



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Nedarim, Daf לנ – Daf טנ

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 לנ---53-----

MISHNA

- If one makes a neder prohibiting himself from dates, he is mutar to eat the date honey from the dates. If the neder prohibits him from eating the grapes that stay on the vine over the winter (“winter grapes”, which are used to produce vinegar) he is mutar to eat the “winter grape vinegar”.
 - **R' Yehuda ben Beseira** says, whenever the thing that comes from the assur item carries the name of the item itself (“date honey”, “winter grape vinegar”), the person is assur on the things that come from the assur item as well. The **Chachomim** say that it is mutar.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The **Chachomim** are saying the same thing as the **T”K**? **A:** The difference between them would be the view of **R' Shimon ben Elazar** of a Braisa, where he says that if an item is normally eaten and the thing that comes from it is also normally eaten, such as dates and date honey, then a neder prohibiting one of them prohibits them both. If the item is normally not eaten and the thing that comes from it normally is eaten, a neder prohibiting the eating of the item itself only prohibits the thing that comes from it to be eaten. The **Chachomim** of our Mishna agree fully with **R' Shimon ben Elazar**, whereas the **T”K** says that when the neder is made regarding the item itself, the thing that comes from it is always mutar.

MISHNA

- One who makes a neder prohibiting himself from wine, may still drink apple wine. If the neder prohibited oil, he is mutar to have sesame seed oil. If the neder prohibited honey, he may have date honey. If the neder prohibited vinegar, he may have winter grape vinegar. If the neder prohibited “kreishin” he is permitted to have “kaflotos”. If the neder prohibited vegetables, he may have wild grown vegetables. The reason for all this is because the second items have an accompanying name, and are therefore not included in the first name alone.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, if one makes a neder to prohibit “oil” in Eretz Yisrael, he is mutar to have sesame seed oil and assur to have olive oil. If this same neder is made in Bavel, he is mutar to have olive oil and assur to have sesame seed oil. If the neder is in a place where both oils are used, he would be assur from both oils.
 - **Q:** This last Halacha seems obvious!? **A:** The case is where most of the people of that locale use one of the oils. We would think to follow the majority. The Braisa teaches that this is a safek of an issur and we therefore must be machmir.
 - The Braisa continues, if one made a neder prohibiting vegetables, if the neder was made in a year other than shmitta, he is assur to eat garden vegetables but may eat wild grown vegetables. If it was a year of shmitta, he is assur to eat wild grown vegetables and mutar to eat garden vegetables.
 - **R' Avahu in the name of R' Chanina ben Gamliel** said, this is only true in a place where during shmitta vegetables are not imported from outside Eretz Yisrael. In a place where they are imported, even garden vegetables would be assur.
 - The **T”K** of the Braisa and **R' Chanina ben Gamliel** can be said to be arguing about whether one may bring vegetables from outside Eretz Yisrael to Eretz Yisrael, which is a machlokes in a Braisa between the **T”K** and **R' Chanina ben Gamliel**.
 - **R' Yirmiya** explains, the reason for not allowing imports of vegetables would be as a gezeirah that it may lead to the tumah of the clumps of earth from Chutz Laaretz to spread in Eretz Yisrael.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

MISHNA

- If one made a neder prohibiting cabbage, he is also assur to eat “isparagus”. However, if the neder was made regarding isparagus, he may eat cabbage. If the neder prohibited “grisin” he may also not eat soup that normally contains the grisin, although **R’ Yose** says this would be mutar. If the neder was made regarding the soup, he may eat grisin. If the neder was made regarding this soup substance, he may not eat garlic, although **R’ Yose** says it would be mutar. If the neder was made regarding garlic, he may eat the soup. If the neder was made regarding lentils, he may not eat honey fried lentils, although **R’ Yose** would allow it. If the neder was made regarding the honey fried lentils, he is mutar to eat lentils.
- If a person made a neder prohibiting “wheat grain, wheat grains in regard to tasting them”, he is assur to eat them as flour or as bread. If he says this regarding “gris, grisin”, he is assur to eat them whether raw or cooked. **R’ Yehuda** says, if one makes gris or wheat grains assur to eat, he is mutar to chew them raw.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, **R’ Shimon ben Gamliel** says, if a person makes it assur for himself to taste “wheat grain”, he may not eat them baked but may eat them raw. If he says “wheat grains”, he is assur to eat them raw but may eat them baked. If he says “wheat grain, wheat grains” it is assur whether baked or raw. If he makes it assur for himself to taste “gris”, it is assur cooked but mutar raw. If he says “grisin” it is assur raw but mutar cooked. If he says “gris, grisin”, it is assur whether cooked or raw.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HANODER MIN HAMEVUSHAL!!!

