

דף יומי • חליון • דף צ"ח

Daf Yomi • The Full Daf • Elucidated Talmud • Navy & Gold Edition • with Rashi

THE SUGYA

We start off on our daf with a fascinating shakla v'tarya regarding the status of non-kosher eggs. The Gemara is bothered by a kasha from a baraita: do regular non-kosher eggs actually impart flavor and forbid a mixture, or is this din davka by an egg that already has a chick formed inside it? We see a beautiful back-and-forth as the Gemara tries to resolve the true p'shat of the baraita and whether the Tanna is talking about a real non-kosher egg or a kosher egg with a chick.

From there, the Gemara moves into practical shailos of bittul, nullification, and how we measure the required ratios. We learn about real-life ma'asehs that came before the Amoraim, including a case of forbidden fat where they discussed whether we can include the meat absorbed in the walls of the pot to help nullify the issur, and another case dealing with a half-shiur of forbidden fat. This leads into a major discussion of the shiur of bittul b'shishim, sixty times, and how the Chachamim of different generations calculated these ratios in practice.

All introductions, summaries, and contextual notes are the editor's commentary and are not part of the original text.

עמוד א' DAF 98A

EXPLANATION

בביצת אפרוח, אבל טמאה – לא.

The Mishnah's ruling that an egg can forbid other food applies specifically **with an egg** that contains a **chick**, which has a strong flavor, **but** a regular **non-kosher** egg **does not** impart flavor and therefore does not forbid other food.

OBJECTION

איתיביה: ביצים טהורות ששלקן עם ביצים טמאות, אם יש בהן בנותן טעם – כולן אסורות.

Rav Idi bar Avin **raised an objection to him** from a baraita: If there are **kosher eggs** that one boiled with **non-kosher eggs**, **if there is in them** enough to impart flavor, they are all forbidden. This proves that non-kosher eggs do indeed impart flavor!

ANSWER

הכא נמי בביצת אפרוח, ואמאי קרי לה "טמאה"? כיון דאית בה אפרוח, קרי לה "טמאה".

Abaye answered: **Here too**, the baraita is dealing **with an egg** of a kosher bird that contains a **chick**. **And why does** the baraita call it "non-kosher"? Since it has a **chick in it** which makes it forbidden, the Tanna calls it "non-kosher".

QUESTION

והא מדקתני סיפא: ביצים ששלקן ונמצא אפרוח באחת מהן, אם יש בהן בנותן טעם – כולן אסורות, מפל דרישא דלית בה אפרוח עסקינן.

The Gemara asks: **But from the fact that the latter clause teaches:** Eggs that one boiled and a chick was found in one of them, **if there is in them** enough to impart flavor, they are all forbidden, by implication, in the first clause we are

dealing with an egg that does not have a chick in it, and yet it is called non-kosher!

ANSWER

פִּירוּשֵׁי קָא מְפָרֵשׁ: בִּיצִים טְהוֹרוֹת שֶׁשָּׁלָקְנוּ עִם בִּיצִים טְמֵאוֹת, אִם יֵשׁ בָּהֶן כְּנוּתָן טַעַם – כּוֹלֵן אֲסוּרוֹת. בִּיצֵד? כִּגוֹן שֶׁשָּׁלָקְנוּ וְנִמְצָא אֶפְרוֹחַ בְּאַחַת מֵהֶן.

The Gemara answers: The latter clause is not a separate case; rather, it is explaining the first clause, as if to say: Kosher eggs that one boiled with non-kosher eggs, if there is in them enough to impart flavor, they are all forbidden. How so? For example, where one boiled them and a chick was found in one of them.

PROOF

הֲכִי נָמִי מְסַתְבָּרָא, דְּאִי סָלָקָא דַּעְתָּךְ רִישָׁא דְלִית בֵּה אֶפְרוֹחַ – הִשְׁתָּא דְלִית בֵּה אֶפְרוֹחַ אֲסוּרָה, דְּאִית בֵּה אֶפְרוֹחַ מִיבְעָא?

The Gemara notes: So too it is reasonable to explain the baraita this way, for if it should enter your mind to say that the first clause is dealing with an egg that does not have a chick in it, now that we are told that an egg which does not have a chick in it makes the mixture forbidden, is it necessary to teach a case where it has a chick in it? That would be obvious!

