



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Mutant bechor (cont.)

R' Achai unsuccessfully challenges R' Yosi HaGalili's exposition as presented in a Baraisa.

R' Pappa explains how Rabanan would respond to this exposition and then the Gemara goes on to record the exchange between R' Yosi HaGalili and Rabanan regarding their respective positions.

The Gemara inquires about the status of a cow that gave birth to a firstborn that looked like a donkey yet had some features that resembled its mother.

This question is developed into three different parts.

After two attempts the Gemara was only successful at resolving the first of the three inquiries.

2) The product of that which is non-kosher or kosher

The rationale behind the wording of the Mishnah is explained.

A Baraisa is cited that provides the source for the Mishnah's principle that the product of something has the same status as the thing itself.

The exchange between the dissenting opinions of Rabanan and R' Shimon in the Baraisa is recorded.

R' Acha the son of Rava questions the need for the expositions of the Baraisa when there seems to be an alternative source to prohibit camel's milk.

The necessity of the additional expositions is explained.

This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

The Gemara searches for and finds a number of sources that indicate that milk from a kosher animal is permitted.

The Gemara questions the earlier exposition that was

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the source that firstborn horses and camels are not subject to the laws of bechor?

2. Why was it necessary for the Mishnah to emphasize that the product of a non-kosher animal is not kosher and that the product of a kosher animal is kosher?

3. What is the famous exposition of Shimon HaAmsoni that was salvaged by R' Akiva?

4. What is the source that milk from a kosher animal is kosher?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Awe for God, fear for parents

כיון שהגיע לאת ה' אלקיך תירא פירש

Tosafos (6a, and Bava Kamma 41b) notes that the Gemara in Kiddushin (30b) connects the mitzvos we find in two pesukim. In Vayikra (19:3) we find the mitzvah, "a man should fear his mother and father." Also, in Devarim (6:13) we find "One should fear God." The Torah associates the fear one must have for God with the fear he should engender for his mother and father. This being the case, Shimon the Amsoni should have been comfortable saying that the verse is coming to teach that the fear of God should be emulated and applied to the awe and admiration a person should have for his parents. And although this concept is already indicated in the parallel we find between the aforementioned verses, this additional verse could be coming to teach that there is an additional, compounded mitzvah counted in the area of fearing one's parents.

Tosafos answers that Shimon HaAmsoni felt that the word "es" in Devarim 6:13 would include a fear parallel to that which is appropriate for God, and it is not possible to extend that same degree of fear to one's parents. This is why he desisted from suggesting this lesson.

Tosafos in Bava Kamma (41b) notes, in the name of R' Yeshaya, that the association between fear of God and the awe one should have for his parents is not a bona fide comparison. The verses are in different places in the Torah, so the connection between these concepts is not a complete one. Therefore, Shimon HaAmsoni knew that the parallel between these mitzvos was not complete, and the word "es" could not be understood to connect them. Taz (Y.D. 242:#1), however, writes that once the Gemara informs us that the fear of God and the fear for parents are connected, this is to be understood as a complete association, without compromise.

Tosafos himself (ibid.) writes that Shimon HaAmsoni did not want to make this drasha because he did not feel that the purpose of this extra word was in order to just establish a second positive commandment to fear parents where one is already in place.

The Shitta Mikubetzes cites several Rishonim who ask why Shimon HaAmsoni did not stop earlier, when he arrived at the verse (Devarim 6:5), "And you shall love – אה – God, your Lord." What could possibly be associated to parallel the love one must have for God? Shitta quotes Rabeinu Yeshaya who answers that Shimon HaAmsoni understood that one should also love the service of God.

(Continued on page 2)

HALACHAH Highlight

Eating eggs from a kosher bird

הואיל ולכא מידי דאתי מחי ושרייה רחמנא

Since there is nothing that comes from a living creature that the Torah permits

Tosafos¹ writes that it is permitted to eat an egg that was laid by a kosher bird and it does not violate the prohibition of eating a limb from a living creature. His proof is that the Torah says regarding the mitzvah of shiluach hekein “**ואת הבנים ותקח לך** – and the offspring you shall take for yourself” and Chazal derive from this that the egg must be something that is edible for the person performing the mitzvah. Tosafos also quotes Ba'al Halachos Gedolos who asserts that the permissibility of eating the egg of a kosher bird is derived from the fact that the Torah had to prohibit eggs from a non-kosher bird. Chasam Sofer² explains that the Ba'al Halachos Gedolos did not utilize shiluach hakein as the source for this halacha since it is possible that one is taking the eggs so that a chick should be able to develop.