-----Daf 71--54-----

PEREK HANODER MIN HAYEREK -- PEREK SHEVI’I

MISHNA

- If one makes a neder prohibiting vegetables, he is mutar to have squash. **R’ Akiva** says he would be assur. They said to **R’ Akiva**, if a person sends a messenger to buy vegetables and he only finds squash in the market, he will go back to the person and say “there were no vegetables, only squash” (this shows that squash are not included in vegetables). **R’ Akiva** said to them, this shows that squash *is* included in vegetables, because the messenger would never come back and say “there were no vegetables, only beans”! This shows that squash is included in the category of vegetables.
 - The person will also be assur to eat Mitzri beans when they are moist, but will be mutar when they are dry.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How could **R’ Akiva** possibly consider a squash to be a vegetable, when it is a fruit? **A: Ulla** said, the case is where the person says the “vegetables of a pot are assur to me”. These extra words are meant to add something, and **R’ Akiva** says they add squash.
 - **Q:** Maybe he means “vegetables that are eaten in a pot of food” (that give flavor to food)? **A:** The case is where he says “vegetables that are cooked in a pot should be assur to me”.
- The machlokes in the Mishna is that the **Rabanan** say that anything that a messenger must go back and ask the principal about is not considered part of the original category. **R’ Akiva** holds that it is.
 - **Abaye** said, **R’ Akiva** would agree that if the person in the Mishna ate the squash, he would not get malkus for doing so.
 - A Mishna says, if a shaliach does what he is told to do and that included using hekdesch, it is the principal who is mo’el. If the shaliach does not do what he was supposed to do and used hekdesch, the shaliach is mo’el. The Mishna says, for example, if the principal tell the shaliach to give meat to his guests and the shaliach instead gave liver (of hekdesch), it is the shaliach who is mo’el. **R’ Chisda** said, this cannot follow

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

R' Akiva, because he would say that liver is in the category of meat (a shaliach would come back and ask about it) and therefore the shaliach would be considered to have done what he was supposed to do, and therefore it should be the principal who is mo'el. **Abaye** said, this can even follow **R' Akiva**, because even **R' Akiva** would hold that the shaliach must in fact ask the principal before changing to the slightly different item, and if he does not, he has not done what he was supposed to do.

- **Rava** said that he agrees with the view of **Abaye**.
- **Q:** Who is the Tanna that argues on **R' Akiva**? **A:** It is **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** in a Braisa, who has a stricter interpretation of the word “meat”, which seems to be based on the fact that if the shaliach must ask about an item, it is not considered part of the original item.
 - **Q:** The **T”K** of this Braisa (who argues on **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**) says that “meat” includes chicken, but not fish. Why should there be a difference? Presumably a shaliach would ask the principal whether he should bring fish if not meat is found, and as such should also be included in “meat”!? **A: Abaye** said, the case is where the principal just let blood. Such a person does not eat fish (it is not healthy for him), and fish is therefore not included in the term “meat”.
 - **Q:** Such a person would not eat chicken either, as we see in many places that it is not healthy for him!? **A:** It can be eaten by such a person if it is boiled.
 - **A: Rava** said, the Mishna is discussing a case where the principal has pains in his eyes, in which case fish would be bad for him.
 - **Q:** We find that **Shmuel** says that fish is good for the eyes!? **A:** That is only when the pains are already subsiding.

-----Daf 71--55-----

MISHNA

- If one makes a neder prohibiting “dagan”, **R' Meir** says he is also assur to eat dry Egyptian beans. The **Chachomim** say he is only assur to eat things made of the 5 grains.
 - **R' Meir** says, one who makes a neder prohibiting “tevuah” is only assur from the 5 grains. However, if the neder prohibits “dagan” he is assur in everything that gets stored in piles and is mutar to eat fruits and vegetables, which do not get stored in piles.

