where there is no fledgling in it.*
- F. *[We may respond that the latter text] comes to explain [the details of the former text as follows]: [As regards] clean eggs that one boiled with unclean eggs — if [the unclean eggs] are of sufficient quantity to impart flavor [to the clean eggs, those eggs are] prohibited [T. Ter. 9:5 D-E]. What is the circumstance? The case in question may be where one boiled [eggs together] and [later] found a fledgling in one of them... [T. Ter 9:5 G-H].*
- G. *This approach makes more sense. For if you concluded that in the former text of the passage there is no fledgling [in one of the eggs and the eggs] are prohibited, [then in the latter text] where there is a fledgling in one of the eggs, do I need [to state that they are prohibited]? But if you reason in this manner, why specify [both rules]? [Rather] the latter text was taught to spell out the former. For you should not say that [it is prohibited] by the former text since there is a fledgling [in one of the eggs], but where there is no fledgling [in one of the eggs] it is permitted [to eat the others that are cooked with them]. It taught us in the latter text that there is a fledgling [in one of the eggs]. We may derive from that that the former text [speaks of a case where] there is no fledgling [in one of the eggs]. And even so they prohibited [the others].*

I.7 A. *There was an olive’s bulk of fat that fell into a caldron of meat. R. Assi [var.: Ashi] reasoned that they evaluate [the quantity of mixture] including whatever was absorbed into the cauldron. Said our rabbis to R. Ashi, “Is it the case that it absorbed permitted [matter] but it did not absorb prohibited [matter]?” [We take into account what is visible in the mixture and not what is absorbed in the sides of the pot (Rashi).]*

B. *There was half an olive’s bulk of fat that fell into a caldron of meat. Mar bar R. Ashi reasoned to evaluate [the mixture and declare the prohibited fat nullified] in thirty half-egg bulks of meat [i.e., half the normal amount needed to nullify the prohibited substance]. Said to him his father, “Have I not told you, ‘Do not devalue the standardized measures of our rabbis’? And furthermore, lo, said R. Yohanan, ‘Half a measure is prohibited by the*

Torah [as if it were a whole measure when it comes to evaluating a mixture].”

- C. *Said R. Shaman bar Abba, said R. Idi bar Idi bar Gershom, said Levi bar Parta, said R. Nahum, said R. Biryim in the name of one elder, and R. Jacob was his name, that the house of the Patriarch said, “A [prohibited] egg — in [a mixture of] sixty [times its bulk] is prohibited. In [a mixture of] sixty-one [times its bulk] it is permitted.”*
- D. *Said R. Zira to R. Shaman bar Abba, “See here! Why do you set this boundary to permit [the mixture]? For behold, two of the great authorities of our generation did not specify [the quantity for permitting the egg in] this matter.*
- E. *“R. Jacob bar Idi and R. Samuel bar Nahmani, the two of them in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi said, ‘A [prohibited] egg — in [a mixture of] sixty [times its bulk of permitted matter] is prohibited. In [a mixture of] sixty-one [times its bulk] it is permitted.’*
- F. *“And they posed a question to them: sixty-one [times the bulk of the egg] including [the prohibited egg] itself [in the total] or sixty-one excluding [the prohibited egg] itself [from the total]? And they did not answer the question. And the master [i.e., Shaman bar Abba] now presumes to answer the question!”*
- G. *It was stated: Said R. Huna, “[Concerning a prohibited] egg [in a mixture] — in sixty-one [times the bulk of the egg] including [the prohibited egg] itself [in the total], it is prohibited. In sixty-one excluding [the prohibited egg] itself [from the total], it is permitted.”*

I.8 A. *A person came before Rabban Gamaliel bar Rabbi [to inquire regarding quantities needed to nullify a prohibited substance in a mixture]. He said to him, “My father did not evaluate that a mixture [containing a prohibited substance along] with forty-seven [times the bulk of permitted substance was prohibited]. Will I evaluate that a mixture [containing a prohibited substance along] with forty-five [times the bulk nullifies it]?”*

B. *A person came before Rabban Simeon bar Rabbi [to inquire regarding quantities needed to nullify a prohibited substance in a mixture]. He said to him, “My father did not evaluate that a mixture [containing a prohibited substance along] with forty-five [times the bulk is prohibited]. Will I evaluate that a mixture of forty-three [times the bulk nullifies it]?”*

C. *A person came before R. Hiyya [to inquire regarding quantities needed to nullify a prohibited substance in a mixture]. He said to him, “There is no issue here. Is there thirty [times the bulk of the prohibited substance]?” The basis for his ruling is that there was not thirty [times the bulk]. [The implication is that] lo, where there is thirty [times the bulk] they evaluate [that it is permitted]. [No, not so.] Said R. Hanina, “He exaggerated [to make a point. It was not meant to set a legal precedent.]”*

I.9 A. *Said R. Hiyya bar Abba, said R. Joshua b. Levi, in the name of Bar Qappara, “All of the prohibited substances of the Torah [are nullified in a mixture of permitted*

substance] sixty [times its bulk].” [Rashi: where the flavor of the prohibited substance is not present.]

- B. Said before him R. Samuel bar R. Isaac, “Rabbi, are you sure you want to say that? This was said by R. Assi, said R. Joshua b. Levi in the name of Bar Qappara, ‘All of the prohibited substances of the Torah [are nullified in a mixture of permitted substance] one hundred [times its bulk].’”
- C. And both of them [Hiyya and Assi] learned this only from the verse that deals with the boiled shoulder [of the Nazirite’s offering]. As it is written, “And the priest shall take the shoulder of the ram, when it is boiled, [and one unleavened cake out of the basket, and one unleavened wafer, and shall put them upon the hands of the Nazirite, after he has shaven the hair of his consecration]” (Num. 6:19).
- D. *And it was taught on Tannaite authority: “Boiled” — [98b] The language “Boiled” means [it is valid] only when it is whole [by itself and not in a mixture]. R. Simeon b. Yohai says, ““Boiled” means [it is valid] only when it was boiled together with the rest of the ram.”*
- E. *Everyone agrees that he boils it together with the rest of the ram. One master reasons in accord with the view that he first cuts it up and then boils it. And one master reasons in accord with the view that he first boils it and then cuts it up. [Rashi and Tosafot dispute which master holds which view.]*
- F. *And if you prefer another possibility: Everyone agrees that he first cuts it up and then boils it. But one master reasons in accord with the view that he boils [the shoulder] along with the rest of the ram. And one master [reasons in accord with the view that] he boils [the shoulder] in another pot.*
- G. *According to the former reading [E] in accord with everyone [they boil the shoulder with the rest of the ram]. And according to the latter reading [F] in accord with the view of R. Simeon bar Yohai [they boil the shoulder with the rest of the ram]. [We derive the rule for nullifying prohibited matter in a mixture from this case, since the Israelites partake of the ram and the shoulder boiled with it is a substance prohibited to everyone but the priest.]*
- H. *The authority who says [one] in sixty [is nullified, i.e., Hiyya] reasons that we evaluate the flesh and the bones of [the shoulder] against the flesh and bones of [the rest of the ram]. And the proportion is [one] in sixty. And the authority who says [one] in one hundred [is nullified, i.e., Assi] reasons that we evaluate the flesh [of the shoulder] against the flesh [of the rest of the ram]. And the proportion is [one] in one hundred.*
- I. *But do we derive [the rule for nullifying prohibited matter in a mixture] from this source? But lo it was taught on Tannaite authority: This is a case where [the Torah] permitted a substance that came out of a prohibited mixture. [Even though the shoulder is prohibited and the rest of the mixture should be prohibited because it absorbed substance from the shoulder, the Torah permitted the mixture (Rashi).]*
- J. [The language of the Tannaite explanation,] “This is a case where...” — *what does it exclude [from consideration]? Does it not exclude all of the prohibited substances of the Torah [except for the shoulder]?*

