



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

**Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

1. A person once asked the egg sellers if they had fertilized eggs for sale and they sold him unfertilized eggs. When the purchaser complained to Rabbi Ami, Rabbi Ami told him that the purchase was a mistake and he could retract from the transaction. Although it is obvious that the transaction was a mistake, one would have thought that the purchaser only wanted eggs for eating and the reason he asked to be sold fertilized eggs is because they are fatter than unfertilized eggs. The difference would thus have been that if the purchaser had merely wanted fertilized eggs for eating, then the seller would have merely been required to give the purchaser the difference in value between the cost of fertilized and unfertilized eggs. Rav Ami therefore ruled that since the purchaser specified that he wanted fertilized eggs, he did not want unfertilized eggs and the seller has to refund him all the money. (7a)
2. The Gemara offers an alternative explanation to Rav’s statement that an egg when it exits the mother hen becomes fully formed. Rav meant that when the

majority of the hen exits the mother hen, the egg is fully developed. This is in accordance with Rabbi Yochanan who ruled that if the majority of the egg exits from the mother hen before Yom Tov, and then goes back inside the hen and is laid on Yom Tov, one can eat the egg on Yom Tov. An alternative explanation is that Rav meant that when the egg exits entirely from the hen, it is fully developed. Only when the egg exits entirely is the egg fully developed, but if only the majority of the egg exits, then it is not fully developed. According to this explanation, Rav is coming to negate the opinion of Rabbi Yochanan who maintains that an egg is deemed to be fully developed when the majority of the egg exits the hen. (7a)

3. If one slaughters a chicken and there are fully developed eggs inside, the Tanna Kamma rules that they can be eaten with milk and Rabbi Yaakov rules that if the eggs are still attached to the connective tissue, then they cannot be eaten with milk. A Baraisa states that if one ate from the neveilah of a kosher bird, and he ate from the group of eggs that are attached

by connective tissue to the ovary, he is tahor. It would seem that this Baraisa does not follow the opinion of Rabbi Yaakov, because Rabbi Yaakov deemed eggs that are attached to the connective tissue to be part of the bird's flesh and thus they may not be eaten with milk, yet the Baraisa rules that such eggs do not generate tumah because they are not part of the bird's flesh. The Gemara rejects this supposition, because perhaps Rabbi Yaakov only rules that the attached eggs are part of the bird's flesh regarding the rabbinic injunction against eating the eggs with milk, but regarding tumah where there was no rabbinic decree, the eggs are not considered to be a part of the bird's flesh. The reason the Chachamim did not decree that fully developed eggs are deemed to be flesh regarding tumah is because we do not unnecessarily add tumah to food. (7a)

4. Any specie that cohabitates by day will bear offspring by day. Any specie that cohabitates at night will bear offspring by night. Any specie that cohabitates by day or by night will bear offspring either by day or by night. An example of a specie that cohabitates by day and bears offspring by day is the chicken. A specie that cohabitates by night and bears offspring by night is the bat. A specie that cohabitates by day and by night and bears

offspring by day or by night is man and any specie similar to man. (7a)

5. We learned in the Mishnah (2a) that Bais Shammai maintains that the biblical prohibition of owning leaven on Pesach pertains to a quantity that is equivalent to the volume of an olive, whereas the biblical prohibition of owning chametz applies to a minimum size that is the volume of a date. Bais Hillel, however, maintains that both prohibitions apply to a minimum that is the volume of an olive. According to Bais Shammai, the disparity in measurements is because if they were both the same amounts, the Torah should have only stated chametz and not leaven, and I would say that if chametz, which does not have strong leavening properties, is prohibited with the minimum of the volume of an olive, then leaven, whose leavening properties are strong, certainly should be prohibited with the minimum of the volume of an olive? The Torah therefore mentions leaven to teach us that the minimum prohibited amount for leaven and the minimum prohibited amount for chametz are different. Bais Hillel, however, maintains that we require the mentioning of leaven and chametz because if the Torah had mentioned leaven and not chametz, I would have said that leaven is prohibited because of its strong leavening properties,

whereas chametz does not have strong leavening properties, so it should not be prohibited. Therefore the Torah had to say that chametz is prohibited. Had the Torah mentioned chametz and not leaven, I would have said that chametz is prohibited because one can eat it, whereas leaven cannot be eaten so it should not be prohibited. The Torah therefore had to write that leaven is prohibited. Thus, the Torah had to write both leaven and chametz and we cannot infer like Bais Shammai that the prohibitions of leaven and chametz are disparate. (7b)

