



# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## Maseches Nedarim, Daf נד – Daf נב

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H  
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf נד---46-----

### PEREK HASHUTFIN -- PEREK CHAMISHI

#### MISHNA

- Partners who each made a neder not to benefit from the other may not walk into their jointly owned chatzer. **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** says that they may, because each partner is walking into the chatzer based on his own ownership rights, without those of his partner.
  - Both partners are not allowed to put a mill, an oven, or raise chickens, in the courtyard.
- If only one partner was assur to benefit from the other partner based on a neder (e.g. Shimon was assur to benefit from Reuven), Shimon may not enter the jointly owned chatzer. **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** says, Shimon can tell Reuven, I am going into my share of the chatzer and not yours (just as in the previous case when they were both assur).
  - We require Shimon to sell his share in the courtyard (we are concerned that when he sees Reuven using the chatzer for all purposes and he himself is very restricted, this causes jealousy and may cause him to violate the neder and use the field).
- If an outsider (one who is not a partner – e.g. Levi) is assur to benefit from one of the partners based on a neder, he may not enter the chatzer jointly owned by the partners. **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** says he may enter the chatzer by saying that he is entering under the rights of the partner that he is not assur to benefit from.
- If Shimon is assur to benefit from Reuven, and Reuven owns the bathhouse or olive press in the city, but he leases it out to Levi, the Halacha is, if Reuven retains a holding in the property (a “tefisas yad”), Shimon may not use it. If he does not, Shimon may use it.
- If Shimon makes a neder to Reuven making it assur for Shimon to enter Reuven's house, or making it assur for him to buy Reuven's field, and Reuven then dies or sells the property, Shimon may then enter the house or buy the field. If Shimon's neder made it assur for him to enter “this house” or to buy “this field”, then even if Reuven dies or sells the property, Shimon is still assur to enter the house or buy the field.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna's case is where each partner took a neder upon themselves to prohibit themselves from benefitting from the other partner. That is the case where there is a machlokes between the **Rabanan** and **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov**. What would be if each partner made a neder to prohibit the *other* partner from benefitting from them? Would the **Rabanan** agree with **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** in this case, since this was not a willing neder that they accepted upon themselves to make themselves assur, or would they argue in this case as well? **A:** The Mishna's next case is where one partner was “mudar” from having benefit (which means the other partner imposed the restriction on him) and still the **Rabanan** argue.
  - The Gemara says, this second case is no proof, because the wording of that case should be changed to “nadur” (which means the partner accepted a neder on himself, prohibiting himself to benefit from the other partner). It makes sense that the word should be changed like this, because the Mishna says that in this case we force the prohibited partner to sell his share of the property. Now, if he is prohibited based on someone else's neder, we would not force him to sell his property based on that!
- **Rabbah in the name of Zeiri** said, the machlokes in the Mishna is only when the chatzer is large enough to divide among the partners (leaving each with 4 amos in front of his door, and another 4 amos of usage area). However, if the chatzer is not large enough for that, even the **Rabanan** would agree that the prohibited partner may enter the chatzer.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Yosef** asked, a shul is considered to be a property that is not large enough to be divided (it cannot be divided), and yet a Mishna says that when two people of a city are prohibited from each other, they cannot use the shul, since each of them own a share in the shul!? **A: R' Yosef** therefore says, that **Zeiri** said, the machlokes in our Mishna is where the chatzer is *not* large enough to be divided. However, if it is large enough to be divided, even **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** would agree that the partners are prohibited to enter the chatzer.

- **R' Huna and R' Elazar** both paskened like **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov**.

HAMUDAR HANA'AH MEICHAVEIRO V'YEISH LO SHAM MERCHATZ...

- **R' Nachman** said, a “tefisas yad” means that the owner is paid at least half, a third, or a quarter of the profits from the operation of the property. **Abaye** said, if he receives any form of profits from the operation he is considered as having a “tefisas yad”. If he receives a fixed rental income he is considered not to have a tefisas yad.

### -----Daf יז--47-----

HA'OMER L'CHAVEIRO...