GEMARA

- From **R' Meir** we see that “dagan” refers to anything stored in a pile in the granary.
 - **Q: R' Yosef** asked, a pasuk lists “dagan” and then separately lists “all the produce of the field”. According to **R' Meir**, the produce of the field should be included in “dagan”!? **A: Abaye** said, “the produce of the field” comes to include fruits and vegetables, which are not stored in piles, and are therefore not included in “dagan”.

R' MEIR OMER HANODER MIN HATEVUAH...

- **R' Yochanan** said, all agree that when one makes a neder prohibiting “tevuah”, he is only assur from the 5 grains. A Braisa says this as well.
 - **Q:** This seems obvious (that tevuah refers only to the 5 grains)!? **A:** We would have thought that the word tevuah encompasses all items and all should be assur. The Braisa therefore teaches that it refers specifically to the 5 grains.
 - **Q: R' Yosef** asked, the pasuk (referred to above) clearly says that “tevuas hasadeh” refers to all produce of the field!? **A: Rava** said, when tevuah is stated alone it refers to the 5 grains. When it is written as “tevuas hasadeh” it refers to all.
- The son of **Mar Shmuel** left over a will that gave 13,000 zuz to **Rava**, to be taken from “alata” in Nehar Panya. **Rava** asked **R' Yosef**, what is included in the term “alata” (which is the Aramaic word for “tevuah”)? **R' Yosef** said, a Braisa says that regarding nedarim the word tevuah includes only the 5 grains. **Abaye** said to **R' Yosef**, although the word tevuah means only the 5 grains, the word alata refers to anything (it means profit or gains, and as such refers to any profits or gains). When this was told to **Rava**, he said, I never had a question that alata

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

meant everything. My question was whether the rent from houses and ships is considered to be part of alalta as well. When **R' Yosef** heard this he became upset at **Rava** for asking something that he already knew the answer to (“what is alalta”). **Rava** went to **R' Yosef** on Erev Yom Kippur (to ask for mechila) and saw his attendant was preparing a cup of wine for him. **Rava** asked the attendant to allow him to prepare the wine for **R' Yosef**. When it was given to **R' Yosef**, he said this tastes like wine prepared by **Rava**. When **Rava** then told him that he had indeed prepared it, **R' Yosef** told him to give an explanation of a pasuk (the drasha included the importance of humility, which **R' Yosef** wanted to instill in **Rava** - Ran).

- A Braisa says, if one makes a neder prohibiting dagan, he is also assur to eat dried Egyptian beans, but he is mutar to eat them when moist, and he may eat rice, chilka, targis and tisni.
- A Braisa says, if one makes a neder prohibiting the “fruits of the year”, he is assur from all fruits of the year (even the ones that don't grow from the ground) but is mutar to eat goats, sheep, milk, eggs, and birds. If the neder prohibited the “growths of the year” he would even be assur in these additional things as well.
 - A Braisa says, if a neder prohibits the “fruits of the earth” he is assur from all things that grow from the ground, but is mutar to eat mushrooms. If the neder prohibited “the growths of the ground” he would be assur to eat mushrooms as well.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that we make a shehakol on mushrooms, because they do not “grow from the ground”!? **A: Abaye** said, they grow from the ground, but they get their nourishment from the air, not the ground. The Braisa that says to make a shehakol on mushrooms should be read as saying that the bracha is made on things that do not *nourish* from the ground.

MISHNA

- If one makes a neder prohibiting clothing, he is allowed to wear a sackcloth, a sheet, and a chamila sheet.
- If the neder prohibited him from putting wool on himself, he is allowed to put wool shearing on himself. If this neder was made regarding flax, he is allowed to cover himself with stalks of flax. **R' Yehuda** says, it all depends on the person who made the neder. For example, if a person was carrying a heavy load of wool or flax, and he was sweating and smelled because of it, and he therefore said a neder prohibiting wool or flax from coming upon him, he would be allowed to wear clothing of these materials, but wouldn't be allowed to carry loads of these materials anymore.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, if one made a neder prohibiting clothing, he may wear sackcloth, sheets and chamila sheets, but he may not wear belts, a skurtiya, a hard leather garment, leather socks, a pelinya, pants or a hat.
 - **Rabbah bar bar Chana** said, skurtiya is a leather shirt.

R' YEHUDA OMER HAKOL LEFI HANODER...

- A Braisa says, an example of what **R' Yehuda** means that it depends upon the one who made the promise is as follows. If a person was wearing wool or flax and was uncomfortable, and he therefore makes a neder not to put wool or flax on himself, he would assur to wear wool or flax but would be mutar to carry them. If he was carrying wool or flax and was uncomfortable, and he therefore makes a neder not to put wool or flax on himself, he would assur to carry wool or flax but would be mutar to wear them.

