



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

Nedarim Daf Nun Daled

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 tells 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 **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.