- **Q: Avimi** asked, if Reuven makes a neder that prohibits Shimon to enter “this house” (which Reuven owns at that time) and Reuven then dies or sells the house to someone else, what is the Halacha for Shimon to then enter the house? Can one make something that he currently owns assur even for a time when he no longer owns it, or not? **A: Rava** said, a Mishna says that if a person makes a neder that his son may not benefit from him “during my life or after my death”, he does not inherit his father after his death. We clearly see that a person can make something assur for a time when he no longer owns it. **SHEMA MINAH**.
- **Q:** A Mishna says, if someone made a neder prohibiting “these fruits” on himself, he is even assur to things gotten in exchange for these fruits or things that grew from these fruits. **Rami bar Chama** asked, what if someone makes a neder to prohibit another person from “these fruits”, would the person likewise become assur in things exchanged for those fruits? Do we say that regarding a person himself, since a person can make another person’s fruit assur on himself, he can also make assur on himself things that do not yet exist (i.e. the exchanged items), but regarding another person, since a person cannot make someone else’s items assur on someone else, maybe he also can’t make assur on the person something that does not yet exist? Or do we say that the items exchanged for the original subject of the neder are considered to be extensions of that original item, and are therefore assur to the other person as well? **A: R' Acha bar Menyumei** said, a Braisa says, if a person makes a neder to prohibit his wife from benefitting from him, and she needs money and therefore goes and borrows money from people, the lender can then go and collect payment from the husband. Now, the payment of the loan by the husband is essentially an exchange for the money lent to his wife, and yet we see that this is permitted for the wife to benefit in this way! From here we see that when the neder is on another person, the exchange of the original items are mutar.
  - **Rava** said, this Braisa is not a good proof, because it may be that an outright exchange done l’chatchila is assur like the initial prohibited items, but an exchange that is done b’dieved (the exchange only becomes an exchange after the husband pays back the lenders) is not assur.
  - **A:** Maybe we can bring a proof from a Mishna that says, if someone is mekadesh a woman with orlah, it is not an effective kiddushin. However, if he exchanges the orlah from another item, and is mekadesh her with the other items, it is an effective kiddushin. We see that the exchanged item is not assur to benefit as was the original assur item.
    - The Gemara says, this too is no proof, because it is again an example of a b’dieved, and not a l’chatchila.

### -----Daf יח--48-----

MISHNA

- If Reuven tells Shimon, “I am cheirem to you”, Shimon is assur to benefit from Reuven, and Reuven is mutar to benefit from Shimon. If Reuven says “You are cheirem to me”, Reuven is assur to benefit from Shimon, but

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Shimon may benefit from Reuven. If Reuven says “I am cheirem to you and you to me”, then they are each assur to benefit from each other.

- People who are assur to each other based on a neder are still mutar to have benefit from the facilities that were set up by the people who came up from Bavel (it is not considered to be community property of which everybody has a share, rather they were set up as hefker). However, they are assur to use the facilities of the city in which the person they are assur to belongs (these are considered to be community property with each member having a share).
  - What is a “facility set up by those who came up from Bavel”? Examples are the Har Habayis, the Azaros, and the water wells on the way from Bavel to Eretz Yisrael. The “facility of a city” are things like the town square, the bathhouse, the shul, the Aron, and the seforim.
  - If these people don’t want to become assur in the city facilities, they should have the shares of the person who they may not benefit from written over to the Nasi. (The actual words of the Mishna are “and one who writes his shares to the Nasi”).
    - **R’ Yehuda** says it may be given to a regular person as well. The reason why the Nasi is used as an example is because one need not make a kinyan when giving something to the Nasi, but must make a kinyan when giving something to a regular person. The **Chachomim** say that even a Nasi would need a kinyan. The reason that the Mishna used the Nasi as an example is because it was common for one to give their shares to the Nasi.
    - **R’ Yehuda** says, the people of the Galil don’t have to write their shares over to the Nasi, because the previous generations have already done so.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** (Based on the actual words of the Mishna, the Gemara asks) Why does one become assur just because he gave his share to the Nasi? **A: R’ Sheishes** said, the Mishna means, that if people are assur to use the facility based on a neder, they can become mutar if the shares are given to the Nasi.

### R’ YEHUDA OMER EIN ANSHEI GALIL TZRICHIN L’ZAKOS...

- A Braisa says, the people of the Galil were argumentative people who would often make nedarim prohibiting one to the other. Therefore, their fathers gave their shares of the cities’ facilities to the Nasi.