-----Daf ן]---56-----

MISHNA

- **R' Meir** says, if one makes a neder not to enter a particular house, he may go into the upper level of that house. The **Chachomim** say that the upper level is part of the term “house” and would therefore be assur as well. If the neder prohibited entering the upper level, he would be allowed to enter the lower level (which is generally referred to as the “bayis”).

GEMARA

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says that the extra word “B’beis” (in the house) written in regard to tzaraas is written to include the upper level of the house.
 - **R’ Chisda** said, this must follow **R’ Meir**, because according to the **Rabanan**, the upper level is already included in the simple term of “the house”. **Abaye** said, it may even follow the **Rabanan**. With regard to tzaraas, since the Torah says that tzaraas only applies in “beis erez achuzaschem”, we would think that it only applies to a house attached to the ground, and not an upper level. Therefore, we need the extra word to teach that it even applies to an upper level.
- **Q: R’ Huna bar Chiya in the name of Ulla** said, if a seller tells a purchaser “I am selling you a house within my house”, he may later tell him that he was referring to the upper story. Now it seems to be that he may only say he was referring to the upper story because he told him “a house within my house”, but if he would have said “I am selling you a house” he would not be able to do so. This seems to only follow **R’ Meir**, who says that a “house” does not include the upper level!? **A:** It may even follow the **Rabanan**. When **Ulla** said that he may show him the “aliya”, it didn’t mean the upper level, it meant the best of the houses (“me’ulah”).

MISHNA

- **R’ Meir** says, if one makes a neder not to use a bed, he may use a “dargaash”. The **Chachomim** say that a dargash is included in the term “bed”. If the neder said that he may not use a dargash, he may use a bed.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What is a dargash? **A: Ulla** said, it is a bed that was left empty, to bring about good mazal (it was left empty for the Malach that would watch over the house).
 - **Q:** The **Rabanan** asked, a Mishna says that a king who becomes an avel sits on a dargash. If **Ulla** is correct, why would the king when he is an avel sit on a bed that was never used before!?
 - **R’ Ashi** said, that is not so difficult to accept, because we find that even regular aveilim are treated better than usual, in that they are given food by others.
 - **Q:** If a dargash is a type of bed, why doesn’t it have to be overturned in an avel’s house? We learned a Braisa that says that all beds must be overturned!? **A:** That is not problematic, because the Braisa said that a bed that is designated for keilim need not be overturned. This dargash is also not meant for sitting on, and therefore need not be overturned.
 - **Q:** We learned that **R’ Shimon ben Gamliel** says, the loops of a dargash should be untied and let to fall. If a dargash is like **Ulla** said, it is built like any other bed, and doesn’t have loops!?
 - **R’ Tachlifa** of Eretz Yisrael said to **Ravin**, that a dargash is a leather bed.
 - We find that **R’ Yirmiya** said similarly, that the sleeping surface of a dargash is attached to the frame by looping it through holes in the frame. A regular bed is attached to the frame by tying it around the frame.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that a bed is considered to be a finished keili when the wood frame is fully smoothed over with fish oil. Now, if the straps of the bed are tied around the frame (thus covering the wood frame), it should be considered a finished keili without the smoothing of the wood!? **A:** A bed is also tied with holes in the frame. The difference is that a regular bed has the sleeping surface tied directly through the holes in the frame. A dargash has its sleeping surface tied to loops that are themselves tied to holes in the frame.
 - **R’ Yaakov bar Acha in the name of Rebbi** said, a two post canopy bed may simply be stood on its side (rather than being turned upside down).
 - **R’ Yaakov bar Idi in the name of R’ Yehoshua ben Levi** paskened like **R’ Shimon ben Gamliel**.

MISHNA

- If one makes a neder not to enter a particular city, he may enter the techum of the city, but may not enter its extension (if a house is within 70 and 2/3 amos to a city, the city is considered to extend to that point, and the techum begins to be measured after that point).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- If one makes a neder not to enter a particular house, he is assur to pass the point where the door shuts.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Where do we find that the “extension” of a city is considered part of the city? **A: R’ Yochanan** said, we find it in the pasuk by Yehoshua, where it says that he was “in Yericho”, although at that point he was not yet in Yericho. It must be that he was in the extension of the city and it is called “in Yericho”.
- **Q:** Maybe within the techum is called within the city as well? **A:** The pasuk regarding techum says it should be “measured from outside the city”. We see that the techum is outside of the city.

