

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Egg (cont.)

Abaye answers the challenge to R' Nachman's implication that eggs do not impart taste.

This answer is unsuccessfully challenged.

The proof cited from the Beraisa in response to the challenge is refuted.

2) Nullification

Two incidents related to nullifications are presented.

A disagreement regarding the nullification of an egg is presented.

A final ruling regarding the nullification of an egg is recorded.

More discussion related to nullifications is presented.

It is noted that there was a dispute amongst early Amoraim whether prohibited substances are nullified in sixty or in a hundred.

The basis for each opinion is identified.

A second explanation of the dispute is presented.

The use of the cooked foreleg as the source for the ruling regarding nullification is unsuccessfully challenged.

Rava suggests an alternative explanation of the use of the cooked foreleg as the source for nullification. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. Do non-kosher bird eggs impart taste?

2. What is the ratio to nullify the taste of a non-kosher egg?

3. What is the point of dispute between Tanna Kamma and R' Shimon ben Yochai?

4. Explain the principle of מין במינו לא בטיל.

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated as a zechus for a
רפואה שלימה
for

מרים אורית בת דבורה

Distinctive INSIGHT

Prohibited foods can be nullified when outnumbered by sixty

כל איסורין שבתורה בשישים

The Gemara reports that prohibited foods can be nullified if they fall into a mixture which has sixty times their amount of permitted food. Rashi notes that this rule only applies where the taste of the prohibited food has been negated. However, if the prohibited food is the type whose taste prevails even when outnumbered by sixty times its amount, the prohibited food remains prohibited, no matter what the proportions may be. For example, if a spice of a prohibited item falls into a pot, its contribution may be strong and noticeable even in a minute ratio within the entire pot.

This is also the ruling of Rema (Y.D. 98:8), where he writes that if a prohibited item contributes a taste to the food, it is not nullified, "even as one in a thousand" in the pot. Therefore, salt and spices, which are made for flavor, are not nullified. Shach (ibid. #29) writes that this halacha is rabbinic, while Ra"n says that it is a Torah-level rule. Pri Megadim explains that this disagreement is not only in regard to spices, but to any prohibited food item which has a strong taste which can be detected even after it has been outnumbered by sixty times its volume. The view of Shach apparently is that once the taste is outnumbered by sixty, although it is still detectable, the taste has been diminished and blunted, so that it can really be disregarded as far as Torah law is concerned, but the rabbis ruled that even a dulled taste must still be reckoned with.

The amount necessary to nullify a prohibited food substance that falls into permitted food is a matter of disagreement between Amoraim, both attributing their views to Bar Kappara. R' Chiya b. Abba says that the amount necessary is sixty times the prohibited item, while R' Shmuel b. R' Yitzchak says that it is necessary to outnumber the prohibited food by one hundred times its volume. The Gemara reports that both views attribute the source of their opinion to the verse (Bemidbar 6:19) which describes an offering of a nazir, part of which is given to a kohen, and which is prohibited for a non-kohen to eat. This offering was of a foreleg of a ram which was cooked together with the ram. As a result of this, the foreleg was given to the kohen to eat, while the rest of the ram was eaten by the nazir, who could have been a non-kohen. The entire ram has a volume of sixty times more than the foreleg of the ram, including its bone and its meat. However, the meat of the ram is one hundred times more than the meat of the foreleg. There are several technical issues which are problematic regarding learning laws of nullification from this episode, and Tosafos comments that this verse is not the genuine source of these amounts. There was a tradition whether we use sixty or one hundred to calculate nullification, and the verse is only a rabbinic reference to these amounts (אסמכתא). ■

HALACHA Highlight

Do non-kosher eggs impart a prohibited taste?