### MISHNA

- If Shimon is assur to benefit from Reuven based on a neder, and he has nothing to eat, Reuven may give food to a third person as a gift, and Shimon may then take the food from the third person.
- It once happened in Beis Choron that a father was assur to benefit from his son based on a neder. The son was marrying off his own son and wanted his father to be able to come and eat at the wedding. He went to another person and said “The entire chatzer and all the food are given to you as a gift, so that my father should be able to come and partake in the wedding”. The person then said, if you are giving all this to me, I hereby give it all to hekdesh. The son said back to him, I only gave it to you to allow my father to come and you therefore don’t have the right to make it hekdesh! The person said, if so, they are not really mine and therefore your father is assur to come and participate! The **Chachomim** thereby said, any gift which doesn’t give the recipient the rights to make the items hekdesh is not considered to be a gift at all.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** The Gemara first states a Halacha and then brings a story that contradicts it!? **A:** The Mishna is missing words and should be read as saying, that giving it as a gift will be ineffective if we can tell that the gift was not given sincerely. To that statement, the Mishna then brings the story which proves that point.
- **Rava** said, the reason the gift in the story was ineffective was because of the *stipulation* that it was given only so that his father would be allowed to come. However, if he gave the gift and said “so that my father can come”, but did not make it a stipulation, it would be a valid gift and the father would be allowed to come.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Another version of Rava** is that even if he did not make a clear stipulation it would still be assur, because the fact that he is making the wedding and giving it away so that his father can come, is the same as if he made a clear stipulation. Therefore, the gift would not be a valid gift.
- There was a son who was a thief. The father was upset and said that his assets should be assur on this son. People said to the father, this son may have a son of his own who becomes a talmid chachom (and you would presumably want him to benefit from your possessions)!? The father said, let my son (the thief) get half my property so that if he has a son who is a talmid chachom, he can give it to him.
  - **Q:** Is this a valid gift? **A:** In Pumbedisa they said that it is giving a gift for one to be koneh only so that he can then give it to someone else, which is not a true kinyan or gift. **R' Nachman** said, we see that the kinyan of chalipin is done by giving a handkerchief only so that he can make the kinyan and then give it back, and yet it is a good kinyan. Therefore, in the story it would be a valid gift.
    - **R' Ashi** said, the case of chalipin is different, because the recipient of the handkerchief can decide to keep it! It is customary for him to return it, but he need not do so. That is different than the case of the story. Also, in the case of chalipin, the entire kinyan takes place immediately, before the return of the handkerchief. However, in the case of the story, when the kinyan was made from the father to the son the kinyan is not complete. It is not complete until this son has a son of his own who is a talmid chochom. By the time that happens the kinyan with the father was long over, and as such cannot be said to have been an effective kinyan.
    - **Q: Rava** asked **R' Nachman**, the case of the gift in Beis Choron in our Mishna is a case similar to making a kinyan for the purpose of giving it to someone else (both recipients have no real rights in the gift) and we see that it is *not* a valid gift!? **A:** Sometimes **R' Nachman** answered him that the case of the Mishna is different, because by giving away the entire wedding party that he just prepared it shows that the gift was insincere. Other times **R' Nachman** answered him that the Mishna follows **R' Eliezer**, who is very stringent in allowing benefit in the case of a neder, and as such would consider the gift in our Mishna to be invalid because of the neder. However, in a case other than a neder, such a gift would be valid.
    - **Q:** In our Mishna the **Chachomim** said that “any” gift which the recipient cannot make hekdesch is not a gift at all. The word “any” comes to include something, and presumably includes a case like the father who gives the possessions to his son the thief only so that he then give it to the grandson who is a talmid chachom, and we see that this too would *not* be a valid gift!? **A:** The word “any” comes to include that the gift of a wedding party is not valid even if there was no clear stipulation (like the second version of **Rava's** statement).

**HADRAN ALACH PEREK HASHUTFIN!!!**

-----Daf 49-----

**PEREK HANODER MIN HAMEVUSHAL -- PEREK SHISHI**

### MISHNA

- If a person makes a neder making himself assur from something that “is cooked”, he is mutar to eat roasted and undercooked food.
- If a person makes himself assur from tasting “cooked food”, he is assur from liquidy type food that is cooked in a pot, but may eat solid food that was cooked in a pot. He is also mutar to eat a “turmuta” egg, and a “rimutza” melon.
- If a person makes himself assur from “something prepared in a pot”, he is only assur from food that was cooked a long time.
- If a person makes himself assur from tasting “something that goes into a pot”, he is assur from any foods that are cooked in a pot.