- K. *Said Abbayye, "It was only necessary to state this [explanation at I] in accord with the view of R. Judah who said [a mixture of prohibited substance of one] kind together with [permitted substance of] its kind, [the prohibited substance] cannot be nullified. It [i.e., the verse] comes to make the novel point here it is nullified [even though the shoulder and ram are of the same kind]."*
- L. *So why not let us derive [the rule in general about mixtures of permitted and prohibited substances of the same kind] from this instance? The Torah declared, "[Then he shall go out to the altar which is before the Lord and make atonement for it,] and shall take some of the blood of the bull and of the blood of the goat, [and put it on the horns of the altar round about]" (Lev. 16:18). The [blood of the] two of them [i.e., the bull and goat] is mixed together and they are not nullified. [Even though there is more blood of the bull, the verse still speaks specifically of the blood of the goat. This implies that substances of the same kind in a mixture are not nullified.]*
- M. *And why do you see fit to derive [the rule that they are not nullified] from that source [regarding the blood]? You should derive it [that they are nullified] from that source [regarding the shoulder of the Nazirite's offering].*
- N. *[The case of the shoulder of the Nazirite's offering] is an atypical case [of mixtures because they intentionally cook the shoulder together with the ram and it is permitted anyway]. And [we have a principle that] from an atypical case [we do not derive any generalizations].*
- O. *If so then [with regard to establishing the proportion of prohibited to permitted substances needed in the mixture], whether sixty or one hundred [to one, as at A-C above], this too you should not derive [from the atypical case of the shoulder].*
- P. *[This is not a valid objection.] Is it the case that we derive a lenient rule from this instance? We derive a strict rule [i.e., that we need a proportion of sixty or one hundred to one to nullify the prohibited substance from the instance of the mixture of the shoulder and the rest of the ram]. For based on the authority of the Torah [in general, aside from this inference, a prohibited substance in a mixture] is nullified by a majority [of permitted substance]. [Rashi: in accord with Exo. 23: 2 we follow the majority.]*
- Q. *Raba said, "It was only necessary to state this [explanation at I] on account of the rule that we deem the taste to have the status of the source itself. In regard to Holy Things [we do hold that the taste in a mixture of a prohibited substance in general] is prohibited [as if the substance itself were present]. It [i.e., the verse] comes to make the novel point here [in this case of the shoulder] it is permitted."*

- R. **[99a]** *So why not let us derive [the rule in general about taste in mixtures of permitted and prohibited substances] from this instance? The Torah declared regarding the sin-offering, “[Every male among the descendants of Aaron shall eat of it, as their perpetual due throughout your generations, from the Lord’s offerings by fire;] anything that touches them shall become holy” (Lev. 6:18). [This implies that what touches it or what absorbs the taste] has the same status as the sacrifice itself. For if [the sacrifice] is invalid, [the mixture that absorbed from it] is invalid. And if [the sacrifice] is valid, [the mixture] is valid [to be eaten in accord with] the strict rules that pertain to it.*
- S. *And why do you see fit to derive [the rule that the taste of a Holy Thing in a mixture is not nullified] from that source [regarding the sin-offering]? You should derive it [that it is nullified] from that source [regarding the shoulder of the Nazirite’s offering].*
- T. *[The case of the shoulder of the Nazirite’s offering] is an atypical case [of mixtures because they intentionally cook the shoulder together with the ram and it is permitted anyway]. And [we have a principle that] from an atypical case [we do not derive any generalizations].*
- U. *If so then [with regard to establishing the proportion of prohibited to permitted substances needed in the mixture], whether sixty or one hundred [to one, as at A-C above], this too you should not derive [from the atypical case of the shoulder].*
- V. *[This is not a valid objection.] Is it the case that we derive a lenient rule from this instance? We derive a strict rule [i.e., that we need a proportion of sixty or one hundred to one to nullify the prohibited substance from the instance of the mixture of the shoulder and the rest of the ram]. For based on the authority of the Torah [in general, aside from this inference, a prohibited substance in a mixture] is nullified by a majority [of permitted substance]. [Rashi: in accord with Exo. 23: 2 we follow the majority.]*
- W. *Rabina said, “It was only necessary to state this [explanation at I so as to render permitted] the place of the incision [when the shoulder is cut from the animal]. For it is said that the place of the incision in general is prohibited. But here it is permitted.”*

I.10 A. *R. Dimi was sitting in session and stated this teaching: [All of the prohibited substances of the Torah [are nullified in a mixture of permitted substance one hundred times its bulk].*

B. *Said to him Abbaye, “And is it so that all of the prohibited substances of the Torah [are nullified in a mixture of permitted substance] one hundred [times its*

bulk]? *For lo, it was taught on Tannaite authority in the Mishnah: And [with reference] to what did they say, ‘Whatever leavens, spices or is mixed [etc.,]’ yields a strict ruling [in that the mixture is forbidden even if it contains sufficient permitted produce to neutralize the forbidden]? [They said it with reference to the case of] one kind [of produce] mixed with [produce of its] same kind. [And with reference to what did they say, ‘Whatever leavens, etc.,’] yields [both] a lenient and a strict ruling? [They said it with reference to the case of] one kind [mixed] with a different kind [M. **Orlah 2:6 A-D**]. And the latter text of the Mishnah-passages teaches: To yield both a lenient and a strict ruling [in the case of] one kind [of produce mixed with produce of] its same kind [M. **2:6 C-D**]. How so? For example, pounded beans [which are heave offering] which were cooked with lentils [which are common produce], and there are [enough] of them [the pounded beans] to give a flavor [to the lentils], whether there is [little enough heave offering] to be neutralized in one hundred and one, or whether there is not [so little heave offering as is] neutralized in one hundred and one — it is forbidden [=strict ruling]. [If] there is not [enough] of them to impart flavor [to the lentils], whether there is [so little heave offering as is] neutralized in a hundred and one, or whether there is not [little enough heave offering] to be neutralized in a hundred and one — [the mixture] is permitted [as common food; =lenient ruling] [M. **Orlah 2:7**]. There is not [little enough heave offering] to be neutralized in a hundred and one, but is it not the case that there is [little enough heave offering to be neutralized] in sixty? [Therefore we see that the proportion where it did not impart taste is sixty to one.]*

