

29 Adar I 5779
March 6, 2019



Chullin Daf 99

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

Nullification

The *Gemora* asks: Why then does he not derive the rule (*that consecrated matters are nullified in sixty or a hundred*) from this (*the nazir’s ram*)?

The *Gemora* answers: It is because the Torah has expressly stated with regard to the *chatas* offering: *Whatever shall touch its meat shall be holy*. It should become like the *chatas* which touched it, so that if it the *chatas* is disqualified, that which touches it becomes disqualified; while if it is qualified, it may be eaten only in accordance with its stringencies.

The *Gemora* asks: But why do you prefer to derive it from this verse rather than from the other (*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 from a novelty.

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*).

Ravina said: The exclusion was necessary with respect to the place of the cut (*where the ram and the foreleg are attached*); for generally, it is said that the place of the cut (*where the forbidden substance touches the permitted one*) is forbidden, but here it is permitted.

Rav Dimi was sitting and reported this statement (*of Rabbi Shmuel the son of Rabbi Yitzchak who said in the name of Rav Assi who stated in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi who said in the name of Bar Kappara that all forbidden substances of the Torah are nullified in one hundred*) when Abaye said to him: Are then all forbidden substances of the Torah nullified only in a hundred? Surely we have learned in a *Mishna*: With regard to what did they say that every substance of *terumah* which leavens dough of *chullin*, or spices it, or it is mixed with it, must be treated with stringency? It is with regard to like substances (*and the mixture is forbidden if there is a taste of the terumah, or if there is not one hundred and one times chullin more than the terumah*). And with regard to what did they say that it must be treated with leniency as well as with stringency? It is with regard to a mixture of two different kinds (*which the Mishna will explain that the mixture is forbidden if there is a taste of the terumah, but if there is no taste of terumah in the mixture, it is permitted – even if there is not one hundred and one times chullin more than the terumah*). And in the next

part of the *Mishna* it states: And the mixture is sometimes treated with leniency and sometimes with stringency – if it is a mixture of two different kinds; therefore, if split beans (*of terumah*) were cooked with lentils (*of chullin*) and they impart a taste (*to the lentils*), the entire mixture is forbidden, whether there was enough in the mixture to nullify it in a hundred and one, or whether there was not enough in the mixture to nullify it in a hundred and one. If, however, they do not impart a taste (*to the lentils*) they are permitted, whether there was enough in the mixture to nullify it in a hundred and one, or whether there was not enough in the mixture to nullify it in a hundred and one.

Now, in this last case, where there was not enough in the mixture to nullify it in a hundred and one, is it not to be assumed that there was sixty (*for we derive from the case of the cooked foreleg that a forbidden substance is nullified in either sixty or one hundred*), and that is what nullified it? [*This proves that when no taste is discerned in a mixture, it is permitted if it was nullified in sixty.*]

The *Gemora* rejects this proof: No! It could be nullified in a hundred.

The *Gemora* asks: But surely since the first clause deals with nullification in a hundred, the latter deals with nullification in sixty! For the first clause reads as follows: With regard to a mixture of substances of the same kind, there is always a stringency. What is the case? If leaven (*of terumah wheat*) fell into a dough of (*chullin*) wheat, and there was sufficient of it to leaven the dough, it is forbidden, whether there was enough in the mixture to nullify it in a hundred and one, or whether there was not enough in the mixture to nullify it in a hundred and one. Also, if there was not enough of the

dough to nullify the leaven in a hundred and one, it is forbidden, whether there was enough leaven in it to leaven the dough or whether there was not enough in it to leaven the dough. Can it then be said that both the first and second clauses are alike in that nullification takes place only in a hundred? [*Is not the point of the Mishna that we rule leniently with regard to a mixture of different kinds, and thus require a nullification of sixty, but not sa hundred!*]

Rav Dimi answers: No! The first clause deals with nullification in a hundred and one, whereas the second clause deals with nullification in a hundred.

The *Gemora* asks: Why is it then, where there were (*in the chullin*) a hundred and one times (*the quantity of the forbidden leaven*), even though it can still leaven the dough, that it is not nullified? [*There cannot be taste from the forbidden substance if there is one hundred and one times of chullin against it!?*] Rav Dimi remained silent.

Abaye said to him: Perhaps it is different with leaven for its sourness is very sharp?

Rav Dimi said to him: You have now reminded me of that statement of Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Chanina, who said: Not all standards (*for imparting a taste*) are alike, for in the case of brine (*from non-kosher fish*), the standard of nullification is almost two hundred. For we have learned in a *Mishna*: The brine of non-kosher fish is forbidden. Rabbi Yehudah says: It is forbidden if there was even a quarter-log (*of non-kosher brine*) mixed in two *se'ahs* (*of kosher brine*). [*This is a proportion of one in one hundred and ninety-two, for one se'ah is six kavin, and one kav is four logs. If, however, the proportion of*

the substances was less than this (e.g., if the forbidden substance was one in two hundred), the mixture would be permitted, even though the substances are of the same kind.]

The *Gemora* asks: But has not Rabbi Yehudah said that identical substances cannot be nullified?

The *Gemora* answers: It is different with brine, for it is only the sweat of the fish. (99a – 99b)

Gid Hanasheh Mixtures

The *Gemora* discusses the dispute regarding if the sciatic nerve possesses any taste or not (*and therefore, if it is cooked with other foods and then removed, it would not render the remainder forbidden*). Our *Mishna* holds that it does, but the *Gemora* rules that it does not.

