

דף יומי • חלין • דף צ"ט

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

THE SUGYA

We begin the daf with a deep dive into the sugya of the nazir's ram (ayil nazir), where the Torah tells us that the cooked foreleg is mixed and cooked together with the rest of the ram. The Gemara asks a kasha: why don't we learn out from here that flavor (ta'am) is generally nullified in a mixture? The Gemara answers that the case of ayil nazir is a chiddush—a unique novelty of the Torah—and we have a rule that we cannot learn other halachos from a chiddush. This leads the Gemara into a fascinating shakla v'tarya regarding the ratios of nullification (bitul), specifically whether we require sixty times the volume (shishim) or one hundred times (me'ah) to nullify forbidden foods.

Next, the Gemara brings a kasha from a Mishnah in Orlah regarding terumah that fell into chullin. We analyze the different cases of min b'mino (the same type) and min b'she'eino mino (different types), and how the rules of imparting flavor (nosein ta'am) interact with the standard shiurim of bitul. We also discuss unique cases where the forbidden substance is exceptionally potent, such as leaven (se'or) or non-kosher fish brine (tzir), which require much larger ratios to be nullified.

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

עמוד א' DAF 99A

QUESTION

ולגמר מיניה?

The Gemara asks: **And let us learn from it**, from the case of the nazirite's ram, that the flavor of sacrificial food can be nullified in a mixture?

ANSWER

גלי רחמנא גבי חטאת: "כל אשר יגע בבשרה יקדש",

The Gemara explains: **The Merciful One revealed regarding the sin offering**, where the Torah states: "Whatever shall touch its flesh shall be holy",

EXPLANATION

להיות כמוה – שאם פסולה תפסל, ואם פשרה תאכל כחמור שבה.

meaning that the food which absorbs its flavor is **to become like it**—so that if the sin offering is **disqualified**, it shall be **disqualified**, and if the sin offering is **valid**, it shall be **eaten in accordance with the stringencies that apply to it**. This teaches that flavor absorbed from sacrificial food is not nullified.

QUESTION

ומאי חזית דגמרינן מהאיה, לגמר מהאי?

The Gemara asks: **And what did you see** to indicate **that we learn** the general rule **from that** verse of the sin offering? **Let us learn** instead **from this** verse concerning the nazirite's ram, which shows that flavor is nullified!

ANSWER

חדוש הוא, ומחדוש לא גמרינו.

The Gemara answers: The case of the nazirite's ram is **a novelty**, and we **do not learn** general principles **from a novelty**.

OBJECTION

אי הכי, למאה וששים נמי לא ליגמר?

The Gemara objects: **If so**, that the nazirite's ram is a novelty from which we cannot learn, then **for** the ratios of **one hundred and sixty** times the volume **also**, **let us not learn** from it that forbidden food is nullified in these amounts?

RESOLUTION

אטו אנו לקולא קא גמרינו? לחומרא קא גמרינו, דמדאורייתא פרוכא בטיל.

The Gemara responds: **Is it to say that we learn this as a leniency?** We learn it only as a **stringency**, as by Torah law, any forbidden food mixed with permitted food **is nullified in a simple majority**, and the requirement of sixty or one hundred is a stringency.

EXPLANATION

רבינא אמר: לא נצרכה אלא למקום חתה, דאמר: מקום חתה בעלמא אסור, והכא שרי.

Ravina said an alternative explanation of the word "this" in the baraita: It is **necessary only for the place of the cut** where the foreleg is severed from the ram, **as he said: Generally, the place of a cut** on permitted food that was attached to forbidden food **is forbidden** because it absorbs flavor, **but here**, in the case of the nazirite's ram, the Torah **permitted** it.

STATEMENT

תניב רב דימי, וקאמר לה להא שמעתא.

The Gemara returns to the statement of Rabbi Shmuel bar Rav Yitzchak that forbidden food is nullified only in one hundred times its volume: **Rav Dimi sat and said this halakha.**

QUESTION

אמר ליה אביי: וכל איסורין שבתורה במאה?

Abaye said to him: And are all forbidden foods in the Torah nullified only in **one hundred** times their volume?