HANODER MIN HABAYIS EINO ASSUR ELAH MIN HA’AGAF V’LIFNIM

- This suggests that he is mutar to even go on the threshold of the house, as long as it is outside the place of the actual door.
 - **Q: R’ Mari** asked, regarding tzaraas the pasuk says that the Kohen must leave the house before declaring it tamei, and a Braisa explains that the Kohen may not even be on the threshold of the house!? **A:** The pasuk there uses the words “min habayis”, which teaches that the Kohen must leave the house in its entirety (learned from the word “min”), which means that he may not even be on the threshold of the house.

-----Daf 57-----

MISHNA

- If a person says “these fruits are konam to me”, or “they are konam upon my mouth”, or “they are konam to my mouth”, he is also assur to benefit from items that were exchanged for these fruits, and from things that grew from these fruits. If the neder was that the fruits are konam “in regard to my eating” or “in regard to my tasting”, he is mutar to benefit from the items exchanged for them or that grew from them. However, this is only if the seeds of these items decompose before they grow. If the seeds do not decompose, then the growth is considered part of the initial fruit and things that grow from it, or even things that grow from the things that grew from the original assur item, remain assur for him to benefit.
- If a person says to his wife “the work of your hands is konam upon me” or “they are konam upon my mouth” or “they are konam to my mouth”, he is also assur to benefit from items that were exchanged for them, and from things that grew from them. If the neder was that they are konam “in regard to my eating” or “in regard to my tasting”, he is mutar to benefit from the items exchanged for them or that grew from them. However, this is only if the seeds of these items decompose before they grow. If the seeds do not decompose, then the growth is considered part of the initial fruit and things that grow from it, or even things that grow from the things that grew from the original assur item, remain assur for him to benefit.
- If the neder said “that what you make I will not eat until Pesach” or “will not wear until Pesach”, then he may eat or wear these items after Pesach, even if they are made before Pesach. If the neder said “that what you make until Pesach I will not eat” or “I will not wear”, then even after Pesach he is assur to eat items that she made before Pesach.
- If he makes a neder to his wife that says, “you are assur to benefit from me until Pesach if you go to your father’s house before Succos”, if she then goes to her father’s house before Pesach she may not benefit from her husband until Pesach. If she goes after Pesach (and had already benefitted from her husband before Pesach), she will transgress the lav of “lo yacheil”.
- If he makes a neder to his wife that says, “you are assur to benefit from me until Succos if you go to your father’s house before Pesach”, if she then goes to her father’s house before Pesach she may not benefit from her husband until Succos. However, once Pesach passes, she may go to her father’s house.

GEMARA

- **Yishmael** of the village by the sea, or of the village of Deyama, asked whether an onion that was planted and grew in shmitta, and was then replanted in the following year and continued to grow so that the post-shmitta growth exceeded the shmitta growth, does this onion now become mutar as not being from shmitta based on

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

the larger growth volume being after shmitta? He went to **R' Ami**, who didn't have an answer. He then went to **R' Yitzchak Nafcha**, who said that we can answer this based on the statement of **R' Chanina Trisa'a in the name of R' Yanai**, who said that an onion of terumah which was planted and then grew more than the amount of the terumah, becomes mutar as not being terumah at all.

- **Q: R' Yirmiya, or R' Zrika**, said to **R' Yitzchak Nafcha**, why are you giving a psak based on the statement of one Amora who permits this case when we have statements from 2 Amoraim who do not permit it!? We have the statement of **R' Avahu in the name of R' Yochanan**, who says that fruits of orlah that are grafted onto an old tree and grew there, even 200 times the old growth, remain assur as orlah. We also have the statement of **R' Shmuel bar R' Nachmeini in the name of R' Yonason**, that an onion that grew as kilayim in a vineyard, and then grew more after the vineyard was removed, remains assur.
- **Yishmael** then went to **R' Ami**, who said we can answer the question from the statement of **R' Yitzchak in the name of R' Yochanan**, who says, if a litra of onions had terumos and maaseros separated from them, and were then replanted and grew more, they need to have terumah and maaser separated for the entire crop again. We see that the new growth nullifies the previous growth to the point that the already removed terumos and maaseros are not taken into account.
 - **Q:** The Gemara says, it may be that in that case he holds that way, because it brings about a chumra. However, we would not follow that logic if it would bring about a leniency (like in the case that **Yishmael** was asking about).