Ramban³ cites an opinion who asserts that the source for the allowance to eat kosher eggs is derived from the fact that it is permitted to eat the chicks that develop from eggs. If the eggs are prohibited as a limb taken from a living creature then the chick that develops from that egg should also be prohibi-

(Insight...continued from page 1)

Maharsha explains that it is commendable to love talmidei chachamim, who study and teach Torah to the nation. However, it is unreasonable to say that the Torah expects us to fear talmidei chachamim as we do God. Fear and awe are ultimately connected with reward and punishment, and this is only in the hands of God. ■

ed. Ramban rejects this position based on the Gemara in Temurah (31a) that teaches that a chick born from a hen that is a tereifah is permitted because the egg turns putrid before the chick develops. Consequently there is no proof from the fact that chicks are permitted since it is possible that even if the egg is prohibited the chick may still be permitted. Chasam Sofer⁴ also challenges the rationale behind the opinion cited by Ramban. Even if one were to consider chicks to be a limb taken from a living creature this would not be sufficient to prohibit them for consumption since before it may be eaten it must be slaughtered and slaughtering removes the preexisting condition of being a limb from a living creature. An egg, on the other hand, if considered a limb from a living creature can not be rendered permitted since it is not possible to slaughter an egg. ■

1. תוס' חולין ס"ד. ד"ה שאם – השני.
2. שו"ת חת"ס יו"ד סי' ע"ח ד"ה והנה בה"ג.
3. רמב"ן בהלכותיו כאן.
4. שו"ת חת"ס יו"ד סי' ע"ד ד"ה אלא דהדרנא. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

“And You Shall Live by Them”

דס נעקר ונעשה חלב

In the hospital, people often face complex and unusual halachic questions with which they would otherwise hardly see.

One great rav became very ill and was checked into the hospital. He was told that he required a blood transfusion. But when he remembered a statement on today's daf, he began to wonder if one can take blood from just anyone. “The halachah is that one should not allow a baby to feed from a woman who eats non-kosher food, even if she is obligated to do so due to danger or another reason. The same is true regarding nursing from a non-Jewish mother. Although the baby is allowed to nurse and the mother is allowed to eat the prohibited food, it still pollutes her milk and the baby

will also be polluted if he feeds from her.¹ Since in Bechoros 6 we find that mother's milk is formed from blood, it seems that the same is true regarding taking blood from a non-Jew or a Jew who eats non-kosher for whatever reason. Should I not carefully screen from whom I receive blood?”

When he asked the Chelkas Yaakov, zt”l, this question, the sage ruled that he should not screen blood in this manner. “On the surface your reasoning is entirely correct. Although the Mahrsham, zt”l rules that taking in food intravenously is not considered eating on Yom Kippur, this has no bearing on blood polluting one's system. Clearly the moment this blood is introduced into one's system the harm is done. Nevertheless, you should not screen what blood you use. Many people who require blood transfusions are in a dangerous state of health—or at least a potentially dangerous state of health—and cannot

wait. If people begin being careful about whom the blood is from this can easily cost someone who has no time his life. As the Belzer Rebbe, zt”l, would say, when a person is sick and he doesn't have a yetzer hara for illicit desires or the like, the negative within often entices him to disregard the mitzvah of “**יחיי בהם**.”²

1. ע"רמ"א, יו"ד, סי' פ"א, סי' ז'
2. שו"ת חלקת יעקב, ח"ב, סי' מ' ■

(Overview...continued from page 1)

derived from the repetition of the term גמל.

3) Mutant bechor (cont.)

Another Baraisa discusses the status of a mutant bechor.

The Gemara inquires whether R' Shimon maintains his same position as recorded in the Baraisa when the question is whether a mutant animal is permitted for consumption. ■