



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Nedarim, Daf 7 – Daf 7

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 7---4-----

- The Gemara had asked how it is possible for one to be oiver on lo si'acher for the promise of nezirus, since the moment that the promise is made he becomes a nazir. The Gemara gave some answers and now continues with more.
  - **R' Acha the son of R' Ika** said, a nazir can be oiver the lav of lo si'acher if he doesn't shave his head when he is supposed to. This is so even according to the view that shaving of the head is not essential. Still, it is a mitzvah, and delaying it would be an issue of lo si'acher.
  - **Mar Zutra the son of R' Mari** said, a nazir can be oiver lo si'acher if he delays in bringing the obligatory korbanos at the end of his nezirus period.
    - **Q:** We would not need to learn this from the hekesh, because we could learn this from the pasuk that teaches that all korbanos that are delayed in being brought are subject to lo si'acher!? **A:** We would have thought that since there is a novelty with regard to the halachos of nezirus, the lav does not apply. The hekesh therefore teaches that it does apply.
      - **Q:** What is the novelty? It can't be based on the fact that a person cannot make a neder to bring the chatas of a nazir, because that applies to any chatas!? **A:** The Gemara says, the novelty is that a person who accepts nezirus only with regard to the aspect of eating grapes seeds, is considered to have accepted a full nezirus upon himself, with regard to all laws of nezirus. Since there is this novelty, we would think that the lav of lo si'acher wouldn't apply. The hekesh teaches that it does.
        - **Q:** This answer doesn't work according to **R' Shimon**, who says that this person would *not* be subject to nezirus based on this qualified promise!? Also, this novelty is a chumra, and would therefore not be a reason to prevent a lav from taking effect!? **A:** The novelty is, that although a nazir must bring 3 korbanos, if he only brings one and shaves his head he becomes free from nezirus. Since that is the case, we would think that lo si'acher would not apply. The hekesh therefore teaches that it does.
        - **A:** We can also say that the novelty is as stated above, that a person cannot make a neder to bring the chatas of a nazir. Although we asked that one cannot make a neder to bring any other chatas either, we would say that other chatas are brought to bring a kaparah, and they are therefore subject to lo si'acher. The chatas of a nazir is not, and we would therefore think it should not be subject to lo si'acher.
          - **Q:** The chatas of a woman who gave birth is not brought for kaparah and yet is subject to lo si'acher!? **A:** Her chatas permits her to eat kodashim, which she must do for mitzvos (e.g. the Korbon Pesach). Therefore, that makes sense that it is subject to lo si'acher. However, the chatas of a nazir would be thought not to be subject to lo si'acher.
  - **Q:** The Gemara earlier quoted the Braisa that said that a hekesh teaches that just as a father may annul the vows of his daughter and a husband may annul the vows of his wife, a father may also annul the nezirus of his daughter and a husband may annul the nezirus of his wife. Why is a hekesh needed to teach this? Why can't we learn this directly from nedarim, since it is seemingly a similar concept!? **A:** We would think that they can annul nedarim because there is no time limit associated with nedarim. However, nezirus has a time limit, and therefore it may be that they can't annul the nezirus. The hekesh therefore teaches that they can annul nezirus as well.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

HA'OMER L'CHAVEIRO MUDAR ANI...