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## GEMARA

- A Braisa says, **R' Yoshiya** says the person in the first case of the Mishna would be assur to eat roasted foods as well, as we see a pasuk refers to the Korbon Pesach as being cooked, even though it is roasted.
  - **Q:** Maybe the machlokes is that our Mishna says we follow the meaning of a word based on how people use it, and **R' Yoshiya** says we follow the meaning in the Torah? **A:** Everyone says that for nedarim we follow the meaning given to it by people. In the place of **R' Yoshiya** they referred to roasting as “cooked” as well. The pasuk he brings is only as asmachta.

## KONAM TAVSHIL...

- **Q:** In this second case of the Mishna he made a neder regarding all cooked food, so why may he eat solid cooked food? **A: Abaye** said, our Mishna holds that “cooked foods” refers to something eaten with bread. Solid foods are not eaten with bread. We see this in a Braisa as well, because the Braisa says that a person who makes this neder will be assur to eat soft squash, because sick people eat it with bread.
  - **Q:** We find that **R' Yirmiya's** doctor said that squash is very unhealthy for a sick person!? **A:** Soft squash is good for him. Hard squash is bad for him. **A2: Rava bar Ulla** said, the insides of a squash are good for him, the outsides are not. **A3: Rava** said, when the Braisa says “sick people” it refers to **Rabanan** (not actually sick people) and that is why it says they ate squash with bread.