-----Daf 71-----58-----

- The Gemara is trying to answer **Yishmael's** question, whether an onion of shmitta which was replanted after shmitta and whose post-shmitta growth exceeded the size of the shmitta growth, is considered to be mutar and not to be of shmitta. The Gemara says we can answer this from a Braisa. In the Braisa, **R' Shimon** says, forbidden items that can become mutar (“davar sheyeish lo matirin”) never become batul in a mixture, no matter how minute the assur item is. However, items that can never become mutar, the **Rabanan** gave ratios in which they become mutar in a mixture. The **Chachomim** asked **R' Shimon**, the issur of shmitta can never become mutar and yet the **Rabanan** did not give a ratio in which it becomes batul!? **R' Shimon** answered, that it doesn't become batul only before the time that the shmitta item must be brought back into the field (the time of “biur”) since it can still be eaten then. However, once that time has passed, and the issur will therefore never leave, it in fact does become batul as long as it does not impart taste into the other items in the mixture. Presumably this would apply when a 6th year onion was replanted and grew more in the 7th year (which is shmitta), and we see that the new growth is not considered part of the 6th year growth, but is rather a new and independent growth. The same should be the case for the 8th year growth of a 7th year onion, and the 8th year growth should not be considered a shmitta onion.
 - The Gemara says, it may be that we only say this way when this logic brings about a chumra (treating part of the 6th year onion as shmitta) but not when it leads to a leniency (treating part of the shmitta onion as an 8th year onion).
- The Gemara says, we can answer **Yishmael's** question from a Mishna. The Mishna says, if a 6th year onion grew leaves in shmitta (and we don't know if they received their nutrients from the soil and are assur, or if they got their nutrients from the onion and are mutar), if the leaves are dark they are assur and if they are light, they are mutar. **R' Chanina ben Antignas** says, if they are strong enough to use to pull up the onion, they are assur, and if they are not, they are mutar. The Mishna says that the same would be regarding a shmitta onion that grew leaves in the 8th year. We see from here that post shmitta growth is not considered part of the shmitta produce.
 - The Gemara says, it may be that the Mishna only applies to crushed onions, which are not themselves significant enough to give status to the new growth. However, if they were whole onions, it may be that the leaves would take on the status of the onion itself.
- The Gemara says, we can answer **Yishmael's** question from a Braisa. The Braisa says, **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says, if after shmitta one gets an onion from another Yid who is someone who is not trusted regarding shmitta, the onion is mutar. This must be because the post-shmitta growth is not considered to be assur as shmitta.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The Gemara says, it may be that we only say this when the item is something whose seed is destroyed when it grows.
 - **Q:** The Braisa discussed when the items was “chasayos” (which are onions and the like) whose seeds aren’t destroyed when they grow!? **A:** It may be that the Braisa is discussing crushed onions, and that is why it doesn’t take on the status of the shmitta produce.
 - **Q:** The Braisa was discussing one who is not trusted regarding shmitta, and who therefore would not deliberately crush the onions to try and make them mutar (he does not care about shmitta altogether)!? **A:** The Braisa may be talking about a case where the onions were placed into a mixture of other mutar items, and as such becomes batul in the mixture.
 - **Q:** The Gemara asks, the Braisa talks about whether one who is pruning may eat these onions while he is pruning. In that case there is no chance for it to become mixed with other items. Therefore, the Braisa can’t be said to only be discussing a case of a mixture! Therefore, there is a proof from the Braisa that the 8th year growth does not become assur because of the 7th year growth, and may even make the issur to become batul.
 - **Q:** Now that we have a proof from the Braisa, should we say that this Braisa refutes the views of **R’ Yochanan and R’ Yonason**, who said that the 8th year growth is assur based on the 7th year onion? **A:** **R’ Yitzchak** said, the issur of shmitta is different in that the issur comes about through the growth from the ground, therefore, it also becomes batul through the growth of the ground (in the 8th year).
 - **Q:** Maaser is an issur that comes from the ground (from growing in Eretz Yisrael) and yet a Braisa says that it does not become batul if it is replanted and grows in shmitta (when there is no maaser obligation)!? **A:** With regard to maaser, the obligation does not take effect until the produce is completed and piled. As such, it is not simply the ground that causes the obligation, and therefore the ground cannot remove the obligation.