REFUTATION

אִי מְשׁוּם הָא לָא אִירְיָא, תְּנָא סִיפָא לְגַלּוּיֵי רִישָׁא, שְׁלָא תֹאמַר: רִישָׁא – דְּאִית בֵּה אֶפְרוֹחַ, אֲבָל לִית בֵּה אֶפְרוֹחַ – שְׂרִיָא, תְּנָא סִיפָא דְאִית בֵּה אֶפְרוֹחַ, מְכַלֵּל דְרִישָׁא דְלִית בֵּה אֶפְרוֹחַ, וְאֶפִּילוּ הֲכִי אֲסִירָא.

The Gemara rejects this proof: If it is because of that argument, it is no proof, for one can say that the Tanna taught the latter clause to reveal the true meaning of the first clause, so that you should not say: The first clause is only where it has a chick in it, but if it does not have a chick in it, it is permitted. Therefore, the Tanna taught the latter clause and specified that it has a chick in it, so that by implication, the first clause must be dealing with an egg that does not have a chick in it, and even so it is forbidden.

STATEMENT

הָהוּא כְּזִיתָא תִּרְבָּא דְנָפַל בְּדִיקוּלָא דְבִשְׂרָא, סָבַר רַב אֲסִי לְשַׁעוּרִיָּה בְּמֵאֵי דְבָלַע דִּיקוּלָא,

The Gemara relates: There was a certain olive-bulk of forbidden fat that fell into a pot of meat. Rav Asi thought to measure the ratio of nullification by including the meat that the pot had absorbed, to help nullify the fat.

OBJECTION

אָמְרֵי לִיה רַבִּנּוּן לְרַב אֲשִׁי: אַטּוּ דְהִיתָרָא בָּלַע, דְּאִיסוּרָא לָא בָּלַע?

The Rabbis said to Rav Ashi regarding this: Is that to say that the pot absorbed the permitted meat, but did not absorb the forbidden fat? Since it absorbed both, you cannot include the absorbed meat to nullify the fat.

STATEMENT

הָהוּא פִּלְגָא דְזִיתָא דְתִרְבָּא דְנָפַל בְּדִיקוּלָא דְבִשְׂרָא, סָבַר מַר בַּר רַב אֲשִׁי לְשַׁעוּרִיָּה בְּתִלְתִּין פִּלְגֵי דְזִיתָא.

There was another incident where a certain half-olive-bulk of forbidden fat fell into a pot of meat. Mar bar Rav Ashi thought to measure the nullification with thirty half-olive-bulks of meat, thinking that since a half-measure is only rabbinically

forbidden, we do not require sixty times its volume.

OBJECTION

אמר ליה אבוה: לאו אמינא לך לא תזלזל בשיעורין דרבנן?

His father, Rav Ashi, said to him: Did I not tell you not to treat measures lightly even with regard to Rabbinic prohibitions?

PROOF

ועוד, האמר רבי יוחנן: חצי שיעור אסור מן התורה.

And furthermore, didn't Rabbi Yochanan say: A half-measure is forbidden from the Torah? Therefore, it requires sixty times its volume to be nullified, just like a full measure.

STATEMENT

אמר רב שמן בר אבא, אמר רב אידי בר גרשום, אמר לוי בר פרטא, אמר רבי נחום, אמר רבי בירימם משום זקן אחד, ורבי יעקב שמיה, דבי נשיאא אמרו: ביצה בששים – אסורה, בששים ואחת – מותרת.

Rav Shemen bar Abba said that Rav Idi bar Idi bar Gershom said that Levi bar Perata said that Rabbi Nachum said that Rabbi Biryam said in the name of a certain elder, and Rabbi Yaakov was his name, who said that the house of the Nasi said: A non-kosher egg mixed in sixty eggs is forbidden, but in sixty-one eggs it is permitted.

OBJECTION

אמר רבי זירא לרב שמן בר אבא: ראה שאתה מטיל בה גבול היתר, שחרי שני גדולי הדור לא פירשו את הדבר.

Rabbi Zeira said to Rav Shemen bar Abba: See that you are fixing a limit of permission in this matter, for the two giants of the generation did not clarify this matter.

STATEMENT

רבי יעקב בר אידי ורבי שמואל בר נחמני, תרוניהו משמיה דרבי יהושע בן לוי אמרי: ביצה בששים – אסורה, בששים ואחת – מותרת.

These two giants were Rabbi Yaakov bar Idi and Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachmani, both of whom said in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi: A non-kosher egg mixed in sixty is forbidden, but in sixty-one it is permitted.

QUESTION

ואיבעיא להו: בששים ואחת, בהדי דידה, או דילמא לבר מינה?

And a dilemma was raised by them: When he said "in sixty-one," does that mean sixty-one eggs together with it, the non-kosher egg, or perhaps sixty-one eggs besides it?