## UMUTAR B'AVEH...

- The Mishna says that people don't eat things like thick porridge with bread. This does not follow the custom of Bavel, where the people did eat thick porridge with bread.
  - **R' Chisda** wondered whether the bread and porridge should be of the same grain or whether they should be of different grains. **Rava** would eat bread with porridge made of oven dried grain. **R' Huna** said in the name of **Rav** that eating porridge with one's fingers makes it sweeter. **R' Chiya and R' Huna** both said that one should travel a parsah to eat porridge, and should even travel 3 parsah to eat meat. They also said, one should never spit in front of his rebbi unless he is spitting because he just ate porridge or squash, because it is dangerous to swallow that saliva. **R' Yose and R' Yehuda** were eating porridge – one ate with his fingers and the other ate with the bark of a tree. Each one felt that the other's method of eating was disgusting.
  - When figs were brought to **R' Yehuda and R' Shimon**, **R' Yehuda** ate them and **R' Shimon** did not. **R' Shimon** did not eat them, because they would take a long time to digest. **R' Yehuda** said, that is all the more reason to eat them, because you won't be hungry tomorrow.
    - **R' Yehuda** explained to **R' Tarfon**, that the reason his face shone was because he ate fresh beets. He said, if he would have eaten them with salt his face would have shone even more.
    - **R' Yehuda's** shining face caused an aristocratic woman to accuse him of being drunk. The true reason for the shine was his wisdom, which a pasuk says causes one to shine.
      - When a tzeduki accused him of either raising pigs or lending with interest (as a reason for why his face must be shining) **R' Yehuda** said his shine was because he went to the bathroom often.
    - **R' Yehuda** would carry a jug when he went to the Beis Medrash, and would say that “work honors the worker” (by carrying the jug he had someplace to sit and did not have to sit on the floor). **R' Shimon** would carry a basket and say the same thing.
    - **R' Yehuda** and his wife would share a nice cloak (because they were so poor). When **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** was once goizer a fast, **R' Yehuda** didn't go to sit with the **Rabanan** during the fast, because other than that cloak he had nothing dignified to wear. They told this to **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**. He sent a garment to **R' Yehuda**, but he refused to accept it. He lifted his mat and showed the messenger a pile of gold coins (that appeared through a miracle). He told the messenger, it is not that I do not have, it is that I do not want to benefit from this world at all.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Akiva** was mekadesh the daughter of Kalba Savuah, who became so angry at the marriage that he made a neder prohibiting his daughter to benefit from his vast wealth. The couple got married in the winter and would sleep in the straw storage place, because they had no money. **R' Akiva** would take the straw out of his wife's hair and say "If I had the money, I would buy you a golden crown with a picture of Yerushalayim carved into it". Eliyahu came, appearing as a man, and begged for some straw for his wife who had just given birth. **R' Akiva** told his wife, we at least have straw, while others obviously do not. She then told him to go and learn in Yeshiva. He learned by **R' Eliezer and R' Yehoshua** for 12 years. He then returned home and before entering heard a wicked person telling his wife that her father was right for the neder he made, since her husband (**R' Akiva**) was not an equal to her, and has left her as a living widow for the last 12 years! She responded, if my husband would listen to me, I would tell him to stay for another 12 years! Hearing that, **R' Akiva** returned to the Yeshiva for another 12 years. When he went home after these 24 years, he had 24,000 talmidim, and the entire town went out to greet this Gadol Hador. When his wife tried to push to see him, the talmidim tried to push her away (not knowing who she was). **R' Akiva** told them, "Let her come, for my Torah and your Torah is truly hers" (it is only because of her). At that time Kalba Savuah went to him and asked him to be matir neder, thereby allowing him to give half of his wealth to **R' Akiva**.
  - **R' Akiva** became wealthy from 6 places:
    - From Kalba Savuah.
    - From a figurine filled with gold that people would keep on a travelling ship, which he found (and was then told that he may keep it).
    - He once gave money to sailors and told them to bring him back something from their travels. They found nothing to get him other than a box they found at shore. They gave it to him. When he opened it, he found it was full of gold coins. This chest was actually from a ship of businessmen that had sunk.
    - From an aristocratic woman, who lent money to **R' Akiva** and made Hashem and the sea the guarantors. When the time to pay came, the sea brought her a box full of gold and precious stones (that the king's daughter had thrown into the sea). She took the amount she was owed and gave the rest to **R' Akiva**.
    - From the wife of Turnusrupus, who eventually converted and married **R' Akiva**, bringing him much wealth.
    - From Ketia bar Shalum, a Roman officer who was killed for helping the Jews, and when he was being executed he gave all his money to **R' Akiva** and the **Chachomim**.
  - **R' Gamda** once gave money to sailors, telling them to buy something for him. They found nothing to buy, and therefore bought a monkey. The monkey escaped and ran down a hole. They dug after the monkey and found it to be sitting on a pile of pearls, which they then brought to **R' Gamda**.
- The daughter of the Caesar said to **R' Yehoshua ben Chananya**, how can the beautiful Torah be in such an ugly keili (saying that **R' Yehoshua** was not good looking)? He answered her, by asking what they royal family stored their wine in. She said they used earthenware keilim. He said, people like you should use gold and silver keilim! She had the wine put in such keilim and the wine spoiled. He told her, Torah is the same – it must be kept in simpler keilim. She asked, there are talmidei chachomim who are good looking!? He answered, had they been less good looking, they would have been even greater in Torah.
  - A woman once described **Shmuel** to **R' Yehuda** as being short, fat, dark, with big teeth. **R' Yehuda** put her in cheirem and she died.

### UMUTAR B'BEITZAH TURMITA

- **Q:** What is this turmita egg? **A:** **Shmuel** said, it is an egg (very difficult to prepare) that is put 1,000 times in hot water, then 1,000 times in cold water, and it shrinks to the point that it can be swallowed whole. If a person with a health issue swallows it, it can be examined by a doctor when it exits the person and the doctor will be able to tell what method of healing this person needs. **Shmuel** said, any servant that knows how to prepare this is worth 1,000 dinars.
  - The Gemara says, a person was once hired to teach the slave of another person 1,000 different dishes of cooked figs. The person only taught him 800, so the owner of the slave took the person to a Din Torah to

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

**Rebbi. Rebbi** (who himself was an extremely wealthy man) was amazed at the level of luxury being displayed.

- When **Rebbi** made a wedding for his son **R' Shimon**, he did not invite **Bar Kappara**. When **Bar Kappara** commented that he was slighted, **Rebbi** invited him, and **Bar Kappara** was then happy.
  - Any day that **Rebbi** laughed, bad things happened to the world. He therefore said to **Bar Kappara**, I will pay you 40 measures of wheat if you don't make me laugh. **Bar Kappara** went to collect this wheat, but did so wearing a basket upside down on his head. **Rebbi** laughed and therefore told him that he did not owe him anything, since he made him laugh.