- C. **[99b]** *No. [It could be one in] one hundred.*
- D. *But lo, since the former text of the Mishnah-passages [2:6] refers to [a proportion of] one hundred [to one], the latter text of the Mishnah-passages [2:7] must refer to [a proportion of] sixty [to one]. For it was taught on Tannaite authority in the former text of the Mishnah-passages: How so? [How does the law yield a strict ruling in the case of like mixed with like?] Leaven of wheat [in the status of heave offering] which fell into wheat dough [which is common produce], and there is enough of it [the leaven] to leaven [the dough], whether there is [a quantity of heave offering which is] neutralized in one hundred and one [parts of common produce], or whether there is not [so little heave offering as is] neutralized in one hundred and one — it is forbidden [=strict ruling]. [If] there is not [so little heave offering as is] neutralized in one hundred and one [parts of common produce], whether there is enough of it to leaven [the dough], or whether there is not enough of it to leaven [the dough] — it is forbidden [=strict ruling] [M. **Orlah 2:6 E-L**]. Could the former text of the Mishnah-passages and the latter text of the Mishnah-passages refer to [a proportion of] one hundred [to one]?*
- E. *No, it must be that the former text of the Mishnah-passages refers to [a proportion of] one hundred and one [to one]. And the latter text of the Mishnah-passages refers to [a proportion of] one hundred [to one].*
- F. *[Now Abbaye said to Dimi], “But if you have enough of it to leaven in one hundred and one [parts of common produce] why is it not nullified?”*

- G. *[Dimi] was silent.*
- H. *He [Abbaye] said to him, "Perhaps leaven has a different status [as to the law of mixtures]. For its leavening power intensifies it."*
- I. *He [Dimi] said to him, "You reminded me of the matter that R. Yosé b. R. Hanina said, "All the measures are not the same. For lo, fish-brine — its measure [for nullification in a mixture because of its intensity] is close to two hundred to one." As it was taught in the Mishnah on Tannaite authority: [As regards] unclean fish... the brine is forbidden [unclean]. R. Judah says, "[It is forbidden if there is] a quarter [-log, i.e., fifty zuz, of unclean fish] in two seahs" [M. Ter. 10:8 A, F] [i.e., a proportion of one hundred ninety-two to one].*
- J. *But lo did not R. Judah say that [a mixture of prohibited substance of one] kind together with [permitted substance of] its kind, [the prohibited substance] cannot be nullified?*
- K. *Brine has a different status [in regard to the rule for nullification]. It is considered to be mere moisture [from the fish, not of its essence].*

II.1 A. How do they estimate the matter? Like meat [cooked] with turnips [M. 7:4 B-C]. Said R. Huna, "Like meat [cooked] with turnip-heads [or: -roots]."

- B. *The Mishnah-passage does not accord with the view of this Tannaite authority, as it was taught on Tannaite authority: R. Yohanan ben Beroqah says, "The principle of imparting a flavor does not apply to sinews" [T. 7:6 E].*
- C. *A person came before R. Hanina [for a ruling on this subject]. R. Judah bar Zebina was sitting at the gate. When [the person] came out he [Judah] said to him, "What did he say to you?"*
- D. *He said to him, "He permitted it to me."*
- E. *He [Judah] said to him, "Go back before him [and ask again to make certain]."*
- F. *He [Hanina] said, "Who is this one who is pestering me? Go and tell the one who is sitting at the gate, The principle of imparting a flavor does not apply to sinews."*
- G. *When they came before R. Ammi [for a ruling on this subject] he would send them before R. Isaac b. Halob who would instruct that it was permitted in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi. But he [Ammi] himself did not reason in accord with this view.*

H. *And the law accords with the view that: The principle of imparting a flavor does not apply to sinews.*

III.1 A. The sinew of the hip that was cooked with [other] sinews, and one recognizes it — [it must be removed, and the remainder is prohibited if there is enough] to impart a flavor. And if [one does] not [recognize the presence of the sinew of the hip], all of them are prohibited [for any one might be the sciatic nerve]. As to the broth, [it is prohibited if] it imparts a flavor [M. 7:5 A-C]. But it should be nullified by the majority [of the mixture which is permitted].

- B. **[100a]** *[The sinew is] another category unto itself [of substance, i.e., not food, and thus] subject to a different rule [cf. b. 96a. II.1 C].*

IV.1 A. And so with a piece of carrion, and so with a piece of unclean fish which were cooked with [other] pieces: When one recognizes their [presence], [they must be removed and the rest are forbidden if there is enough] to impart flavor. And if [one does] not [recognize their presence] they are all forbidden. As to the broth, [it is forbidden only if the carrion or unclean fish] imparts a flavor [M. 7:5 D-G]. *But it should be nullified by the majority [of the mixture which is permitted].*

B. *Now we could settle the matter according to the authority who holds the view that we learned [this version of the Mishnah-clause], **Anything that [or: whatever] is usually counted.** [Since a piece of meat is sometimes counted, it would not be nullified.] But according to the authority who holds the view that we learned [this version of the Mishnah-clause], **That which is usually counted,** what can you say? [Meat normally is sold by weight, and not by the piece, thus it should be nullified.]*

The passage is: **Whoever had bunches of fenugreek that are [prohibited under the laws of] diverse kinds in a vineyard — [the bunches] must be burned. [If the bunches] were mixed with other [permitted bunches] — “All must be burned,” the words of R. Meir. And sages say, “They are neutralized in [a ratio of] one [forbidden bunch] to two hundred [permitted bunches]” [M. Orlah 3:6 A-E].** For R. Meir would say, “Whatever normally is enumerated [when being sold] renders [other food mixed with it] sanctified [forbidden, so that all of the food in the mixture must be burned].” But sages say, “Only six foods render [other foods] sanctified.” And R. Aqiba says, “Seven foods render others forbidden.” And these are they [sages’ six foods]: (1) nuts from Perekh, (2) pomegranates from Baddan, (3) sealed jars [containing forbidden wine], (4) beet shoots, (5) cabbage stalks and (6) Greek gourds. R. Aqiba says, “Also (7) loaves [of bread] of a householder.” To those [among these items] to which the [restrictions of] *orlah* are applicable the [restrictions of] *orlah* [apply]. To that to which the prohibition of diverse kinds in a vineyard is applicable, the prohibition of diverse kinds in a vineyard [applies] [M. Orlah 3:7]. B. Zeb. 72a-b adds: *And in this connection it has been stated, R. Yohanan said, “The formulation of the matter that we have learned to repeat is, **That which is usually enumerated.**” And R. Simeon b. Laqish says, “The formulation of the matter that we have learned to repeat is, **Whatever is usually enumerated.**” Now there is no problem from the perspective of R. Simeon b. Laqish, but from the premise of R. Yohanan as to the correct formulation of the matter, what is there to be said?*

C. **A piece** [of carrion in a mixture] *is subject to a different rule, since it is proper to serve it to guests.*

D. *And it is necessary to teach [in the Mishnah-passage both the rule for the sinew and the rule for the piece of carrion in a mixture]. For if it had taught the rule for a sinew [I would have reasoned that it is not nullified] because it is another category unto itself. But with regard to a piece [of carrion], it would make sense to maintain that is not the case. And if it had taught the rule for a piece [of carrion I would have reasoned that it is not nullified] because it is proper to serve*

it to guests. But with regard to a sinew, it would make sense to maintain that is not the case. It is necessary to teach [both cases].