OBJECTION

ולא פשוט, ומר פשיט לה מפשט.

And they did not resolve the dilemma, and yet the Master, Rav Shemen, resolves it as a certainty that it means sixty-one including the forbidden egg!

STATEMENT

אָתָמֶר, אָמַר רַבִּי חֶלְבּוֹ אָמַר רַב הוּנָא: בִּיצָה בְּשִׁשִּׁים זָהִיא – אִסּוּרָה, בְּשִׁשִּׁים זָהִיא – מוּתָרָה.

It was stated that Rabbi Chelbo said that Rav Huna said: A non-kosher egg mixed in sixty kosher eggs and itself making sixty-one is forbidden; but if there are sixty-one kosher eggs and itself making sixty-two, it is permitted.

STATEMENT

הָהוּא דֹאֲתָא לְקַמְיָה דְּרַבִּי גַמְלִיאֵל בֶּר רַבִּי, אָמַר לֵיהּ: אֲבָא לֹא שִׁיעַר בְּאַרְבָּעִים וְשֶׁבַע, וְאֲנִי אֲשַׁעַר בְּאַרְבָּעִים וְחֲמִישׁ.

There was a certain person who came before Rabban Gamliel the son of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi with a mixture of kosher and non-kosher food. Rabban Gamliel said to him: My father did not measure sixty, but permitted a mixture that had only forty-seven times the permitted food, and I will measure and permit even with forty-five times the permitted food.

STATEMENT

הָהוּא דֹאֲתָא לְקַמְיָה דְּרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן בֶּר רַבִּי, אָמַר לֵיהּ: אֲבָא לֹא שִׁיעַר בְּאַרְבָּעִים וְחֲמִישׁ, וְאֲנִי אֲשַׁעַר בְּאַרְבָּעִים וּשְׁלֹשׁ.

There was another certain person who came before Rabbi Shimon the son of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. Rabbi Shimon said to him: My father did not measure sixty, but permitted a mixture that had only forty-five times the permitted food, and I will measure and permit even with forty-three times the permitted food.

STATEMENT

הָהוּא דֹאֲתָא לְקַמְיָה דְּרַבִּי חִיָּיא, אָמַר לֵיהּ: כָּלוּם יֵשׁ שְׁלֹשִׁים?

There was another certain person who came before Rabbi Chiyya with a mixture. Rabbi Chiyya said to him: Is there at least thirty times the permitted food against the forbidden food?

QUESTION

טַעְמָא דְּלִיכָא שְׁלֹשִׁים, הָא אִיכָא שְׁלֹשִׁים – מְשַׁעְרִין?

The Gemara asks: Is the reason he asked this because there is not thirty, but if there is thirty, we measure and permit? Do we not require sixty?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַבִּי חַנִּינָא: גּוּזְמָא.

Rabbi Chanina said: It was an exaggeration. Rabbi Chiyya knew there was sixty, and merely asked if there was even thirty.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבִּי חִיָּיא בֶר אֲבָא, אָמַר רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן לֵוִי מִשּׁוֹם בֶּר קַפָּרָא: כָּל אִיסּוּרִין שְׁבִתּוּרָה בְּשִׁשִּׁים.

Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said in the name of Bar Kappara: All forbidden foods in the Torah are nullified in sixty times their volume.

QUESTION

אמר לפניו רבי שמואל בר רב יצחק: רבי, אתה אומר כן?

Rabbi Shmuel bar Rav Yitzchak said before him: Rabbi, do you say so?

OBJECTION

הכי אמר רב אסי אמר רבי יהושע בן לוי משום בר קפרא: כל איסורין שבתורה במאה!

This is what Rav Asi said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said in the name of Bar Kappara: All forbidden foods in the Torah are nullified only **in one hundred** times their volume!

EXPLANATION

ושניהם לא למדוה אלא מ"זרוע בשלה", דכתיב: "ולקח הכהן את הזרע בשלה וגו'", ותנא:
"בשלה" –

And both of them learned it only from the "cooked shoulder" of the ram of the Nazir, as it is written: "And the Kohen shall take the cooked shoulder, etc." And it is taught in a baraita: "Cooked" means that it is cooked together with the rest of the ram, and the Torah permits the ram to the Nazir despite the absorbed flavor of the holy shoulder.

עמוד ב' DAF 98B

STATEMENT

אין "בשלה" אלא שלימה.

