



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Chullin Daf Tzaddik Ches

- The Gemara had quoted the ruling of **R' Nachman** that an egg becomes batul in 60, but the assur egg itself is not counted in the count of 60.
 - **Q: R' Idi bar Avin** asked **Abaye**, that we find that eggs do not impart flavor into the things with which they are cooked!? **A: Abaye** said, we are discussing an egg with a chick inside, which does impart flavor. However, a regular egg of a non-kosher bird would not give off flavor.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if kosher eggs were cooked together with non-kosher eggs, if the non-kosher eggs impart a flavor into the kosher eggs, they are all assur. We see that even regular eggs do impart flavor!? **A:** This Braisa is also talking about an egg with a chick inside. Since it has a chick inside the Braisa refers to it as a non-kosher egg.
 - **Q:** The Braisa continues and says, if eggs were cooked and an unhatched chick was found in one of them, if that egg with the chick imparts a flavor the other eggs, they are all assur. Now, since this part of the Braisa clearly discusses an egg with a chick, it must be that the earlier part of the Braisa is discussing an egg without a chick!? **A:** This second part of the Braisa is explaining the first part of the Braisa and says that when the Braisa says "non-kosher egg" it is referring to an egg with a chick inside.
 - This must be the way to understand the Braisa. If you will say that the first part of the Braisa is discussing where there is no chick, now in the case where there is no chick the Braisa says that the eggs become assur, then surely in a case where it had a chick they would become assur and so there would be no reason to even state the second case of the Braisa!
 - The Gemara says, this is not a valid proof. It may be that the second case is mentioned to make it clear that it is the *second* case that is discussing an egg with a chick, and the first case is not.
- There was a kezayis of cheilev that fell into a pot of meat. **R' Ashi** was measuring to see if there was 60 times the issur and wanted to include into the calculation of 60, all the food that was absorbed into the walls of the pot. The **Rabanan** said to him, do you think that the walls only absorb mutar things and not assur things!?
 - There was a half kezayis cheilev that fell into a pot of meat. **Mar bar R' Ashi** wanted to make it batul by measuring that there was 30 half kezaysim of heter. His father told him – I told you that you may not treat the measurements lightly even when dealing with D'Rabanan issurim! Also, **R' Yochanan** has said that "chatzi shiur" (half shiurim, like the half kezayis) is actually assur D'Oraisa!
- **R' Shemen bar Abba in the name of R' Idi bar Idi bar Gershom in the name of Levi bar Prata in the name of R' Nachum in the name of R' Biryam** in the name of a certain Elder, who was **R' Yaakov**, said, in the house of the Nasi they said, if an assur egg was cooked with 60 of heter, they are assur. If it was cooked with 61, they are mutar. **R' Zeira** said to **R' Shemen bar Abba**, you are stating something that is a matter of question between the great **R' Yaakov bar Idi** and **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini** who both said in the name of **R' Yehoshua ben Levi**, that an assur egg that was cooked with 60 eggs, the eggs are assur. If it was cooked with 61 eggs, the eggs are mutar. They asked, is the assur egg allowed to be counted as one of the 61 or does there need

to be 61 besides the assur egg? Now, you (**R' Shemen bar Abba**) seem to clearly state that the 61 can even include the assur egg.

- The Gemara says, **R' Chelbo in the name of R' Huna** said, an assur egg that was cooked in 60 eggs plus itself, is assur. If it was cooked in 61 eggs plus itself, it is mutar.
- A person came with a mixture of issur and heter where there was 45 times as much heter as there was issur. **R' Gamliel** told him, my father would not say it was mutar even if there 47 times as much heter, so I certainly cannot be matir this mixture.
 - A person came with a mixture of issur and heter where there was 43 times as much heter as there was issur. **R' Shimon bar Rebbi** told him, my father would not say it was mutar even if there was 45 times as much heter, so I certainly cannot be matir this mixture.
 - A person came with a mixture to **R' Chiya**. **R' Chiya** told him, you do not have 30 times as much heter as there is issur, so I can't say it is mutar.
 - **Q:** This seems to say that if there was 30 times as much he would have been matir it!? **A:** **R' Chanina** said, **R' Chiya's** response should not be taken literally. He meant to say – you don't even have 30 times as much, and you are asking whether we can be matir it!?
- **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yehoshua ben Levi in the name of Bar Kappara** said, all assur things in the Torah become batul in 60. **R' Shmuel bar R' Yitzchak** said to him, rebbi do you really say that? We find that **R' Assi in the name of R' Yehoshua ben Levi in the name of Bar Kappara** said, all assur things in the Torah become batul in 100!?
 - They both base their views from the cooked leg of the nazir's korban shelamim, where the part that is only mutar to the Kohen is cooked along with the rest of the ram. The view that says things become batul in 60 holds that we measure the meat and bones of the leg given to the Kohen against the meat and bones of the rest of the ram, and that is a ratio of 1:60. The other view holds that we measure the meat of the part given to the Kohen against the meat of the rest of the ram, and that is a ratio of 1:100.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that the allowance for a non-Kohen to eat the nazir's ram even though it was cooked together with the leg that is only permitted to a Kohen is a unique allowance. Presumably, this means that we cannot learn from there to other cases of issurim in the Torah!? **A:** **Abaye** said, the Braisa means it is unique according to **R' Yehuda**, who holds that items of like-kind that became mixed do not become batel. The Braisa says, in the case of the nazir's ram it does become batul.
 - **Q:** Why don't we learn from the nazir's ram to other cases of like-kind mixtures to teach that they are batul? **A:** We learn from the pasuk of "v'lakach midam hapar umidam hasa'ir" that a like-kind mixture does not become batul (even though the two bloods are mixed together, the pasuk refers to them as two different bloods).
 - **Q:** Why do we choose to learn from the pasuk of the bloods instead of learning from the case of the nazir's ram? **A:** The case of the nazir's ram is a chiddush, because it is a case in which we l'chatchila mix things and make it batul, which is something we are typically not allowed to do. Therefore, we cannot learn from it.
 - **Q:** If so, we should not even learn out the 1:60 or the 1:100 ratio from it!? **A:** Learning this ratio is a chumra, because D'Oraisa things become batul in simple majority. To learn a chumra we can even do from a chiddush.