- IV.2** A. Rabbah bar bar Hannah expounded [the Mishnah-passage under discussion here]: **“A piece of carrion, and... a piece of unclean fish** does not render [the mixture] prohibited until it imparts flavor to the gravy, the froth and the pieces [of meat].”
- B. *Rab set up an Amora [to repeat in a loud voice whatever he said] to contradict him and he expounded: “As soon as [the piece of carrion] imparts flavor to the piece [of valid meat next to it (Rashi)], the piece itself takes on the status of carrion. It in turn renders prohibited all the other pieces [in the pot] because they are of the same classification. [The principle is that items of the same classification do not nullify one another in a mixture. Therefore all the pieces of meat are prohibited on the basis of the presence of that one piece.] [b. 108a, II.1 A].”*
- C. *Said R. Saфра to Abbaye, “What is the case? In accord with whose view does Rab state the matter? In accord with R. Judah who said that [a mixture of one prohibited item with other permitted] items of the same classification does not nullify [the one item]. Why then specify that it imparted flavor [to the mixture]? Even if it did not impart flavor, it also [would render it prohibited according to that view].”*
- D. *He said to him, “In this case what are we dealing with? Where he went ahead and removed [the piece of carrion from the mixture and all that is left is the flavor].”*
- E. *Raba said, [100b] “You even may maintain that the case is that he did not go ahead and remove it. It is then a case of a [mixture that consists of] a prohibited item with other permitted items of the same classification and with items of a different classification. And [we have a principle that for] any [mixture that consists of] a prohibited item with other permitted items of the same classification and with items of a different classification, you can disregard the [other items of] the same classification [and treat them] as if they are not there. Then the items of the different classification will form a majority [and outnumber the prohibited item] and nullify it.”*

7:6

- A. **[The prohibition of the sinew of the hip] applies to a clean [beast], but it does not apply to an unclean [beast].**
- B. **R. Judah says, “Also to an unclean one.”**
- C. **Said R. Judah, “And is it not so that the sinew of the hip was prohibited to the children of Jacob, while an unclean beast still was permitted to them?”**
- D. **They said to him, “At Sinai was [the law] stated, but it was written down in its [present] place.”**
- I.1** A. *And does R. Judah reason in accord with the view that one prohibition can apply on top of another prohibition? But lo, it was taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says, “You might infer that when located in the esophagus, the carrion of an unclean bird should impart uncleanness such that the person makes the clothing that he is wearing unclean? Scripture states explicitly, ‘That which dies of itself or is torn by beasts he shall not eat to defile himself therewith’ (Lev. 22: 8) — only that which is subject to the prohibition of eating carrion. But this is excluded, since it is not subject to the prohibition of eating carrion but to the prohibition of eating*

what is unclean.” [The added prohibition cannot apply to what is already prohibited.]

- B. *And if you wish to maintain that he [Judah] reasons in accord with the view that, **The principle of imparting a flavor does not apply to sinews**, then it follows that for [eating the sinew of] an unclean beast there is a prohibition for [eating] the sinew, but there is no prohibition for eating the meat [itself because the sinew has no flavor]. [We thus avoid the issue of one prohibition on top of another.]*
- C. *But does R. Judah reason in accord with the view that, **The principle of imparting a flavor does not apply to sinews**? For lo, it was taught on Tannaite authority: He who eats of the sinew of the hip of an unclean animal — R. Judah declares him liable on two counts, and R. Simeon declares him exempt [on account of eating meat of an unclean animal, since there is no taste in the sinew, and he is not liable on the sinew, because he would be liable on that count only if the meat of the beast were permitted, but not when the meat also is forbidden (b. Pes. 22a, Freedman)].*
- D. *Invariably then he [Judah] reasons in accord with the view that, **The principle of imparting flavor does apply to sinews**. And he reasons in accord with the view that [both prohibitions] apply to a foetus because the prohibition of the sinew and the prohibition on account of uncleanness simultaneously apply [when the foetus develops sufficiently].*
- E. *But is it possible to say [that Judah holds that the prohibition of the sinew] applies to a foetus? For lo, it was taught in the Mishnah on Tannaite authority: **And it applies to the foetus. R. Judah says, “It does not apply to the foetus; and its fat is permitted” [M. 7:1 D-E]. [You may explain] that this concern applies to a clean [beast]. For the Torah said, “Every [lit.: All that is in an] animal [that parts the hoof and has the hoof cloven in two, and chews the cud, among the animals] you may eat” (Deu. 14: 6). But [according to Judah, the prohibition of the sinew] does apply [to the foetus of] an unclean [beast].***
- F. *But is it possible to say [that Judah holds that] the two [prohibitions] simultaneously apply [to the foetus when it develops sufficiently]? For lo, it was taught in the Mishnah on Tannaite authority: **On account of what sorts of uncleanness does the Nazir cut his hair [and bring an offering for having become unclean]? (1) On account of a corpse, and (2) on account of an olive’s bulk of flesh from a corpse... [M. Nazir 7:2 A-B]?***
- G. *But this poses a difficulty for us. If **on account of [coming in contact with] an olive’s bulk of flesh from a corpse** he cuts his hair, then on account of [coming in contact with] the whole corpse is it not certainly logical [that he should cut his hair]?*
- H. *[Indeed it is logical.] And said R. Yohanan, “It was only necessary to state this matter [in M. Nazir of the whole corpse] on account of the [need to include the] case of an abortion whose limbs were not attached together with its sinews.” [So on this basis we conclude that the animal is considered formed even before the sinews are formed.]*
- I. *It then seems [logical to conclude] that the prohibition of the animal as unclean precedes [the other prohibition]. And even though the prohibition of the animal*

as unclean precedes [the other], the prohibition of the sinew comes along and applies to it.

- J. [But we have a principle that a prohibition cannot apply on top of another prohibition. However here the second prohibition is more inclusive and hence can apply in addition to the first.] For this prohibition [of the sinew] does apply [also] to the descendants of Noah.
- K. *We may infer this as well from what was taught in the present Mishnah-passage [M. 7:6C]:* **Said R. Judah, “And is it not so that the sinew of the hip was prohibited to the children of Jacob, while an unclean beast still was permitted to them?”**

I.2 A. *Reverting to the body of the prior text [I.1 C]:* He who eats of the sinew of the hip of an unclean animal — R. Judah declares him liable on two counts. **[101a]** And R. Simeon declares him exempt.

