



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Eggs

Rav Idi bar Avin asked Abaye about Rav Nachman’s statement about nullifying an egg, implying that an egg contributes taste. This contradicts the popular expression, “just like egg water,” in reference to things that have no taste.

Abaye answered that Rav Nachman was referring to an egg with a chick in it, as the chick’s meat contributes taste.

The *Gemora* infers from here that if it would be a non-kosher bird’s egg (*without a chick*), it would not contribute a taste (*and therefore, no nullification would be required*). The *Gemora* questions this from a *braisa*: If kosher eggs were cooked with *tamei* eggs and the *tamei* eggs can impart a taste in the others, they are all forbidden! [*We see that when the non-kosher egg is cooked, it does contribute a taste!?*]

The *Gemora* answers: Here, too, we are referring to an egg with a chick in it (*as the chick’s meat contributes taste*). The *Gemora* explains that since they contain chicks, they are called *tamei*.

The *Gemora* asks: But surely since the latter clause deals with eggs containing chicks, for it states: If eggs were cooked together and in one of them was found a chick, and this one can impart its taste into the others, all are forbidden, it follows that the first clause is dealing with eggs which do not contain chicks!?

The *Gemora* answers that the latter clause is merely an explanation of the first one (*and this is the reading of the braisa*): If kosher eggs were cooked with *tamei* eggs and the *tamei* eggs can impart a taste in the others, they are all forbidden; and the case is they were cooked together and in one of them was found a chick. (97b – 98a)

Nullifications

The *Gemora* relates that once an olive’s volume of *cheilev* (*forbidden fat*) fell into a pot of meat. Rav Ashi intended to include in the measuring (*all the permitted meat*) that was absorbed in the (*walls of the*) pot. The Rabbis said to Rav Ashi: Has it absorbed only from that which is permitted and not from that which is forbidden? [*Some cheilev absorbed as well; therefore, we measure according to what is presently in the pot.*]

The *Gemora* relates that once a half-olive’s volume of *cheilev* fell into a pot of meat. Mar the son of Rav Ashi intended to measure it with thirty half-olive’s volumes (*and nullify it with that*). His father said to him: Have I not told you that you should not treat lightly the measures - even in matters which are forbidden only Rabbinically? And furthermore, Rabbi Yochanan has ruled that half a measure (*of a forbidden matter*) is forbidden Biblically!?

Rav Shemen bar Abba said in the name of Rav Idi bar Idi bar Gershom who said it in the name of Levi bar Parta who said it in the name of Rabbi Nachum who said it in the name of Rabbi Biryam who said it in the name of a certain old man whose name was Rabbi Yaakov: Those of the *Nasi’s* house

said: A forbidden egg (*when cooked*) among sixty eggs renders them all forbidden; a forbidden egg among sixty-one eggs – they are all permitted.

Rabbi Zeira said to Rav Shemen bar Abba: Look (*and be careful not to cause others to stumble*), you are stating a definite boundary at which they are permitted, whereas two great men of the day were unable to issue a definite ruling on this matter, for Rabbi Yaakov bar Idi and Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachmeini both said in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi that a forbidden egg among sixty eggs rendered them all forbidden, and a forbidden egg among sixty-one eggs – they are all permitted. And when it was enquired of them: Does ‘sixty-one’ mean together with it (*the forbidden egg*) or without it, they were unable to resolve it, and you seem to be so certain of it!?

It was stated: Rabbi Chelbo said in the name of Rav Huna: With regard to a (*forbidden*) egg (*cooked with permitted ones*); if there were sixty and this one (*the forbidden egg*), they are forbidden, but if there were sixty-one and this one, they are permitted.

A certain man once came before Rabban Gamliel the son of Rebbe: (*with a case where a prohibited item was cooked together with permitted items measuring forty-five times the forbidden item*). He said: My father would not permit such a case even when it is forty-seven times the amount; should I permit it when it is only forty-five times the amount?

A certain man once came before Rabbi Shimon the son of Rebbe: (*with a case where a prohibited item was cooked together with permitted items measuring forty-three times the forbidden item*). He said: My father would not permit such a case even when it is forty-five times the amount; should I permit it when it is only forty-seven times the amount?