The *Mishna* had ruled that when the *gid hanasheh* was cooked with other sinews, and it is not recognizable, they are all prohibited, even if its taste has been nullified. This is because each sinew might be the *gid hanasheh*.

The *Gemora* explains that it cannot be nullified in a mere majority, for it is an entire creation (*and such things cannot be nullified*). (99b – 100a)

INSIGHTS ON THE DAF

The taste of gid hanasheh

“The halachah is that sinews have no taste.” This conclusion ends a long discussion in the *Gemora* as to if the *gid hanasheh* has a taste (see *Meoros HaDaf HaYomi*, Kidushin 66b, in the article “A difference of

opinions about reality”). In other words, the *gid hanasheh* does not forbid other foods with which it is cooked because it lacks a taste. Thus there is no forbidden taste mixed in the food.

The first point deserving the attention of learners is that we have learnt (Pesachim 24b) that a person is not punished with lashes for eating something not usually eaten, such as someone who eats forbidden fat (*cheilev*) raw is exempt from lashes. Therefore, as the *gid hanasheh* lacks a taste, it is unusual to eat it so why is someone who eats it punished with lashes? (See Rambam, *Hilchos Maachalos Asuros* 8:2). Indeed, the prohibition on the *gid hanasheh* is a special innovation of the Torah and is an exception, as the *Gemora* says: **“It’s like wood but the Torah forbade it.”** (See *Pri Megadim*, *Pesichah Koleles Lehilchos Pesach*, II, Ch. 2:2, that if one ate unnaturally, he is exempt).

We proceed to a halachah which Rambam stated and which occupied many Acharonim. Rambam ruled (*Hilchos Maachalos Asuros* 8:6) that someone who eats the *gid hanasheh* of a *neveilah* (non-slaughtered dead animal) is punished with two sets of lashes because he transgressed two prohibitions at once: *gid hanasheh* and *neveilah*. The question is why does he also transgress the prohibition of *neveilah*. It is obvious that if the *gid hanasheh* were not forbidden, he wouldn’t be punished at all, also not for eating *neveilah*, because it is unnatural to eat the *gid hanasheh*. We must therefore understand how does the prohibition of *gid hanasheh* draw upon it the prohibition of *neveilah*.

Many Acharonim (see *Or Sameiach*, *ibid*, and *Kreisit Ufeleisi*, 65, S.K. 2) solve the question by saying that as the Torah regards its consumption such that it punishes

him for eating the *gid hanasheh*, then this consumption is considered eating despite its strangeness and, as such, he transgresses the prohibition of *neveilah* too.

The author of *Minchas Chinuch* solves the question in the following manner (mitzvah 281, os 7). If a person eats a forbidden food that is not usually eaten, we don't claim that by his very eating he showed, on his part, that he performs eating in every sense, as we don't assume that he is a *rasha'* (willful sinner) as long as we don't have proof. Therefore, when we see someone eating forbidden fat raw, we assume that he gives no importance to raw fat as food, because if he gave it importance, he would surely not eat it to transgress the prohibition. On the contrary, he only eats it because it is not proper food to him. This *pilpul* does not apply to someone who eats a *gid hanasheh* as we see that he eats the *gid hanasheh*, forbidden by the Torah in any instance, even if he gives no importance to its consumption. As such, his very eating gives the food importance and regards it as edible and thus lays the foundation for the prohibition of *neveilah* (see *ibid*, that he bases his statement on Rambam, *Hilchos Shevu'os* 5:5, according to the *Lechem Mishneh*). *Minchas Chinuch* concludes that he said this *chidush* in his youth in the presence of *gedolim*, who praised him (see *ibid* in the remarks on *Minchas Chinuch*, concerning the Acharonim's disagreement with his statement).

DAILY MASHAL

A Correction to the Notice

In the summer of 5643 (1883) the Chafetz Chayim zt"l printed the first part of his famous *Mishnah Berurah*. He disregarded his honor and went around in the towns to

sell it and, as was his wont, he delivered *derashos* everywhere. In one town he saw a notice on the synagogue door that the author of *Chafetz Chayim* and *Mishnah Berurah* on *Orach Chayim* would deliver a *derashah*. He immediately took out a pencil and added: "As of now only one part of *Mishnah Berurah* has appeared, till *siman* 128, and the other parts will appear, G-d willing, later" (*HeChafetz Chayim Ufo'olo*, I, 214).

An "Egg" (*Beitzah*) Every Day

It is related about Rabbi Akiva Eiger's son-in-law, Rabbi Shmuel Birnbaum zt"l, author of *Ma'aseh Choshev* on *Sha'ar HaMelech*, that he would only eat at a mitzvah-meal. Therefore he learnt and finished tractate *Beitzah* every day to eat at a *siyum*. But when he was preoccupied with communal matters and couldn't learn all day, he only ate very late! (Preface to *Ma'aseh Choshev*).

Rambam Never Passed Away

When 850 years passed since Rambam's demise, people approached Torah leaders and requested articles and *chidushim* in his memory. One of them replied, "This is the first time that I hear that Rambam is not alive..." (*Meharerei Kedem*, II).