### -----Daf X]--51-----

- **Bar Kappara** told **Rebbi's** daughter, "Tomorrow, I will drink wine while your father dances and your mother sings". **Ben Elisah**, who was **Rebbi's** son in law, invited **Bar Kappara** to a the wedding of **R' Shimon (Rebbi's** son). At the party, **Bar Kappara** asked **Rebbi**, what is the meaning of the word "to'eiva" in the pasuk regarding homosexuality? **Rebbi** attempted to answer, but **Bar Kappara** refuted each attempt. **Rebbi** told him to give the answer. **Bar Kappara** said, if you want me to answer, I need your wife to give me wine to drink and you to dance in front of me. When they did so, he gave an answer that it means "to'eh ata bah" (you are straying from the norm). The same scene repeated itself regarding the word "tevel" used in the pasuk of bestiality, and the word "zimah". **Ben Elisah** could not stand to see **Rebbi** being treated this way, so he took his wife and left.
  - We find that **Ben Elisah** was very wealthy, as a Braisa says that he would spend a lot of money on a fancy haircut, not because he needed it, but rather because he wanted to show all how the haircut of the Kohen Gadol was done.

#### UVIDLAAS HARIMUTZA

- **Shmuel** said, this refers to a Karkuzai squash, and **R' Ashi** said it refers to a squash baked in hot ashes.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that the Remutza squash is kilayim with other species. This is not like **R' Ashi** said!?

#### TEYUFTA.

#### HANODER MIMAASEI KEDEIRA...

- A Braisa says, if someone made a neder prohibiting from that which goes into a pot, he is also assur from that which goes into a plate, because that had previously gone into a pot. If the neder prohibited from that which goes into a plate, he may eat something that went into a pot. If the neder prohibited "something made in a pot", he is mutar to have something made in a plate, and visa-versa. If the neder prohibited from things that go into the oven, he is only prohibited from bread. If he prohibited "all things made in an oven" he is assur from anything made in an oven.

#### MISHNA

- If one makes a neder prohibiting "preserved food", he is only assur from preserved vegetables. If he said "preserved food is assur for me to taste", he is assur from all preserved foods.
- If one makes a neder prohibiting "undercooked food", he is only assur from undercooked meat. If he said "undercooked food is assur for me to taste", he is assur from all undercooked foods.

#### GEMARA

- **Q: R' Acha the son of R' Avya** asked **R' Ashi**, what if the neder was "that which is preserved is assur", or "that which is undercooked", or "that which is roasted", or "that which is salted"? Does it make all preserved, etc. items assur, or only the most common category? **A: TEIKU.**

#### MISHNA

- If he made a neder prohibiting himself "from the roast", he is only assur from roasted meat – this is the view of **R' Yehuda**. If he said "roast is assur for me to taste", he is assur from all roasted foods.
- If he prohibited "from the salted food" he is only assur from salted fish. If he said "salted foods are assur to me to taste", he is assur from eating all salted foods.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- If he prohibited “fish, fishes I may not taste”, he is assur from large and small fish, salted or unsalted fish, raw or cooked fish. He would remain mutar to eat chopped up taris fish and fish juice.
  - If one prohibited “tzachana” (which has chopped fish and whole fish), he is assur to eat taris fish but may have fish juice.
  - If one prohibited chopped taris fish, he may eat fish juice.

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, **R’ Shimon ben Elazar** said, if one made a neder not to eat “dag”, he may not eat large fish but may eat small fish. If he used the word “daga”, he may not eat small fish but may eat large fish. If he said “dag, daga”, he may eat neither.
  - **Q: R’ Pappa** asked **Abaye**, although we find that the large fish in the story of Yonah was referred to as “dag”, in another pasuk that fish is also referred to as “daga”? **A:** It may be that he was first in a large fish, and was later spit out into a small fish (which is the one referred to as “daga”).
  - **Q:** In Mitzrayim the pasuk says that the “daga” died. Does that mean that only the small fish died!? **A:** The word “daga” can mean large and small fish. Regarding nedarim we follow the meaning typically used by people, in which case “daga” refers to small fish.