A certain man once came before Rabbi Chiya (*with a case where a prohibited item was cooked together with permitted*

items). He said: Is there not here thirty times the amount! The *Gemora* notes: The reason why he ruled it forbidden was because there was not thirty times the amount; but if there was thirty times the amount, could he then have permitted it?

Rabbi Chanina answered: It was merely an exaggeration (*that there was not even thirty times the amount, but in truth, it would not have been permitted with thirty*).

Rabbi Chiya bar Abba said in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi who said it in the name of Bar Kappara: All forbidden substances of the Torah are nullified in sixty. Rabbi Shmuel the son of Rabbi Yitzchak said to him: Master, do you say so? But Rav Assi stated in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi who said it in the name of Bar Kappara: All forbidden substances of the Torah are nullified in a hundred!?

The *Gemora* explains their dispute: They both derived their views from ‘the cooked foreleg’ (*of the ram offered by the nazir*), as it is written: *And the Kohen shall take the cooked foreleg*. And it was taught in a *braisa*: ‘Cooked’ implies that it must be whole (*and not cut into pieces*). Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai says: ‘Cooked’ implies that it must have been cooked together with the ram (*before being given to the Kohen*). Now (*the Gemora explains*), they both agree that it must be cooked together with the ram, but they differ regarding the following: The *Tanna Kamma* holds that it must first be cut away (*from the ram*) and then cooked (*while it is whole*), and Rabbi Shimon maintains that it must first be cooked (*with the ram*) and then cut away. Alternatively, I can say that they all agree that it must first be cut away and then cooked, but they differ regarding the following: The *Tanna Kamma* holds that it must be cooked together with the ram (*in the same pot*), and Rabbi Shimon maintains that it must be cooked in a separate pot.

Now, according to the first version from either view and according to the second version from the view of Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai (*for according to them, the foreleg, which*



is forbidden for an ordinary Jew, is cooked together with the ram, and nevertheless, the ram may be eaten by the owner – a Yisroel; evidently, the foreleg is nullified in the ram). He (Rabbi Chiya bar Abba) who holds that a prohibited substance is nullified in sixty maintains that the meat and bone (of the foreleg) must be measured against the meat and bone (of the ram), and the ram is sixty times as much as the foreleg. But he (Rav Assi) who holds that a prohibited substance is nullified in one hundred maintains that only the meat (of the foreleg) must be measured against the meat (of the ram) and the ram is a hundred times as much as the foreleg (for in the foreleg there is a lot of bone and very little meat).

The Gemora asks: But can one derive this rule (of nullification) from the ram of the nazir? Surely it has been taught in a braisa (regarding the nazir's ram): This is a case of a substance being permitted even though it has absorbed a forbidden substance (which is against the standard rule). Now what does 'this' exclude? Presumably it excludes every other substance which has absorbed any matter forbidden by the Torah?

Abaye answered: The exclusion was necessary only according to Rabbi Yehudah who maintains that in all other cases, one kind cannot nullify its same kind; therefore we are taught that here they do nullify each other (even though both the forbidden and permitted substance are of the same kind – meat).

The Gemora asks: But why does he not derive the rule from here (that there can be nullification by a mixture of the same kind)?

The Gemora answers: It is because the Torah has expressly stated: *And he shall take of the blood of the bull and of the blood of the goat*, which shows that although they are both mixed together, one does not nullify the other.

The Gemora asks: But why do you prefer to derive the rule (of non-nullification of mixtures of the same kind) from this verse, rather than from the other (from the nazir's ram)?

The Gemora answers: It is because that is a novelty (that one is permitted to nullify a prohibited substance from the outset), and one cannot derive laws from novelties.

The Gemora asks: If so, how may we derive the rule of nullification in a hundred or in sixty from there?

The Gemora answers: Are we deriving a leniency from there? We are deriving a restriction, for according to the rule of the Torah, a substance is nullified in a mere majority (and now we learn a stringency that sixty or one hundred is required).