- B. But [according to the view of] R. Simeon any way you look at the matter [he should be liable]. If he reasons in accord with the view that one prohibition can apply on top of another, let him be liable also on account of [eating] the sinew. If he reasons in accord with the view that one prohibition does not apply on top of another, let him be liable on account [violating] the uncleanness that preceded [the prohibition]. And if he reasons in accord with the view that, **The principle of imparting a flavor does not apply to sinews**, let him be liable on account of [eating] the sinew [even if it is not deemed to be meat].

- C. *Said Raba, “Invariably he reasons in accord with the view that, **The principle of imparting a flavor does not apply to sinews**. But here a different rule applies. For scripture said, ‘Therefore to this day the Israelites do not eat the sinew of the thigh, [because he touched the hollow of Jacob’s thigh on the sinew of the hip]’ (Gen. 32:32). [This rule applies to] that [animal] whose sinew is prohibited but whose meat is permitted. This excludes [from the rule] that [animal] whose sinew is prohibited and whose meat is prohibited.”*

I.3 A. *Said R. Judah, said Rab, “One who eats the sinew of the hip of carrion — R. Meir declares him liable on two counts. And the sages say, ‘He is only liable on one count.’ And the sages agree with R. Meir that one who eats the sinew of the hip of a whole burnt-offering or of an ox condemned to stoning that he would be liable on two counts. [These latter two are more inclusive and severe and would apply on top of the prohibition of the sinew].*

- B. *And who is the Tannaite authority who does not [state the principle that] for just a more inclusive prohibition, [that] one prohibition applies on top of another prohibition, but who does [state the principle that] for a more inclusive prohibition that is also a more severe prohibition [as above, one prohibition applies on top of another]?*

- C. *Said Raba, “It is R. Yosé the Galilean [who states this principle].” As it was taught in the Mishnah on Tannaite authority: **An unclean person who ate either unclean Holy Things or clean Holy Things, is liable. R. Yosé the Galilean says, “An unclean person who ate clean [Holy Things] is liable. But an unclean person who ate unclean [Holy Things] is free [of liability]. For he ate only something [of Holy Things] which [in any event] is unclean.”** They said*

to him, “Also: The unclean person who ate clean [Holy Things], since he touched it, has rendered it unclean” [M. Zeb. 13:2 A-D].

- D. *What our rabbis said to R. Yosé the Galilean makes perfect sense.*
- E. *And said Raba, “Where first his body became unclean and then the meat became unclean, no one disputes that he is liable [to extirpation for eating Holy Things in a state of uncleanness]. Where do they dispute the matter? Where first the meat became unclean and then his body became unclean. Here you have a more inclusive prohibition. For since [after he becomes unclean] he would be liable for eating clean pieces [of Holy Things] in general, he would be liable also [through the same prohibition] for eating an unclean piece. And R. Yosé the Galilean does not accept that this is a case of a more inclusive prohibition. For he does say we do not employ the logic of, ‘Since he would be X, he would be Y.’” [Thus he would be liable only for eating clean pieces of Holy Things.]*
- F. *So we may allow that R. Yosé the Galilean does not accept that this is a case of a more inclusive prohibition that would apply on top of a less severe prohibition. Let [him accept that this is a case that entails] the more severe prohibition coming to apply on top of the less severe prohibition. And what is it [that is more severe]? Uncleanness of the body. For lo, [one who eats Holy Things while in the status of] uncleanness of the body is liable to the punishment of extirpation.*
- G. *Said R. Ashi, “On what basis will you maintain that uncleanness of the body is more severe? Perhaps the uncleanness of the meat [of Holy Things] is more severe. For it cannot be rendered clean in an immersion pool.”*
- H. **[101b]** *And [referring back to E, according to] R. Yosé the Galilean is there not [elsewhere] a case of a more inclusive prohibition? For lo, it was taught on Tannaite authority. “The Sabbath and the Day of Atonement [fell on the same day] — if he inadvertently performed labor [on that day], on what basis do we derive that he is liable [to a sacrifice] for this one on its own, and for this one on its own? It comes to teach, ‘[Six days shall work be done; but on the seventh day] is a Sabbath [of solemn rest, a holy convocation; you shall do no work; it is a Sabbath to the Lord in all your dwellings] (Lev. 23: 3); ‘[On the tenth day of this seventh month] is the Day of Atonement; [it shall be for you a time of holy convocation, and you shall afflict yourselves and present an offering by fire to the Lord]’ (Lev. 23:27),” the words of R. Yosé the Galilean. R. Aqiba says, “He is liable for only one [sacrifice].” [Cf. T. Ker. 2:17.] The Sabbath is more severe since the penalty for violating it is death. The Day of Atonement is more inclusive since it imposes additional prohibitions. Yosé stipulates liability for both.]*
- I. *Rabin sent in the name of R. Yosé b. R. Hanina, “This was the proposed teaching. But, reverse the attributions.”*
- J. *R. Isaac bar Jacob bar Giyori sent in the name of R. Yohanan, “According to the words of R. Yosé the Galilean, now that we have reversed the attributions, [on a day that is both the Sabbath and the Day of Atonement] if one inadvertently violated the Sabbath and deliberately violated the Day of Atonement, he is liable. If he deliberately violated the Sabbath and inadvertently violated the Day of Atonement, he is free from liability.”*

- K. *What is the basis for these decisions? Said Abbayye, "The Sabbath is set and permanent. The Day of Atonement is set by the [declaration of the new moon by the] court."*
- L. *Said to him Raba, "In the final analysis both [prohibitions] come into play at the same time."*
- M. *Rather, said Raba, "There was at the time oppression. And they sent word from there that the Day of Atonement of that year would be observed on the Sabbath [even though that was not the actual day for its observance]." And so too when Rabin came [from Israel] with all those who accompanied him they stated the matter in accord with Raba.*

- II.1 A.** **Said R. Judah, "And is it not so that the sinew of the hip was prohibited to the children of Jacob, while an unclean beast still was permitted to them?" They said to him, "At Sinai was [the law] stated, but it was written down in its [present] place" [M. 7:6 C-D].**
- B. *It was taught on Tannaite authority: They said to R. Judah, "It does not say, 'Therefore the children of Jacob, Reuben and Simeon,' will not eat the sinew of the thigh, but, 'the children of Israel' — those who were present before Mount Sinai. So why does he [Moses] write it there [in the setting of Jacob]? To tell you on what account it is prohibited" [T. 7:8 D-E].*
- C. *Raba posed a question: "[Then Jacob set out from Beer-sheba:] and the children of Israel carried Jacob their father, [their little ones, and their wives, in the wagons which Pharaoh had sent to carry him]" (Gen. 46: 5) [This indicates that they were called 'children of Israel' before Sinai.] [The answer is:] This was after the event [itself of Jacob's struggle with the angel took place].*
- D. *Said R. Aha the son of Raba to R. Ashi, "From that time [that they were called 'children of Israel'] it should have been prohibited [for them to eat the sinew]."*
- E. *He [Ashi] said to him, "But was the Torah given at many different times? That time was neither the time of the event itself nor the time of the giving of the Torah [at Sinai]."*