OBJECTION

והתנו: למה אמרו כל המחמץ ומתבבל ומדמע להחמיר – מין ומינו, להקל ולהחמיר – מין ושאינו מינו.

But didn't we learn in a Mishnah: **Why did they say** that anyone who **leavens** non-sacred food with teruma, **or flavors** it with spices of teruma, **or mixes** teruma into non-sacred food, the halakha is **to be stringent** if it is a mixture of **the same type**? But the halakha is **to be lenient and to be stringent** if it is a mixture of **a different type**.

INFERENCE

וקתני סיפא להקל ולהחמיר מין ושאינו מינו, כיצד?

And it is taught in the latter clause of that Mishnah: To be lenient and to be stringent in a mixture of a different type, how so?

BRAISA

גְּרִיסִין שֶׁנִּתְבַּשְׁלוּ עִם הָעֲדָשִׁים, אִם יֵשׁ בָּהֶם בְּנוּתֵן טַעַם, בֵּין יֵשׁ בָּהֶן לְהַעֲלוֹת בְּמֵאָה וְאַחַד, בֵּין אֵין בָּהֶן לְהַעֲלוֹת בְּמֵאָה וְאַחַד – אָסוּר.

For example, split beans of teruma that were cooked with lentils of non-sacred food: If there is enough in them to impart flavor, whether there is enough in them to neutralize the split beans in one hundred and one parts of lentils, or whether there is not enough in them to neutralize the split beans in one hundred and one parts, the mixture is forbidden.

BRAISA

אֵין בָּהֶן בְּנוּתֵן טַעַם, בֵּין שְׁיֵשׁ בָּהֶן לְהַעֲלוֹת בְּמֵאָה וְאַחַד, בֵּין אֵין בָּהֶן לְהַעֲלוֹת בְּמֵאָה וְאַחַד – מוּתָר.

But if there is not enough in them to impart flavor, whether there is enough in them to neutralize the split beans in one hundred and one parts, or whether there is not enough in them to neutralize the split beans in one hundred and one parts, the mixture is permitted.

QUESTION

אֵין בָּהֶן לְהַעֲלוֹת בְּמֵאָה וְאַחַד, אֶלֶּא בְּמֵאֵי? לָאוּ בְּשִׁשִּׁים?

Abaye asks: If there is not enough in them to neutralize the split beans in one hundred and one parts, but it is still permitted, in what ratio is it nullified? Is it not in sixty times its volume? This contradicts the view that all forbidden foods require one hundred!

עמוד ב' DAF 99B

ANSWER

לֹא, בְּמֵאָה.

Rav Dimi answered: No, the latter clause is referring to a case where there is one hundred times its volume of non-sacred food, and the teruma is nullified.

OBJECTION

וְהָא מְדַרְיָשָׁא בְּמֵאָה הוּא, סִיפָא בְּשִׁשִּׁים!

Abaye objected: But since the first clause must be referring to a case where there is one hundred times its volume, the latter clause must be referring to sixty times its volume!

PROOF

דִּקְתָּנִי רִישָׁא: לְהַחְמִיר מִין וּמִינוּ כִּיצַד? שְׁאוּר שֶׁל חֲטִין שֶׁנִּפְּלָ לְעִיסַת חֲטִין, וְיֵשׁ בּוֹ כְּדֵי לְחַמֵּץ, בֵּין יֵשׁ בּוֹ כְּדֵי לְהַעֲלוֹת בְּמֵאָה וְאַחַד, בֵּין אֵין בּוֹ כְּדֵי לְהַעֲלוֹת בְּמֵאָה וְאַחַד – אָסוּר.

As the first clause teaches in the Mishnah in Orlah: To be stringent in a case of a type mixed with its own type, how so? Leaven of teruma wheat that fell into dough of non-sacred wheat, and there is enough in it to cause leavening, whether there is enough in it to neutralize the teruma in one hundred and one, or whether there is not enough in it to neutralize the teruma in one hundred and one, it is forbidden to a non-kohen.

PROOF

אין בו להעלות במאה ואחד, בין שיש בו כדי לחמץ, בין אין בו כדי לחמץ – אסור.

