

Chullin – Simanim

פרק ז – גיד הנשה

דף צט – 99 Daf

1. טעם of *terumah* depend on טעם, not ratios of a hundred and one

A Mishnah states: למה אמרו כל המחמץ ומדמע להחמיר – *when did they say regarding whoever leavens [chullin dough with *terumah*], or spices [chullin with *terumah*], or blends [chullin with *terumah* by cooking them together] that we are always stringent* (as will be illustrated in the next point)? That is regarding מינו במינו – a mixture of a kind with its own kind, but regarding מינו בשאינו מינו – a kind with a different kind, the ruling is להקל ולהחמיר – sometimes lenient and sometimes stringent. This second ruling is illustrated: גריסין שנתבשלו עם העדשים – *if split beans [of *terumah*] were cooked together with lentils*, אם יש בהם בנותן טעם, *if [the beans] give flavor to [the *chullin*]*, it is forbidden (to non-Kohanim), even if there is enough *chullin* ואחד – *to nullify [the beans] in a hundred and one* or not. If they do not give flavor to the *chullin*, it is permitted, even if there is not enough *chullin* to nullify the *terumah* in a hundred to one. Based on the *machlokes* on the previous Daf (about the ratio for nullifying normal prohibitions), this Mishnah is teaching that *terumah* which does not flavor *chullin* (of a different מינו) is likewise בטל in either sixty or a hundred, and does not require a hundred and one.

2. ביטול שאני שאור דחימוצו קשה, and can require a hundred and one for

A Mishnah explains the above ruling that a *terumah* mixture of מינו במינו is always ruled stringently: if leaven of (*terumah*) wheat fell into dough of (*chullin*) wheat, ויש בו כדי לחמץ – *and there is enough leaven in it to leaven the dough* (i.e., its taste is discernible), then even if there is enough *chullin* to nullify the *terumah* in a hundred and one, it is still prohibited (to non-Kohanim). On the other hand, if there is not enough *chullin* to nullify the *terumah* in a hundred and one, then it is prohibited even if there is not enough *terumah* to leaven the *chullin*. Rav Dimi explains this requires a hundred and one parts *chullin* to one part *terumah*. Abaye asked that if so, how can the first ruling prohibit the dough where the שאור “leavens” (i.e., flavors) it? Can leaven possibly impart flavor into a hundred and one permitted parts? Rav Dimi was silent, until Abaye suggested: דלמא שאני שאור דחימוצו קשה – *perhaps leaven is different from ordinary ingredients, because its sourness is strong*, and can even impart flavor at this ratio. This reminded Rav Dimi of something he heard from Rebbe Yose bar Rebbe Chanina: לא כל השיעורין שווין – *not all measures for flavor are equal*, because the nullification *shiur* for nonkosher ציר – fish brine is nearly two hundred.

3. Opinion that אין בגידין בנותן טעם

The Mishnah on Daf 96b taught that food cooked with גיד הנשה is prohibited because of the flavor transferred from the גיד הנשה. The Mishnah does not agree with Rebbe Yishmael the son of Rebbe Yochanan ben Berokah, who says: אין בגידין בנותן טעם – *sinews do not convey any flavor* (because they have none). Someone came to Rebbe Chanina to rule on food cooked with a גיד הנשה, and Rebbe Yehudah bar Zevina, who was sitting by the entrance, asked the person what Rebbe Chanina had ruled. He told him that Rebbe Chanina had permitted it, and Rebbe Yehudah bar Zavin told him to ask Rebbe Chanina again. Rebbe Chanina said: מאן האי דקא מצער לי – *“Who is it that is bothering me?”* Go tell the one sitting at the entrance that אין בגידין בנותן טעם. The Gemara concludes that the *halachah* is that אין בגידין בנותן טעם.

Siman – Cheetah

The non Kohen showed the astounded Kohen how the **cheetahs** would not touch the cooked lentils if the *terumah* beans gave flavor in them even if there was enough *chullin* to nullify them in a hundred and one parts *chullin* dough, and how he wouldn't go near the dough that was leavened by less than one part *terumah* to a hundred and one *chullin* by מינו במינו because the sourness is so strong, while some **cheetahs** that chased down a calf for dinner left over the גיד הנשה because it has no taste.

דף צט | DAF 99

Cheetah



The non Kohen showed the astounded Kohen how the **cheetahs** would not touch the cooked lentils if the **terumah** beans gave flavor in them even if there was enough chullin to nullify them in a hundred and one parts chullin dough, and how he wouldn't go near the dough that was leavened by less than one part terumah to a hundred and one chullin by **מין במינו** because the sourness is so strong, while some **cheetahs** that chased down a calf for dinner left over the **גיד הנשה** because it has no taste.

3 things to remember

1. **of terumah** מין בשאינו מינו depend on טעם, not ratios of a hundred and one
2. **שאינו דחימוצו קשה**, and can require a hundred and one for ביטול
3. Opinion that **טעם** בנותן אין בגידין