6. We learned in the Mishnah (2a) that Shammai maintains that one who slaughters a wild animal or a bird on Yom Tov can dig with a spade and cover the blood with earth, whereas Bais Hillel maintains that one cannot slaughter unless he had prepared the earth prior to Yom Tov. Bais Hillel agrees, however, that if he had already slaughtered the wild animal or bird without preparing earth beforehand, that he should dig with a spade and cover the blood with earth, because ashes from a stove are deemed to be prepared. Rabbah maintains that when the Mishnah said "one who slaughters," it means that if one seeks advice regarding the slaughtering of a wild animal or a bird despite the fact that he has not prepared

earth in advance, Bais Shammai maintains that we tell him to first slaughter the animal and then dig up the earth and cover the blood with the earth. Bais Hillel, however, maintains that he cannot slaughter the animal unless he had prepared the earth prior to Yom Tov. Rav Yosef maintains that the Mishnah means that if one seeks to slaughter a wild animal or a bird and he did not prepare earth prior to Yom Tov, Bais Shammai maintains that we tell him to first dig up the earth and then he should slaughter the animal or bird and cover up the blood with earth. Bais Hillel, however, maintains that he cannot slaughter the animal or bird unless he had prepared earth prior to Yom Tov. (7b)

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### *Drinking is Included in Eating*

Rashi cites the Gemara in Chullin that states that if one melts forbidden fats into a liquid and drinks it, he will be liable. This is derived from an extra word in a verse. Tosfos wonders why an extra word is necessary, if we can use the principle that drinking is included in eating. Tosfos answers that this principle is only said regarding something that is normal to drink. Regarding something that is actually a food item and has now been transformed into a liquid, however, we do not apply the principle that

drinking is included in eating and for this reason we need to use the extra word.

The Gemara in Yoma states that one is required to afflict himself in five different manners on Yom Kippur. The Gemara asks that there are actually six afflictions, to which the Gemara answers that drinking is included in eating.

Rabbi Akiva Eiger questions this principle from a Gemara in Shavuos and we can pose a similar question on the Gemara. Why does the Gemara state that there are only five afflictions, when there are actually six afflictions? Drinking a liquid on Yom Kippur that was initially a solid is not be included in eating and thus would be deemed a sixth affliction?

Perhaps we can answer that the distinction posited by Tosfos only applies to something that is an *issur cheftza*, a prohibition in the item itself. *Cheilev*, forbidden fats, is intrinsically forbidden, so we can say that when the fats are transformed into a liquid, it is not included in the conventional prohibition of eating. Regarding Yom Kippur, however, which is an *issur gavra*, a prohibition on the person not to consume food, the food is not intrinsically forbidden. Rather, the person is prohibited from eating, so there is no distinction between a conventional liquid and a food that was transformed into a liquid. All liquids are included in the prohibition of eating on Yom Kippur.

## DAILY MASHAL

### *Desire on a Rope*

The Gemara states that a rooster once crossed a river on a rope bridge to reach a hen and fertilize its eggs. It is said regarding the Torah *it is not hidden from you and it is not far away. It is not in heaven that you must say, "Who can go up to heaven and take it for us, so that we can listen to it and perform it."* Rashi quotes the Gemara that states that if the Torah were in heaven, one would have to ascend to heaven to study it. Although it seems like the Torah is asking the impossible from us, the truth is that if we understood the greatness and beauty that is found in the Torah, we would be like the rooster that would make every possible endeavor to cross the rope bridge, i.e. to sacrifice ones life for the sake of Torah study.