- **Shmuel** said, all the phrases of the Mishna (e.g. “I am separated from you”, “I am distanced from you”, etc.) only create a neder if they are accompanied by the phrases of the next part of the Mishna (“that what I eat from you”, “that what I taste from you”).
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, if one says “I am vowed from you” or “I am separated from you” or “I am distanced from you”, he has created a neder and is therefore assur. If one says “that what I eat from you” or “that what I taste from you”, he is likewise assur. We see that even the first statements alone create a neder!?  
**A:** The Braisa means to say, that the first phrases create a neder *only when* the second phrases are added afterwards.
    - **Q:** A Braisa says, if one says “that what I eat from you” or “that what I taste from you”, he is assur. If one says “I am vowed from you” or “I am separated from you” or “I am distanced from you”, he is likewise assur. This can't be understood as the previous Braisa was understood. If so, we see that each set of phrases alone can create a neder, not like **Shmuel** said!? **A:** The Braisa should be understood as saying that the first list of phrases is necessary to be stated to create a neder *even if* the second list was said as well.
      - **Q:** That would mean that both Braisos are saying the exact same thing!? Also, if this is correct, why would the Braisa twice say that the person is “assur” (since it is one Halacha stated in the Braisa it should only be stated once)!? **A:** **Shmuel** must have said that when a person adds “that what I eat from you” or “that what I taste from you”, the person becomes assur in the other person's possessions, but the “other person” remains mutar in the possessions of the one who made the neder. However, if a person only says “I am vowed from you” or “I am separated from you” or “I am distanced from you”, they each become assur in each other's possessions.
        - **R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** said this as well.

### -----Daf 7---5-----

- **Q:** A Mishna says, if a person says “I am cheirem to you”, the one who made the neder is mutar to benefit from the other person, but the other person is assur to benefit from the one who made the vow. Now, according to **Shmuel** and **R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** both people should be assur to benefit from each other!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing where the one who made the neder specifically added “but you should not become cheirem to me”.
- **Q:** The same Mishna says, if a person says “you are cheirem to me”, he becomes assur to benefit from the other person but the other person remains mutar to benefit from him. Now, according to **Shmuel** and **R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** both people should be assur to benefit from each other!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing where the one who made the neder specifically added “but I should not become cheirem to you”.
  - **Q:** This would mean that if no such statement was added, they would both be assur to each other. However, when the Mishna wants to give an example of a case where they are both assur to each other, it gives the case where the person says “I am cheirem on you and you are cheirem on me”. This suggests that when the mirroring statement is not made, even if he doesn't add that there is no cheirem in the one direction, only one of the 2 would be assur to benefit from the other one!? **A:** It must be that **R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** said that if a person says “I am vowed *to* you”, both people are assur to benefit from each other. However, if a person says “I am vowed *from* you”, the one who made the neder is assur to benefit from the other person, but the other person remains mutar to benefit from the one who made the vow.
    - **Q:** Our Mishna is a case of where someone says “I am vowed *from* you” and we said that **Shmuel** said that if he doesn't say “from what I eat from you” or “taste from you”, they both become assur to benefit from each other!? **A:** It must be that what **Shmuel** said is, if a person says “from what I eat from you” or “from what I taste of you”, he only becomes assur to *eat*

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

from the other person. However, if he uses one of the phrases like “I am vowed from you”, etc., he becomes assur to have *any sort of benefit* from the other person.