The latter clause of that Mishnah teaches: If **there is not enough** in it to **neutralize** the **teruma** in **one hundred and one**, **whether there is enough** in it to cause leavening, or **whether there is not enough** in it to cause leavening, it is **forbidden**.

QUESTION

רישא וסיפא במאה?

Now, would you suggest that both **the first clause** and **the latter clause** are dealing with **one hundred** times its volume?

ANSWER

לא, רישא במאה וחד, וסיפא במאה.

Rav Dimi answered: **No**, **the first clause** is dealing with **one hundred and one** times its volume, and **the latter clause** is dealing with **one hundred** times its volume.

QUESTION

וכי יש בו כדי לחמץ במאה וחד, אמאי לא בטיל?

Abaye asked: **But if there is enough** in it to cause leavening when mixed in **one hundred and one** times its volume, **why is it not nullified?** Surely leaven cannot have an effect in such a large quantity!

STATEMENT

אישתיק.

Rav Dimi **was silent** and had no answer.

EXPLANATION

אמר ליה: דלמא שאני שאור דחימוצו קשה.

Abaye **said to him**: Perhaps leaven is different, because its leavening property is **potent**, and some leaven can indeed affect a mixture of one hundred and one times its volume.

STATEMENT

אמר ליה: אדפרתן מילתא דאמר רבי יוסי ברבי חנינא: לא כל השיעורין שוין, שהרי ציר שיעורו קרוב למאתים.

Rav Dimi **said to him**: You have reminded me of a matter that Rabbi Yosei son of Rabbi Chanina said: Not all measures are equal, for behold, non-kosher fish brine, its measure for nullification is close to two hundred times its volume.

PROOF

דתנן: דג טמא צירו אסור, רבי יהודה אומר: רביעית בסאתים.

As we learned in a Mishnah: With regard to a non-kosher fish, its brine is forbidden; Rabbi Yehuda says: A quarter-log of non-kosher brine renders kosher food forbidden even if it is mixed in **two se'ah** of permitted food, which is one hundred and ninety-two times the volume of a quarter-log.

QUESTION

וְהָאָמַר רַבִּי יְהוּדָה: מִיֵּן בְּמִינוֹ לֹא בְטִיל?

The Gemara asks: **But doesn't Rabbi Yehuda say that a type mixed with its own type is not nullified** at all? Why then is the brine nullified in two se'ah?

ANSWER

שְׂאֵנִי צִיר, דְּזִיעָה בְּעָלְמָא הוּא.

The Gemara answers: **Brine is different, because it is merely sweat**, meaning it is not the actual body of the fish, so the rule of min b'mino does not apply to it.

EXPLANATION

כִּיצַד מְשַׁעְרִינוּ? אָמַר רַב הוּנָא: כְּכֶשֶׁר בְּרֹאשֵׁי לְפָתוֹת.

The Gemara returns to the Mishnah's rule of measuring the sciatic nerve as if it were meat cooked with a turnip: **How do we measure** this? **Rav Huna said: Like meat** cooked in a pot **with turnip heads**, which absorb flavor very easily.

STATEMENT

מִתְנִיתִין דְּלֹא כִּהְיָ תַנָּא, דְּתַנְיָא: רַבִּי יִשְׁמַעְאֵל בְּנוֹ שֶׁל רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן בֶּן בְּרוּקָה אוֹמֵר: אֵין בְּגִידִין בְּנוֹתֵן טַעַם.

The Gemara notes: **Our Mishnah is not in accordance with this Tanna**, as it is taught in a Braisa: **Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yochanan ben Beroka says: Sinews do not impart flavor** at all, and therefore the sciatic nerve can never forbid the meat cooked with it.

STATEMENT

הָהוּא דֹּאֲתָא לְקַמִּיָּה דְּרַבִּי חַנִּינָא, הָהּ יָתִיב רַבִּי יְהוּדָה בַּר זְבִינָא אֲבָבָא.

The Gemara relates: There was a **certain man who came before Rabbi Chanina** to ask about a thigh cooked with its sciatic nerve, and **Rabbi Yehuda bar Zevina was sitting at the gate**.

STATEMENT

כִּי נִפְק, אָמַר לֵיהּ: מַאי אָמַר לָךְ?