The word "cooked" in the pasuk is **only** coming to teach us that the foreleg must be cooked while it is **whole**, meaning it cannot be cut up into pieces before cooking.

STATEMENT

רבי שמעון בן יוחאי אומר: אין "בשלה" אלא שנתבשלה עם האיל.

Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai says: The word "cooked" is **only** coming to teach us that it must be cooked together with the rest of the **ram** in the same pot.

EXPLANATION

דכולי עלמא בהדי איל מבשל לה,

The Gemara clarifies: According to the first version of their machlokes, **everyone agrees** that **one cooks** the foreleg **together with the ram**.

EXPLANATION

מר סבר: מחתה לה וחדר מבשל לה,

But **one Master**, the Tanna Kamma, **holds** that the kohen **cuts it** off the ram first, **and then cooks it** in the same pot with the rest of the ram. Since it was cut off, we need the word "cooked" to teach us that it must still be cooked whole.

EXPLANATION

ומר סבר: מבשל לה וחדר מחתה לה.

And **one Master**, Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai, **holds** that **one cooks it** while still attached to the ram, **and then cuts it** off after cooking. Therefore, he does not need a word to teach that it must be whole, so he uses "cooked" to teach that it must be cooked

together with the ram.

EXPLANATION

וְאִי בָּעִית אִימָא, דְּכוּלִּי עָלְמָא מַחְתֵּה לֵה וְהָדָר מְבַשֵּׁל לֵה,

And if you want, say an alternative version of their machlokes: Everyone agrees that one cuts it off first, and then cooks it.

EXPLANATION

מִיָּהוּ מֶר סָבֵר: בְּהֵדִי אֵיל מְבַשֵּׁל לֵה,

However, one Master, Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai, holds that one cooks it together with the ram,

EXPLANATION

וּמֶר סָבֵר: בְּקֻדְרָה אַחֶרֶת מְבַשֵּׁל לֵה.

and one Master, the Tanna Kamma, holds that one cooks it in another pot entirely, separate from the rest of the ram.

EXPLANATION

לְלִישָׁנָא קָמָא – אֵלִיבָא דְדַבְרֵי הַכֹּל, לְלִישָׁנָא בְּתָרָא – אֵלִיבָא דְרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן יוֹחָי.

So, according to the first version of the machlokes, the idea that the foreleg is cooked with the ram is according to everyone; according to the latter version, it is only according to Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai.

EXPLANATION

מֵאֵן דְּאָמַר בְּשִׁשִּׁים, סָבֵר: בָּשָׂר וְעֲצָמוֹת בְּהֵדִי בָּשָׂר וְעֲצָמוֹת מְשַׁעְרִינָן, וְהָוָה לִיָּה בְּשִׁשִּׁים.

The Gemara now explains the source for the shiurim of nullification: The one who says that bitul is in sixty, holds that we measure the ratio of the meat and bones of the foreleg together with the meat and bones of the rest of the ram, and it turns out to be a ratio of one in sixty.

EXPLANATION

מֵאֵן דְּאָמַר בְּמֵאָה, סָבֵר: בָּשָׂר בְּהֵדִי בָּשָׂר מְשַׁעְרִינָן, וְהָוָה לִיָּה בְּמֵאָה.

And the one who says that bitul is in one hundred, holds that we measure only the meat of the foreleg together with the meat of the rest of the ram, excluding the bones, and it turns out to be a ratio of one in one hundred.

QUESTION

וּמִי יִלְפִינָן מִיֵּנָה? וְהִתְנַאי: זֶהוּ הֵיטֵר הַבָּא מִכָּלֵל אִיסוּר,

The Gemara asks: And do we really learn the general halachos of bitul from here, from the nazir's ram? But isn't it taught in a braisa regarding the nazir's ram: "This is a case of permitted food that comes from a category of forbidden food"?

INFERENCE

"זֶהוּ" לְמַעוּטֵי מַאי? לָאוּ לְמַעוּטֵי כָּל אִיסוּרִין שְׁבִתוּרָה!

Now, what does this restrictive word "This is" come to exclude? Is it not to exclude all other forbidden foods in the Torah, to teach us that only here is the forbidden flavor nullified, but elsewhere we do not say it is nullified?

ANSWER

אמר אביי: לא נצרכא אלא לרבי יהודה, דאמר מין במינו לא בטיל, קא משמע לן דהכא בטיל.

Abaye said: This exclusion is only necessary according to Rabbi Yehuda, who says that a species in its own species is not nullified. Therefore, the braisa comes to teach us that here, in the case of the nazir's ram, the flavor of the foreleg is nullified even though it is meat in meat.