The Volume of Prohibited Meat On Account of Which One Incurs Liability; The Combination of Small Quantities of a Given Prohibited Substance to Comprise the Prohibited Volume

- II.2 A.** ***Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority: He who eats a limb from a living animal, whether from beast or wild animal or clean fowl, [in any measure at all, he is liable] [T. Zabim 5:12 A-C].*** “
- B. *[It applies] to both unclean and clean [species],” the words of R. Judah and R. Eleazar.*
- C. *And the sages say, "It applies only to clean [species]."*
- D. *Said R. Yohanan, "Both of them derived their inferences from the same verse, 'Only be sure that you do not eat the blood; for the blood is the life, [102a] and you shall not eat the life with the flesh' (Deu. 12:23). R. Judah and R. Eleazar reason [in accord with the rule that they derive from the first part of the verse]: for any [animal] for which you are commanded to abstain from its blood, you are*

commanded to abstain from [eating] its limbs. So for these unclean [animals], since you are commanded to abstain from their blood, you are commanded to abstain from their limbs. *And our rabbis reason [based on the rule they derive from the second part of the verse]: ‘And you shall not eat the life with the flesh’ — [this means that you shall eat] just the flesh. [Thus] for any [animal] from which you are permitted to eat the flesh, you are commanded to abstain from [eating] its limbs. And for any [animal] from which you are not permitted to eat the flesh, you are not commanded to abstain from [eating] its limbs.’*

E. *So according to the view of R. Judah [who says that one prohibition may apply on top of another] why do I need to rely on a verse [to teach me the rule prohibiting eating a limb from a live unclean animal]? Let the prohibition of a limb from a live animal come and apply on top of the prohibition of an unclean animal. For [the prohibition of a limb] applies also to the descendants of Noah [and thus is more inclusive].*

F. *Indeed this is the case. And you therefore need the verse to support the view of R. Eleazar.*

G. *It was taught on Tannaite authority also in this regard: [The prohibition of eating] a limb from a live animal applies to beasts, wild animals and fowl, whether clean or unclean, as it says, ‘Only be sure that you do not eat the blood’: ‘For any [animal] for which you are commanded to abstain from its blood, you are commanded to abstain from [eating] its limbs. And for any [animal] for which you are not commanded to abstain from its blood, you are not commanded to abstain from [eating] its limbs,’ the words of R. Eleazar.*

H. *And the sages say, “It only applies to the clean [species], as it says, ‘And you shall not eat the life with the flesh’ — [this means that you shall eat] just the flesh. [Thus] for any [animal] from which you are permitted to eat the flesh, you are commanded to abstain from [eating] its limbs. And for any [animal] from which you are not permitted to eat the flesh, you are not commanded to abstain from [eating] its limbs.”*

I. *R. Meir says, “[The prohibition] only applies to a clean beast.”*

J. *A mnemonic is given here.] Said Rabbah bar Samuel, said R. Hisda, and some maintain, R. Joseph; and there are those that say, said Rabbah bar Shila, said R. Hisda, and some maintain, R. Joseph; and there are those that say, said Rabbah bar Shimi, said R. Hisda, and some maintain, R. Joseph, “What is the basis in scripture for the view of R. Meir? Scripture says, ‘[If the place which the Lord your God will choose to put his name there is too far from you,] then you may kill any of your herd or your flock, [which the Lord has given you, as I have commanded you; and you may eat within your towns as much as you desire]’ (Deu. 12:21) [i.e., the verse mentions beasts only].”*

- K. Said R. Giddal, said Rab, “The dispute [over what animals are subsumed in the prohibition of a limb from a live animal] pertains only to an Israelite. But regarding a descendant of Noah, everyone agrees that he is warned [that the prohibition of a limb from a live animal applies] to the unclean [species] as it does to the clean [species].”
- L. *It was taught on Tannaite authority also in this regard:* [Regarding the prohibition against eating] a limb from a live animal — a descendant of Noah is warned [that the prohibition of a limb from a live animal applies] to the unclean [species] as it does to the clean [species]. And an Israelite is warned only [that the prohibition of a limb from a live animal applies] to the clean [species].
- M. *Some say:* “To a clean one” [i.e., a clean beast] and in accord with the view of R. Meir [that the prohibition applies only to beasts]. *And some say:* “To clean ones” [i.e., clean beasts, wild animals and fowl] and in accord with the view of our rabbis [E-F above].
- N. Said R. Shizbi, “*I too have taught in this regard on Tannaite authority:* **[The carrion of the unclean bird] ...And (7) he who eats a limb from the living [unclean bird] from it does not receive the forty stripes. And (8) slaughtering it does not render it [i.e., the severed limb] clean [M. Toh. 1:3 H-I].** *Concerning whom? If you maintain this concerns an Israelite, it is obvious that slaughtering it does not render it clean. Rather it concerns the descendants of Noah. We may derive the rule [from (8)] that it is prohibited [to them].*”
- O. *R. Mani bar Patish raised a contradiction from the first text (7) to the last text (8) [in the preceding Mishnah-passage that was cited. It implies first that a limb of an unclean animal is not prohibited and then implies that it is.] And we answer, the first text refers to an Israelite [in accord with the view of sages]. And the last text refers to a descendant of Noah.*

II.3 A. Said Rab [var.: said R. Judah, said Rab], “[To be liable for violating the prohibition against eating] *a limb from a live animal, you must have [a minimum quantity of] an olive’s bulk. What is the basis in scripture for this view? The verse uses the language of ‘eating’ concerning it. [Eating is defined as entailing at least an olive’s bulk.]*”