- **Q:** If this is correct, why didn't **Shmuel** clearly state this difference? **A:** It must be that **Shmuel** said, when a person says “from what I eat from you” or “from what I taste of you” he becomes assur with that neder. However, if a person uses one of the phrases such as “I am vowed from you”, etc., he does not become assur at all, because they are not clearly phraseologies of a neder: “I am vowed from you” may mean that he will not talk to the other person; “I am separated from you” may mean that he will not do business with him; “I am distanced from you” may mean that he will not stand next to him.
- **Q:** Maybe we should say that **Shmuel** holds that yados that are inconclusive (not clearly stated, and can be understood in multiple ways) are not valid yados and therefore do not create a neder? **A:** Yes. **Shmuel** will say that our Mishna follows **R' Yehuda** who has that view.
  - **Q:** Why would **Shmuel** interpret the Mishna to follow **R' Yehuda** and not interpret it in a way to follow the **Rabanan** who argue on **R' Yehuda**? **A:** **Rava** said, **Shmuel** felt that since the Mishna says “from what I eat of yours” and “from what I taste of yours”, the Mishna shows that it requires very clear and conclusive yados to create a neder.
- It was taught that **Abaye** says that yados that are inconclusive are considered yados, and **Rava** says that they are not considered yados.
  - **Rava** said, his reasoning is based on **R' Idi**, who said that the pasuk of “nazir l'hazir” teaches that just as nezirus only takes effect when made in a clear, conclusive statement (based on a drasha of the word “yafli”), so too the yados (learned from the pasuk of nazir l'hazir) are also only effective when they are conclusive.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can say that **Abaye** and **Rava** argue in the same machlokes as the one between **R' Yehuda** and the **Rabanan** who argue whether a get is effective when it just says “you are mutar to all other people”. In that case **R' Yehuda** says that is not effective and the **Rabanan** say that it is. **A:** **Abaye** can say that he can even agree with **R' Yehuda** in the case of get because a get must be something that clearly separates the couple, and an inconclusive statement does not do so. However in other circumstances it may be that **R' Yehuda** would agree with **Abaye**. **Rava** would say that he can even hold like the **Rabanan**, because any such language in a get is enough. A person does not divorce someone else's wife and therefore need not state that he is specifically giving this from him to his wife. However, it may be that the **Rabanan** would agree with **Rava** in other circumstances.

### -----Daf 1--6-----

- **Q:** A Braisa says, if someone says about an object “it is to me” or “this is to me”, it becomes assur, because the phrases are considered a yad to making the item a korbon. Now, this seems to be so only because he added the words “to me”. If not, it would seem that it would not become assur, because the statement would be inconclusive. This refutes **Abaye** who says that even an inconclusive statement is effective to create a neder!? **A:** **Abaye** would say, that without saying the words “to me” the statement is completely ambiguous, because the statement of “this is” may just as easily mean the he intends to make the object hefker or tzedaka. However, in a less ambiguous case, we would still say that a yad need not be conclusive to be effective.
  - **Q:** The Braisa clearly says that the statement is effective in creating a *korbon*, meaning that it is not ambiguous as to the intent!? **A:** The Braisa actually means that even without the words of “to me”, it

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

would still be assur. However, without the words “to me” the object becomes assur to everybody in the world. When he says “to me” he makes the object only assur to him, and to no one else.

- **Q:** A Braisa says, if a person says about an animal “this is hereby an asham” or “this one is hereby a chatas” it is not effective in creating the asham or the chatas. If he says “this is hereby *my* asham” or “*my* chatas” and he was obligated to bring a chatas or an asham, it is effective. This refutes **Abaye!**? **A:** **Abaye** would say that this Braisa follows **R’ Yehuda**. Although **Abaye** said earlier that **R’ Yehuda** would agree with him in areas other than get, **Abaye** must now retract from that statement.
  - Although **Abaye** now agrees that he can’t hold like **R’ Yehuda**, **Rava** would still say that he can hold like the **Rabanan**, and it is only in regard to a get that the **Rabanan** would say that inconclusive yados are effective.
- **Q: R’ Pappa** asked, is there a concept of yados for kiddushin or not?
  - **Q:** The Gemara asks, what would be the case of yados for kiddushin? If the case is where he tells one woman “harei aht mikudeshes li” and tells a second woman “and you too”, that is a clear statement of kiddushin to the second woman, and not just yados. **A:** It must be where he tells the second woman “and you”. **R’ Pappa** is asking whether that means he is giving her kiddushin as well, or whether it is a proposal for marriage, but not an actual kiddushin.
    - **Q:** We find that **R’ Pappa** asked **Abaye** (when discussing the topic of kiddushin) whether **Shmuel** holds that an inconclusive yad is effective. By him asking that, it shows that he does agree that there is a concept of yados, and he is only questioning whether an inconclusive yad would be effective!? **A:** **R’ Pappa** may have asked that to point out an inconsistency in the shitah of **Shmuel**, but he in fact may have not agreed that there is necessarily a concept of yados by kiddushin.
- **Q: R’ Pappa** asked, is there a concept of yados for peyah or not?
  - **Q:** The Gemara asks, what would be the case of yados for peyah? If the case is where he says “this patch should be peyah, and this one too”, that is a clear statement of peyah, and not even a yad!? **A:** The case would be where he says “this patch should be peyah and this one”, without saying “also”.
    - **Q:** This suggests that if someone says “this entire field should be peyah” it all becomes peyah? **A:** That is correct, and a Braisa clearly says this as well.
  - **R’ Pappa’s** question is based on the fact that we have a hekesh from peyah to korbanos. His question is, do we compare that just as korbanos have the concept of yados, peyah does as well, or do we say that it is only compared for purposes of baal ti’acher.