OBJECTION

וליגמר מיניה?

The Gemara asks: If so, let Rabbi Yehuda learn from here as a general rule that all mixtures of min b'mino should be nullified!

EXPLANATION

גלי רחמנא "ולקח מדם הפך ומדם השעיר", תרוניהו פהדי הדדי ביניהו ולא בטלי.

The Gemara answers: The Merciful One revealed regarding Yom Kippur, "And he shall take from the blood of the bull and from the blood of the goat," which teaches that even though both of them are mixed together, and there is much more bull blood, they are not nullified because the Torah still refers to them as separate entities.

QUESTION

ומאי חזית דגמרינן מהאיה, ליגמר מהאי?

The Gemara asks: And what did you see that makes you decide that we should learn from that pasuk of the blood to say min b'mino is not nullified? Let us learn from this case of the nazir's ram that it is nullified!

ANSWER

חדוש הוא, ומחדוש לא גמרינן.

The Gemara answers: The case of the nazir's ram is a novelty, because normally we are not allowed to nullify a prohibition ab initio, yet here the Torah commands us to cook them together. And we do not learn general halachos from a novelty.

OBJECTION

אי הכי, למאן וששים נמי לא ליגמר?

The Gemara challenges: If so, that we cannot learn from the nazir's ram because it is a novelty, then for the shiurim of one hundred and sixty, we should also not learn from here!

ANSWER

אטו אנו לקולא גמרינן? לחומרא גמרינן, דמדאורייתא פרוכא בטיל.

The Gemara answers: Is it to say that we are learning this as a leniency? We are learning it as a stringency! Because by Torah law, any mixture is nullified by a simple majority, and it is only because we learn from the nazir's ram that we require sixty or one hundred.

ANSWER

רבא אמר: לא נצרכא אלא לטעם כעיקר, דבקדשים אסור, קא משמע לן דהכא שרי.

Rava said a different explanation of the braisa's exclusion: This is only necessary for the rule of taste is like the substance itself, which in the case of kodashim is forbidden, meaning that if kodashim flavor is absorbed into other food it makes it forbidden. Therefore, the braisa comes to teach us that here, in the case of the nazir's ram, the rest of the ram is permitted to non-kohanim despite absorbing the flavor of the foreleg.

SUMMARY

The Gemara first clarifies that a non-kosher egg only forbids a mixture if it contains a chick, which has a strong flavor, and resolves a baraita that seemed to suggest otherwise. We then learn that we cannot include the meat absorbed in the walls of a pot to help nullify forbidden fat, and that even a half-measure of issur requires sixty times its volume to be nullified because a half-measure is still forbidden min haTorah. Finally, the Gemara discusses the exact shiur of bittul for eggs and other forbidden foods, analyzing whether we need sixty or sixty-one, and recounts several ma'asehs where the Nasi's family and other Tannaim permitted mixtures with even fewer ratios, which the Gemara explains were either specific to their unique cases or said as an exaggeration when sixty was actually present.

למנשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

In our sugya, we see the great Rav Ashi correcting his son, Mar bar Rav Ashi, who wanted to be mekil on a half-shiur of forbidden fat, thinking that since it was less than the standard shiur, we could treat the laws of nullification more lightly. Rav Ashi gave him a sharp but loving rebuke: "Did I not tell you not to treat measures lightly even with regard to Rabbinic prohibitions?" He reminded him that a half-measure is still forbidden from the Torah, and we must treat every single detail of halachah with absolute seriousness.

Lichoira, we sometimes fall into the same trap in our daily avodas Hashem. We tell ourselves, "It's just a small thing, it's not a major d'oraisa," or "This is only a chumra, it doesn't really touch the core of the halachah." We try to make calculations and find leniencies in areas where we should be standing strong. But a Yid who lives with yiras Shamayim understands that there are no "small" things when it comes to the ratzon of Hashem. Every single halachah, every rabbinic fence, and every detail of a mitzvah is a precious diamond.

When we treat the small details with respect, we build a fortress around our neshama. The moment we start to "treat measures lightly" and make compromises on the minor things, the yetzer hara finds an opening to make us compromise on the big things. Our strength as Torah Jews is that we treat a half-shiur with the same gravity as a full shiur, because both represent the will of our Creator.

Today, choose one small halachah or custom that you usually treat lightly or rush through, such as saying a berachah slowly word-by-word, or being careful with a minor detail of hilchos Shabbos, and fulfill it with the utmost care and seriousness, showing Hashem that every detail of His Torah is precious to you.