### HANODER MIN HATZACHANAH...

- **Q: Ravina** asked **R’ Ashi**, if one used the word “tzichin”, would that make him assur to eat fish juice as well? **A: TEIKU.**

-----Daf **כ**---52-----

### MISHNA

- If one makes a neder prohibiting him from milk, he is mutar to drink whey. **R’ Yose** says, he would be assur to drink whey. If the neder prohibits him to drink whey, he is mutar to drink milk.
- **Abba Shaul** says, if one makes a neder prohibiting himself from cheese, he is assur from salted and unsalted cheese.
- If one makes a neder prohibiting himself from meat, he is mutar to have gravy and meat strands (left on the bottom of the pot). **R’ Yose** says he would be assur in these items.
  - **R’ Yehuda** said, **R’ Tarfon** once forbade eating eggs that were cooked along with the meat (for someone who made a neder prohibiting meat). They said to **R’ Yehuda**, it is true that **R’ Tarfon** said that, but the case there was where the person said “This piece of meat is assur to me”, because when an item is assur based on a neder and the item then becomes mixed with other items, if the assur item gives a taste into the other item, it too becomes assur.
- If one makes a neder prohibiting wine, he may eat a cooked item that has the taste of wine. If he made a neder prohibiting himself from “Tasting this wine”, and the wine then fell into a cooked dish, if the wine gave flavor to the food, the food is assur.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** In a Braisa **R’ Yose** says that one who makes a neder prohibiting lentils does not become assur from honey fried lentils. If so, why does he say in our Mishna that a neder prohibiting milk prohibits whey? **A:** It is a question of what is included in the term “milk”. In **R’ Yose’s** locale, “milk” was used to refer to whey as well.
- A Braisa says, if one makes a neder prohibiting milk, he is mutar to have whey, and visa-versa. If the neder prohibits milk he may have cheese, and visa-versa. If the neder prohibits gravy he may eat the meat shreds, and visa-versa. If the neder said “This meat is assur to me”, he is assur in the meat, the gravy, and the shreds. If the neder prohibited wine, he is mutar to eat a cooked dish with the taste of wine. . If he made a neder prohibiting himself from “Tasting this wine”, and the wine then fell into a cooked dish, if the wine gave flavor to the food, the food is assur.

### MISHNA

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- If one made a neder prohibiting grapes, he is mutar to have wine. If the neder prohibited olives, he may have olive oil.
- If he said a neder that he “will not taste these grapes or olives”, he is assur from these items and anything that comes from them.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** In the Mishna’s last case, what words bring about the stringent result? Is it when he said “these” or is it when he said “I will not taste”? Or is it maybe both that are necessary? **A: Rava** said, a Mishna says, if someone makes a neder prohibiting “these fruits”, he is assur in items exchanged for these fruits and from things that grow from them. This suggests that he would be mutar from things that come from them (i.e. wine from grapes and oil from olives) even though he said “these”.
  - This is no proof. It may be that he would be assur from the wine and oil. The reason the Mishna says the exchange and growths are assur is because that is a bigger chiddush, and teaches that items received in exchange are like items that grew from the principle item, and are assur.
  - **A:** The Mishna above continues and says, if the neder stated that the item is assur “regarding my eating” or “regarding my tasting it”, he would be mutar in the exchanges and the growths. This suggests that he would be assur to the things that come out of the item (the wine and oil).
    - It may be that the Mishna doesn’t mention the things that come out of them in this second case, because it didn’t mention it in the first case, but in truth it would also be mutar.
  - **A:** The previous Mishna said that they said to **R’ Yehuda**, that **R’ Tarfon** paskened the way he did when the person said “this piece of meat is assur to me”, in which case, even taste that comes from that meat would be assur. Surely wine from grapes and oil from olives would be assur when he says “these” as well.
    - The Gemara says, we knew all along that saying “these” or “this” would make the items and anything that comes from them assur. The question was whether the language of “in regard to my tasting” will have that same result or not.
    - **A:** An earlier Mishna said, if a person makes a neder that “dag, dagim are assur in regard to my tasting” he would be assur in large and small fish, whether cooked or raw. However, he would be mutar to eat chopped fish and fish juice. We see that this language does not make him assur in things that come from the assur item.
      - **Rava** said, it may be that the Mishna only permits his eating the juice that came from the fish before the neder was made. However, had it come out after the neder was made, it may be that it would be assur based on that language.