- B. *R. Amram raised an objection [to the requirement of this minimum quantity]: **And (7) he who eats a limb from the living [unclean bird] from it does not receive the forty stripes. And (8) slaughtering it does not render it [i.e., the severed limb] clean [M. Toh. 1:3 H-I].** Now if you conclude that you must have an olive's bulk, let us exclude this [justification that he violated the prohibition against a limb from a living animal] for he did eat an olive's bulk [of unclean meat].*
- C. *[We may explain that it is not possible for him to eat an olive's bulk of unclean meat.] As R. Nahman said, "Any amount [of meat combines with] sinews and bones [to constitute the olive's bulk]." Here too [it is a case of] any amount [of meat that combines with] sinews and bones [to constitute an olive's bulk].*
- D. *Come and take note: For said Rab, [102b] "One who ate a living clean bird of any size [is liable]. [One who eats a bird] after it died [is liable if it is the quantity of] an olive's bulk. [One who ate] an unclean [bird], whether living or dead of any size [is liable]."*
- E. *Here too [the case must be where there is] any amount of flesh [combined together with] sinews and bones [to make up the olive's bulk].*
- F. *Come and take note: **If one took a bird that is not the volume of an olive's bulk and ate it — Rabbi declares exempt. And R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon declares liable. Said R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon, "It is derived a fortiori. Now if on account of a limb from a bird [that is alive] one is liable, is it not logical to conclude that for the whole [bird] one should be liable? [If] one strangled it and ate it, [he is exempt] — All would agree that there must be an olive's bulk." [T. A.Z. 8:6 F-J].***
- G. *On this point they do not dispute. But one master reasons in accord with the principle that [a whole bird] while alive already has been divided [in theory] into limbs. [When one eats the bird whole he transgresses the prohibition of eating the limbs.] And the other master reasons in accord with the principle that [a bird] while alive has not been divided [in theory] into limbs. Everyone agrees meanwhile that we do not need [to be liable to have a limb in the quantity of] an olive's bulk.*

II.4 A. Said R. Nahman, "Any amount [of meat combines with] sinews and bones [to constitute the olive's bulk]."

- B. *But is there such [a bird] that does not have a total of an olive's bulk of meat but on one limb has an olive's bulk [of substance] if you combine the [small] amount of meat on it with its sinews and bones?*
- C. *Said R. Sherabia, "Yes, the kallanita [blue-footed gull]."*
- D. *But consider the latter text [of the Tosefta-passage cited above at III.2 B]: **[If] one strangled it and ate it, [he is exempt]** — All would agree that there must be an olive's bulk. But lo, the kallanita is an unclean bird. And said Rab, "An unclean bird — whether living or dead — [renders unclean] with any amount at all."*
- E. *Rather [it must be that the type of bird referred to in A was] one that resembles the kallanita [but is a clean bird].*

- II.5** A. Said Raba, “If you wish to say that Rabbi [in T. A.Z. 8:6, cited above] reasoned in accord with the view that deliberation regarding foods is effective [in changing its status], then if he deliberated to eat it limb by limb and then he ate it whole, he would be liable [for eating limbs from a living animal].”
- B. *Said to him Abbaye, “Is there such a case where if another person ate it he would not be liable [for eating a limb from a living bird], but if he ate it he would be liable?”*
- C. He [Raba] said to him, “This one is judged in accord with his deliberation and this one is judged in accord with his deliberation.”
- D. And said Raba, “If you wish to say that R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon reasoned in accord with the view that deliberation regarding foods is effective [in changing its status], then if he deliberated to eat it dead and he ate it alive, he would be exempt.”
- E. *Said to him Abbaye, “Is there such a case where if another person ate it he would be liable [for eating a limb from a living bird], but if he ate it he would not be liable?”*
- F. He [Raba] said to him, “This one is judged in accord with his deliberation and this one is judged in accord with his deliberation.”
- II.6** A. Said R. Yohanan, “‘And you shall not eat the life with the flesh’ (Deu. 12:23) — this is [the source of the prohibition against eating] a limb from a living animal. ‘You shall not eat any meat that is mangled by beasts in the field’ (Exo. 22:31) — this is [the source of the prohibition against eating] flesh torn from a living animal and flesh torn from a *terefah*-animal.”
- B. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “‘And you shall not eat the life with the flesh’ (Deu. 12:23) — this is [the source of the prohibition against eating] a limb from a living animal and flesh torn from a living animal. ‘You shall not eat any meat that is mangled by beasts in the field’ (Exo. 22:31) — this is [the source of the prohibition against eating] flesh torn from a *terefah*-animal.”
- C. One who ate a limb from a living animal and flesh torn from a living animal — according to R. Yohanan he is liable for violating two prohibitions; according to R. Simeon b. Laqish he is liable for violating only one prohibition.
- D. One who ate flesh torn from a living animal and flesh torn from a *terefah*-animal — according to R. Simeon b. Laqish he is liable for violating two prohibitions; according to R. Yohanan he is liable for violating only one prohibition.
- E. One who ate a limb from a living animal and flesh torn from a *terefah*-animal — according to both authorities he is liable for violating two prohibitions.
- F. *And they raised a contradiction: [103a] One who ate a limb from a living animal that was terefah — R. Yohanan said, “He is liable for violating two prohibitions.” R. Simeon b. Laqish said, “He is liable for violating only one prohibition.”*
- G. *It is consistent according to R. Yohanan and the matter is settled. But according to R. Simeon b. Laqish there is an inconsistency.*
- H. *Said R. Joseph, “There does not have to be an inconsistency. [You can say] this one [rule] refers to [flesh torn] from one animal. And this one refers to [flesh torn] from two animals. Where there were two animals, he*

is liable for violating two prohibitions. Where there is one animal, they disputed the matter.”

- I. *Said Abbaye, “The case in question [that they disputed] is one where the animal became a terefah as the majority of it emerged from its [mother at its birth]. One authority reasons in accord with the principle that [a whole bird] while alive already has been divided [in theory] into limbs. So the prohibition [against eating] a terefah-animal and the prohibition [against eating] the limbs take effect at the same moment. And the other authority reasons in accord with the principle that [a bird] while alive has not been divided [in theory] into limbs. And the prohibition [against eating] the limb does not apply on top of the prohibition [against eating] a terefah-animal.”*
- J. *If you prefer [another explanation]: All agree with the principle that [a bird] while alive has not been divided [in theory] into limbs. They dispute whether the prohibition [against eating] the limbs can come and apply on top of the prohibition [against eating] a terefah-animal. One authority reasons in accord with the view that the prohibition [against eating] the limbs can come and apply on top of the prohibition [against eating] a terefah-animal. And one authority reasons in accord with the view that the prohibition [against eating] the limbs cannot come and apply on top of the prohibition [against eating] a terefah-animal.*
- K. *If you prefer [another explanation]: All agree with the principle that [a bird] while alive has not been divided [in theory] into limbs. And the case in question is one where the animal became terefah afterward. They dispute whether the prohibition [against eating] a terefah-animal can come and apply on top of the prohibition [against eating] limbs. One authority reasons in accord with the view that [the prohibition against eating a terefah-animal] can come and apply on top of [the prohibition against eating the limbs]. And one authority reasons in accord with the view that [the prohibition against eating a terefah-animal] cannot come and apply on top of [the prohibition against eating the limbs].*
- L. *Raba said, “The case in question is one where he tore off a limb and in so doing rendered the animal terefah. One authority reasons in accord with the principle that [a bird] while alive has not been divided [in theory] into limbs. And the prohibition [against eating] the limb and the prohibition [against eating] a terefah-animal take effect at the same moment. And one master reasons in accord with the principle that [a whole bird] while alive already has been divided [in theory] into limbs. So the prohibition [against eating] a terefah-animal does not come and apply on top of the prohibition [against eating] the limbs.”*
- M. *Said R. Hiyya bar Abba, said R. Yohanan, “One who ate [forbidden] fat torn from a living animal that was a terefah-animal is liable for violating two prohibitions.”*
- N. *Said to him R. Ammi, “Why does the master not maintain [that he violated] three [prohibitions]?”*
- O. *[Said Hiyya], “I do say three.”*