But not for a non-kosher bird's egg

אבל טמאה לא

The Gemara continues its discussion of whether eggs impart flavor and the Gemara responds that indeed eggs generally do not impart flavor but an egg with an unhatched chick does impart flavor. Tosafos¹ writes that not only does an egg with a chick impart a prohibited flavor but an egg that has a bloodspot will also impart a prohibited flavor to a mixture. Additionally, if a non-kosher egg was peeled before it was cooked it will also impart a prohibited taste to the food in the pot. It is only an egg that remains in its shell that does not impart a prohibited taste to a mixture.

Shulchan Aruch² rules that an egg from a kosher bird that was a neveilah or a tereifah has the same halachic status as an egg from a non-kosher bird. Accordingly, if the egg was cooked in its shell with kosher food the mixture remains permitted since the prohibited taste is not imparted through the shell. Rema³, however disagrees with this ruling

and prohibits the mixture even if the egg was not peeled unless that permitted food is sixty times the volume of the prohibited egg.

Vilna Gaon⁴ explains that the disagreement between Shulchan Aruch and Rema is based on the fact that the Gemara attempted to prove that it is only an egg with a chick inside that imparts prohibited taste but the proof was refuted. As such our Gemara does not reach a definitive conclusion as to whether a prohibited egg imparts taste through its shell. Therefore, the halacha will revolve around the Gemara's earlier declaration (64b) that גיעולי ביצים are permitted. Rashi⁵ explains that גיעולי ביצים refers to our discussion here and as such one may rely upon the Beraisa's assertion that a prohibited egg does not impart flavor through its shell. Tosafos⁶ explains that גיעולי ביצים refers to an egg that emerged prematurely. Since he does not reference our Gemara it must be due to the fact that our Gemara did not draw a definitive conclusion about the matter. Consequently, Rema adopted a stringent position. ■

¹ ד"ה בביצת אפרוח.
² שו"ע יו"ד סי' פ"ו סעי' ו'.
³ רמ"א שם.
⁴ ביאור הגר"א שם אות י"א.
⁵ רש"י ס"ו: ד"ה גיעולי ביצים.
⁶ תוס' שם ד"ה גיעולי.

STORIES off the Daf

One in Sixty

"כל האיסורים שבתורה בס'..."

Many wonder why they need to do teshuvah at all. "Just look at the world today," they say to themselves. "Aren't we the cream of this generation of Jews? Why must we worry so much about teshuvah? Don't we do enough?"

Rav Yaakov Kaminetzsky, zt"l, addressed this claim with strong mussar. "But what about chilul Hashem? If one is on a high level, he must comport himself as is fitting or he makes a huge chilul Hashem..."¹

Rav Yisrael of Ruzhin, zt"l, offered a different answer, however. "In Chullin 98 we find that all prohibited

matter becomes nullified in sixty. One may wonder why sin doesn't work in the same manner. Why must one who does many positive actions and some negative have to do teshuvah? If he is certain that he does sixty times good deeds this should cancel out his sins! The answer is that sin is a davar sheyesh lo matirin—a prohibition that is sometimes permitted. It can become permitted if one must do the sin to save a life. It will also become permitted if one does teshuvah. There is no nullification if one can remove the sin by his actions."²

The Dzikover Rav, zt"l, learned a completely different message from this statement on today's daf. "All prohibitions are permitted in sixty. This can also be read as: all prohibitions are nullified when one reaches sixty. The Gemara clarifies an exception—

according to everyone regarding kodoshim and according to Rav Yehudah even regarding ordinary prohibitions—חוץ ממין במינו— besides the same type of prohibition. But the word מין also means a heretic. Even a heretic who reaches sixty won't necessarily cancel and renounce his sacrilege. Even one who reaches a thousand years may not let go of this kind of foolishness!"³ ■

¹ במחיצת רבינו
² כרם בית ישראל, ע"י פ"ז
³ שיח זקנים, ח"ד, ע"י קעיז

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 as a zechus
 for a refuah sheleimah for

שלמה ברוך בן שיינדל ברכה
 דינה חיה שרה בת שיינע מירה