-----Daf 59-----

- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked, our Mishna says that when someone makes a neder prohibiting “these fruits”, even the things that grow from them become assur. If he just prohibits fruits in general, what grows from them is not assur as long as it is the type of fruit that decomposes as the new grows. However, if it does not decompose, the things that grow from them are assur as well. This refutes **R’ Yannai** who said that the new growth of a terumah onion does not take on the terumah status of the prior growth!? **A:** **R’ Abba** said, the case of nedarim is different, because since a person can annul a neder, it is considered to be a “davar sheyeish lo matirin”, and is therefore never batul.
 - **Q:** Terumah designation can also be annulled, and yet we find in a Mishna that tamei terumah can become batul when there is 100 times the amount of the terumah in a mixture!? **A:** That Mishna is discussing terumah that has already been given to a Kohen. That cannot be annulled, and as such can become batul.
 - **Q:** The next part of the Mishna says that if the terumah in the mixture is tahor, the entire mixture should be sold to a Kohen. This shows that the Mishna is not discussing where the terumah has already been given to the Kohen!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing where a Yisrael had terumah that belonged to him, because it was given to him by his grandfather who was a Kohen, and it can therefore no longer be annulled.
 - **Q:** The Mishna then says that the mixture with the tahor terumah should be sold to a Kohen, less the value of the terumah in it. Now, if this person got the terumah from his grandfather, he owns the terumah and should be able to charge for the terumah as well!? **A:** The Mishna is talking about terumah before it is given to a Kohen, when it may still be annulled. The reason why it becomes batul, whereas in the case of the neder in our Mishna it does not become batul, is because it is a mitzvah to annul a neder, but one should not annul his terumah designation. Therefore, the neder is considered to be a davar sheyeish lo matirin, and the terumah is not.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The Gemara earlier said, **R' Yochanan** said, if a litra of onions had terumah and maaser separated from it and was then replanted and grew more, terumah and maaser must be separated from it again for the entire size of the onions. When **Rabbah** said this statement to **R' Chisda**, **R' Chisda** disagreed and said that there is no reason that maaser and terumah has to be given again for the original litra amount! The heter part should not now become assur! **Rabbah** replied, that is not so difficult to say, because we have a Mishna (stated previously) that says that onion leaves that grew in shmitta (from the rain, and possibly not nourished by the ground), if they are dark in color they are assur. Now, the leaves existed before shmitta, and yet we are saying that the additional growth turns the heter into assur! The same may be in the case of **R' Yochanan**. **R' Chisda** replied, that Mishna means that the *new* growth of the leaves becomes assur, not that the original leaf becomes assur. **Rabbah** asked, if so, how would we understand **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** in a Braisa, where he says that only the new growth is assur, but the original leaves are mutar? According to you, that is exactly what the **T"K** of the Mishna is saying!? **R' Chisda** answered, the Mishna is actually the view of **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**.
 - It would seem that we would say that **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** holds this way only when the person did not go through the bother of replanting the onion. However, if he did go through that bother, the original growth would become batul to the new growth.
 - **Q:** We learned a Braisa earlier that says that when the maaser is replanted and grows, it does not become batul to the new growth!? **A:** Maaser is different, because the pasuk uses the double verbiage of "aaser ti'aaser".
- We have learned earlier, **R' Chanina Tirta'ah in the name of R' Yanai** said, if an onion of terumah is replanted, and the new growth exceeds the original onion, the onion is mutar, and is not considered to be terumah.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says, that which grows from terumah is considered to be terumah!? **A:** **R' Yanai** was referring to the growths of the growths of terumah.
 - **Q:** A Mishna already clearly says that the growths of the growths of terumah are mutar!? **A:** **R' Yanai** is teaching that this is so even when the seed of the produce is the type that does not decompose.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that the growths of tevel are mutar only when it is of the kind of produce whose seed decomposes. If it is not, then even the growths of the growths are assur. Presumably the same would hold true for terumah as well!? **A:** **R' Yanai** is teaching that if the new growth exceeds the old growth, then in that case the growths of the growths will be mutar even if the seed of this produce is not the type that decomposes.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HANODER MIN HAYEREK!!!