- P. *It also was stated: Said R. Abbahu, said R. Yohanan, "One who ate fat torn from a living animal that was a terefah-animal is liable for violating three prohibitions."*
- Q. *Concerning what principles do they dispute in this matter? The case in question [that they disputed] is one where the animal became a terefah as the majority of it emerged from its [mother at its birth]. The authority who reasons he is liable for three [violations], reasons in accord with the principle that [a whole bird] while alive already has been divided [in theory] into limbs. So the prohibition [against eating] the fat and prohibition [against eating] a terefah-animal and the prohibition [against eating] the limbs take effect at the same moment. And the authority who reasons he is liable for two [violations], reasons in accord with the principle that [a bird] while alive has not been divided [in theory] into limbs. And the prohibitions [against eating] the fat or a terefah-animal are there. And the prohibition [against eating] the limb does not apply on top of them."*
- R. *If you prefer [another explanation]: all agree with the principle that [a bird] while alive has not been divided [in theory] into limbs. They dispute whether the prohibition [against eating] the limbs can come and apply on top of the prohibitions [against eating] the fat or a terefah-animal. One authority reasons in accord with the view that the prohibition [against eating] the limbs can come and apply on top of the prohibitions [against eating] the fat or a terefah-animal. And one authority reasons in accord with the view that the prohibition [against eating] the limbs cannot come and apply on top of the prohibitions [against eating] the fat or a terefah-animal.*
- S. *If you prefer [another explanation]: all agree with the principle that [a bird] while alive has not been divided [in theory] into limbs. And the case in question is one where the animal became terefah afterward. They dispute whether the prohibition [against eating] a terefah-animal can come and apply on top of the prohibitions [against eating] the fat or limbs. One authority reasons in accord with the view that [the prohibition against eating a terefah-animal] can come and apply on top of [the prohibitions against eating the fat or limbs].*
- T. *It is the same [in that respect] as in the case of the prohibition [against eating] fat [that another prohibition can apply on top of it] [in reference to the verse: "The fat of an animal that dies of itself, and the fat of one that is torn by beasts, may be put to any other use, but on no account shall you eat it" (Lev. 7:24).] For said the master, "[What new law does Lev. 7:24 come to tell us? The prohibition of fat and blood was previously spelled out in Lev. 3:17.] The Torah said: Let the prohibition [against eating] carrion come and apply on top of the prohibition [against eating] fat." And so let the prohibition [against eating] a terefah-animal come and apply on top of the prohibition [against eating] fat.*
- U. *And the other [authority]? [He would say that] it applies on top of [the prohibition of] fat since there are some kinds [of fat] that are permitted*

[i.e., fat of a wild animal]. [103b] But it would not [apply on top of the prohibition of eating] a limb since there are none of its kind [i.e., limbs from a living animal] that are permitted.

- II.7** A. When R. Dimi came [from the Land of Israel] he said: R. Simeon b. Laqish posed a question to R. Yohanan: “If he cut up [the olive’s bulk of a limb of a living animal] outside [of his mouth and then ate it in smaller quantities] what is the law?” He [Yohanan] said to him, “He is exempt [from any violation].” [He asked: “What if he separated the olive’s bulk] inside [of his mouth and swallowed pieces that were each less than an olive’s bulk]?” He said to him, “He is liable.”
- B. When Rabin came [from Israel] he said: If he cut up [the olive’s bulk of a limb of a living animal] outside [of his mouth and then ate it in smaller quantities] he is exempt [from any violation]. If he separated the olive’s bulk] inside [of his mouth and swallowed pieces that were each less than an olive’s bulk] — R. Yohanan said, “He is liable.” And Resh Laqish said, “He is exempt.”
- C. R. Yohanan said, “He is liable.” Behold his gullet has benefited from [ingesting] an olive’s bulk. And Resh Laqish said, “He is exempt.” We must have consumption of an olive’s bulk [at one time] in his belly [for him to be liable]. And here we do not have it.
- D. But then according to the view of R. Simeon b. Laqish how would we ever find a case in which he would be liable? [One always chews it up into small pieces.]
- E. Said R. Kahana, “[A case is] the patella-bone [i.e., it is small and swallowed whole].”
- F. And R. Eleazar said, “Even if he cut up [the olive’s bulk of a limb of a living animal] outside [of his mouth and then ate it in smaller quantities] he is liable [based on the principle that actions] that are disconnected are not necessarily separate acts. [Even if he does it less than an olive’s bulk at a time, they may be deemed part of the same act of eating.]
- II.8** A. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “The olive’s bulk that they speak of [includes all of what one ate] except for the material that sticks between his teeth.”
- B. And R. Yohanan said, “You may include [in the olive’s bulk] the material that sticks between his teeth.”
- C. Said R. Pappa, “Regarding the material that sticks between his teeth nobody disputes [that it cannot be included]. Concerning what material did they dispute? The material that stuck to his gums. One authority reasons that behold his gullet has benefitted from [ingesting] an olive’s bulk. And one authority holds that we must have consumption of an olive’s bulk [at one time] in his belly [for him to be liable. And here we do not have it].”
- D. Said R. Assi, said R. Yohanan, “One who ate half an olive’s bulk and threw it up and then ate another half an olive’s bulk is liable. What principle is the basis for this rule? Behold his gullet has benefitted from [ingesting] an olive’s bulk.”

- E. *R. Eleazar posed a question to R. Assi: One who ate half an olive's bulk and threw it up and then ate another half an olive's bulk — what is the law? But what is the point of this question? If he was not sure whether to consider [what he threw up to have been] digested or not digested, then let him pose the question for the case of an olive's bulk [or more of food]. If he was not sure whether to consider determinative the gullet's benefit or the belly's benefit, let him resolve that question by making reference to the teaching attributed to R. Assi himself [the gullet's benefit determines the status].*
- F. *R. Assi forgot his own teaching and R. Eleazar came and reminded him of it. And here is how he stated the matter to him, "Why must I consider [in this case of one who ate half an olive's bulk and threw it up, that he then ate] another half an olive's bulk? Let the master maintain that [he ate again] the same one [that he had thrown up]." Then you would derive from this [response] two things. We would derive from this that we do not consider [what he threw up to have been] digested. And we would derive from this [that we adhere to the principle that one is liable if] behold his gullet has benefited from [ingesting] an olive's bulk.*
- G. *[Assi] sat mute and said nothing to him in reply.*
- H. *He [Eleazar] said to him, "Marvel of our times! Did you not state this matter many times before R. Yohanan? And he said to you [one is liable if] behold his gullet has benefited from [ingesting] an olive's bulk."*