When the man went out, Rabbi Yehuda bar Zevina **said to him: What did Rabbi Chanina say to you?**

STATEMENT

אָמַר לֵיהּ: שְׂרִיא נִיָּה לֵיהּ.

The man **said to him: He permitted it to me**.

STATEMENT

אָמַר לֵיהּ הָדָר עֵיילִיָּה לְקַמִּיָּה,

Rabbi Yehuda bar Zevina **said to him: Bring it back before him**, as perhaps he did not realize the sciatic nerve was cooked inside.

STATEMENT

אמר: מאן האי דקא מצער לי? זיל אימא ליה למאן דיתיב אפכא: אין בגידין פנוטן טעם.

When the man returned, Rabbi Chanina said: Who is this who is bothering me? Go and say to the one who is sitting at the gate: Sinews do not impart flavor, and therefore the thigh is permitted once the nerve is removed.

STATEMENT

כי אתו לקמיה דרבי אמי, משדר להו לקמיה דרבי יצחק בן חלוב, דמורי בה להיתירא משום דרבי יהושע בן לוי, וליה לא סבירא ליה.

When people would come before Rabbi Ami with this question, he would send them before Rabbi Yitzchak ben Chalub, who would rule leniently about it to permit the thigh, in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi; but he himself, Rabbi Ami, did not agree with this ruling, though he did not want to rule stringently for others.

RULING

והלכתא: אין בגידין פנוטן טעם.

And the halacha is: Sinews do not impart flavor at all.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

גיד הנשה שנתבשל.

We learned in the Mishnah: With regard to a sciatic nerve that was cooked with other kosher sinews, if one cannot identify it, they are all forbidden.

גמרא GEMARA

QUESTION

וליתבטול ברובא!

The Gemara asks: But let it be nullified by a simple majority of kosher sinews, since we hold that sinews do not impart flavor!

SUMMARY

In this daf, the Gemara establishes that the cooking of the nazir's ram is a chiddush, meaning we cannot use it as a source to learn that ta'am is generally nullified, nor do we learn from it that bitul b'shishim is a leniency; rather, the requirement of sixty is a Rabbinic stringency over the Torah's basic rule of bitul b'rov (nullification by a simple majority). The Gemara then debates the shiur of bitul for various issurim, contrasting the standard sixty with the one hundred required for terumah. Through a series of kushyas raised by Abaye to Rav Dimi, we clarify that while standard mixtures are nullified in sixty, certain potent substances are different: leaven has a powerful leavening effect even in tiny amounts, and Rabbi Yehuda holds that non-kosher fish brine is so strong that it requires nearly two hundred times its volume to be nullified, since brine is considered mere sweat rather than the actual body of the fish.

The Gemara is bothered by a kasha: how can leaven of teruma still have the power to affect a dough even when it is outnumbered one hundred and one to one? The teretz is that "chimutzo kasheh", the leavening power of this yeast is uniquely sharp and potent. It does not just blend in; it actively transforms everything around it. Rabbi Yose b'rabbi Chanina comes to teach us a fundamental rule from this: "lo kol hashiurin shavin", not all measurements are the same. You cannot judge the impact of one substance by the standard of another. Some things are so powerful that even a tiny drop completely redefines the entire mixture.

This is a massive yesod in our own avodas Hashem. Lichoira, we often look at our daily schedule and feel overwhelmed by the sheer volume of the "permitted" world we have to deal with. We spend hours at work, tending to physical needs, or dealing with mundane chores. We might think, "What value does my short seder or my few minutes of heartfelt tefillah have? It is completely batel in the majority of my busy day!"

But the Torah is telling us: lo kol hashiurin shavin. A Yid's ruchniyus is like that sharp leaven, its potency is not measured by volume. A single page of Gemara learned with warmth, or one brachah said with real kavanah, has a "chimutzo kasheh" effect. It is so powerful that it does not get nullified in the busy day; rather, it rises up and elevates every single hour that follows, giving the entire day a completely different shape and flavor.

Today, do not measure your spiritual accomplishments merely by the clock. When you sit down to learn or stand up to daven, put your entire heart into it for just five minutes, knowing that this small, potent spark of ruchniyus has the power to elevate and transform your entire day.