



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

### Nedarim Daf Nun Tes

- **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.
- 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 issur! 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!!!**