Rava answered (by explaining the braisa as follows): The exclusion was necessary with reference to the rule that the taste of a forbidden substance is treated as the substance itself. Now as this is forbidden in the case of consecrated matter, we are therefore taught that here it is permitted. (98a – 98b)

INSIGHTS ON THE DAF

Observing the mitzvah lamehadrin with a disqualified esrog

Many sugyos discuss the halachos of mixtures of permitted and forbidden articles, just as our sugya. In a mixture of forbidden and permitted foods the minority becomes insignificant (bateil) in the majority. If the permitted food is the majority, the whole mixture is allowed (see Shulchan Aruch, Y.D. 109:1). A few fascinating questions were presented to the leaders of the generations and help us to clarify the definition of this rule.

Kosher and disqualified tzitzis which became mixed: The author of *Oneg Yom Tov* was asked (§4) how one should deal with a pile of identical tzitzis threads, the majority of which were properly woven for the sake of the mitzvah (see

Shulchan 'Aruch, O.C. 11:1) but some threads weren't woven *lishmah* and are *passul*. In this case do we also say that all the mixture can be used since the minority of disqualified *tzitzis* becomes *bateil* in the majority of kosher ones?

Matzah baked not for the sake of the mitzvah which became mixed with matzos *lamehaderin*: A serious question was brought to HaGaon Rabbi Naftali Tzvi of Volozhin zt"l (*Responsa Meishiv Davar, O.C. 34*) concerning a pile of matzos baked for the sake of the mitzvah containing one matzah which was not baked *lishmah*. Can we rule that the exceptional matzah is insignificant in the majority of matzos and that all of them can be used for the mitzvah of eating matzah on the *Seder* night?

A disqualified *esrog* that was mixed with *esrogim mehudarim*: The Rabbi of Kazimirov (cited in *Sha'arei Yosher, sha'ar 3, Ch. 15*), was similarly faced with dozens of expensive *esrogim* whose *kashrus* fell into doubt. The *pitum* of an *esrog mehudar* fell off and it became disqualified. Later the *esrog* landed up in a box full of *esrogim* that never had a *pitum* and could not be identified. Can we use these *esrogim*?

Does becoming insignificant in a majority lend a new definition to the minority? These three cases, representing a number of similar questions in halachic works, demand us to examine the source of the rule of *bitul berov* (becoming insignificant in a majority). The doubt is if *bitul berov* can create new halachos or perhaps only remove old halachos. Till now we know that forbidden food that became mixed with permitted food loses its prohibition if it is the minority because of *bitul berov*. Pay attention! We didn't place a *heter* (permission) on the forbidden food but merely removed the prohibition from it and, as a result, it is allowed to eat. However, in the above three cases we want to apply a new halachah to the forbidden minority. We want to regard the disqualified *esrog* as kosher, we try to give a matzah not baked for the sake of the mitzvah the status of *lishmah* and we want to give the disqualified *tzitzis* a definition of *kashrus* they never had.

The *poskim* disagreed about this question. The author of *'Oneg Yom Tov* ruled that indeed *bitul berov* negates old halachos but cannot apply new ones. On the other hand, the *Netziv* ruled "follow the majority" in any case, even to create new halachos! (See *Sha'arei Yosher*, who expands on the subject).

DAILY MASHAL

I Don't Believe It

The admiration of HaGaon Rabbi Baruch Ber Leibovitz zt"l, *Rosh Yeshivah* of Kaminitz, for his mentor HaGaon Rabbi Chayim of Brisk zt"l, who taught him at the Volozhin Yeshivah, was boundless. One day he was informed that the newspaper announced that his teacher had passed away. To the surprise of those close to him, he showed no reaction and continued his day as usual. After a while a messenger runner from Brisk personally informed him of the great loss and he fainted on the spot. Later he was asked, "But before, it was known from the newspapers about the demise. Why...?" Rabbi Baruch Ber didn't allow them to end their question but reprimanded them: "From the newspapers? Those papers are forbidden to read and shouldn't be believed at all" (*Kedushas 'Einayim*).