



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Nedarim Daf Yud Aleph

MISHNA

- If someone says "la'chullin (not chullin) that what I eat of yours", or he says "not kosher", "not fit", "not tahor", "tamei", "nossar", "piggul", it is assur for him to eat from the other person's food (his statements say to give the food the status of a korbon to him, and it is therefore assur).
- If someone says that another's items should be "like a lamb (a korbon)", "like the animal pen (presumably of hekdes)", "like wood (presumably of the Mizbe'ach)", "like the fires", "like the Mizbe'ach", "like the Heichal", "like Yerushalayim", or by making reference to one of the keilim of the Mizbe'ach, even if he doesn't explicitly make mention of a korbon, these terms create a neder via reference to a korbon.
 - **R' Yehuda** says, if one says an item should be Yerushalayim (he doesn't say "like"), he has said nothing.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Gemara explains, the word "la'chullin" means "not chullin", meaning that the person is saying that the items should be assur to him like a korbon (from his negative statement we infer his positive intent). Presumably the Mishna cannot follow the view of **R' Meir**, because he says that we don't infer a negative from positive or visa-versa. We see this from a Mishna where he says that a condition must be double sided (e.g. if "a" then "b", and if not "a" then not "b") to be a valid condition, and we don't infer one from the other. We must therefore say that our Mishna follows **R' Yehuda** (who says that the condition does not need to be doubled). However, the end of the Mishna states the opinion of **R' Yehuda**, which would mean that beginning of the Mishna is not!? **A:** The entire Mishna follows the view of **R' Yehuda**. The end of the Mishna should be read as saying, that if one says an item should be Yerushalayim it is not a neder, *because R' Yehuda* says that one who leaves out the "like" has said nothing at all.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** says that even saying "like Yerushalayim" does not create a neder until someone says "it should be like something that is offered in Yerushalayim"!? **A:** There are 2 Tanna'im who argue as to what the view of **R' Yehuda** is when a person says "it should be like Yerushalayim".
- A Braisa says, if a person says "chullin, or ha'chullin (the chullin), or ka'chullin (like chullin) that which I eat of yours" or "that which I don't eat of yours", no neder is created and all remains mutar (although the inference can be made that "what I eat of yours should not be chullin"). However, if he says "la'chullin that which I eat of yours" it is a neder and he is assur to eat from it. If he says "la'chullin that which I do not eat of yours", no neder is created and he is mutar.
 - **Q:** The first part of the Braisa must follow **R' Meir** who says that we do not make an inference from a person's statement. However, the later part of the Braisa says, if he says "la'chullin that which I do not eat of yours", no neder is created and he is mutar. Now, **R' Meir** says in a Mishna, if a person says "la'korbon I will not eat of yours", he has created a neder and is assur. The explanation of that shita cannot be based on an inference from what the person says, because **R' Meir** says we don't make an inference. **R' Abba** therefore explains, that we treat the statement as if he said "your items should be a korbon and therefore I will not eat from them". If so, in the Braisa as well, according to **R' Meir** we should understand the statement as saying "it is not chullin (i.e. it is a korbon) and therefore I will not eat from it"!? Why does the Braisa say that in this case he would be mutar!? **A:** The Tanna of this Braisa holds like **R' Meir** in one regard (that we don't make an inferences) and he argues with him in another regard (regarding how to interpret the statement of "la'korbon that which I don't eat of yours"). **A2: R'**

Ashi said, the beginning of the Braisa is discussing where the person said “*l’*chullin (as chullin) should be that which I don’t eat from you”. In that case **R’ Meir** says there is no neder, because a neder can only be created if we infer that what he does eat should be a korbon. The case where **R’ Meir** would agree that a neder is created is where the person says “*la’*chullin” (not chullin), which means he is saying the food should be not chullin, but rather a korbon.

TAHOR V’TAMEI NOSSAR U’PIGGUL ASSUR

- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked, if someone says that an item should be to him like the meat of a shelamim after the blood has been offered (in which case the meat may be eaten), does the item become assur?
 - **Q:** If he stated this explicitly why would it become assur? **A:** The case is where there is a piece of shelamim meat whose blood was offered, lying there, and the person says, “let this item be like that meat”. In that case, do we say he meant it to be like the essential state of a shelamim which is assur, or did he mean to compare it to the meat as is, in which case it is mutar?
 - **A: Rava** said, our Mishna says that if someone says an item should have the status of nossar, it is an effective neder. Now, a neder through comparison is only created when the comparison is made to something which itself is assur through a neder. The issur of nossar is not created through a neder. Therefore, the Mishna must hold that reference to nossar is a reference to the korbon before the offering of the blood, at which time it was assur through a neder. We see that the comparison to the meat must refer to the time before the offering of the blood.
 - **R’ Huna the son of R’ Nosson** said, it may be that the Mishna is referring to the nossar of an Olah, which never became mutar to eat, and as such has been assur from a neder the entire time.
 - **Q: Rava** said, if that is correct, the Mishna should have said that the comparison was made to the meat of an Olah!? Why the need to even mention nossar at all? **A: R’ Huna the son of R’ Nosson** said, the Mishna is teaching that even though he compares it to nossar, and one might think that it should not create a neder, because the issur of nossar was not created through a neder, it is still assur, because the comparison is made to the korbon before it becomes assur as nossar, at which time it was assur as the subject of a neder.