### -----Daf 7-----

- **Q:** Is there a concept of yados by tzedaka?
  - **Q:** What would be the case of yados? If it is where a person says “Let this coin be tzedaka, and this one too”, that would be a clear statement of tzedaka on the second coin!? **A:** The case must be where he says “let this coin be tzedaka, and that one”, without saying “too”. If we say yados, this would mean for tzedaka as well. If we don’t, this would mean he intends for the second coin to go for payment of some other expense.
  - The question hinges on whether the hekesh of tzedaka to korbon only teaches regarding baal ti’acher, or whether it also teaches that there are yados by tzedaka as well.
- **Q:** Is there a concept of yados by hefker?
  - **Q:** Hefker seems to be the same thing as tzedaka!? **A:** The question is, do we say that even if there are yados by tzedaka that is only because of the hekesh, and the question then is whether hefker essentially is tzedaka and therefore would also have yados? Or do we say that tzedaka is different, because it is given to the poor people, whereas hefker is free to be taken by all people?
- **Q: Ravina** asked, is there the concept of yados regarding the designation of an area as a bathroom?
  - **Q:** What would be the case of yados? If it is where a person says “Let this room be a bathroom, and this one too”, that would be a clear statement of designation as a bathroom on the second room!? **A:** The

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

case must be where he says “let this room be a bathroom, and that one”, without saying “too”. If we say yados, this would mean for a bathroom as well. If we don’t, this would mean he intends for the second room to be used for other purposes.

- **Q:** This would seem to mean that **Ravina** clearly holds that a verbal designation is effective in giving a room the status of a bathroom. However, we find that **Ravina** is actually unsure whether a verbal designation is effective!? **A:** **Ravina** was unsure. However, he asked further, that if we say a verbal designation is effective, are yados effective as well.
- With regard to this question, the Gemara remains with a **TEIKU**.

MENUDA ANI LECHA...

- **Abaye** said, although **R’ Akiva** held l’chumra in this case, he would agree that a person would not get malkus for violating this neder. We can see this from the fact that the Mishna doesn’t say **R’ Akiva** was machmir, but rather says that he struggled and came out l’chumra.
- **R’ Pappa** said, if a person says “I am detached from you” all would agree (**R’ Akiva** and the **Rabanan** who argue on him) that he would be assur through a neder. If a person says “I am excommunicated from you”, all would agree that there would be no neder. The machlokes is where he says “I am *menudah* from you”. **R’ Akiva** says this is similar to saying “detached” and the **Rabanan** say this is similar to saying “excommunicated”.
  - We find that **R’ Chisda** held that **R’ Akiva** even argued in the case of where one used the term of “excommunicated”.
- **R’ Illa in the name of Rav** said, if a person was put into cheirem while he was there, he may not be freed from cheirem unless he is there. If he was put into cheirem without him being there, he may be freed even without him being there.
- **R’ Chanin in the name of Rav** said, if someone hears a person use the Name of Hashem in vain, he must put that person into cheirem. If he does not, he himself should be put into cheirem.
  - The mention of the Name of Hashem in vain is so severe, because it brings about poverty, which is the equivalent of death.
  - **R’ Abba** said that he saw a woman say Hashem’s Name in vain in front of **R’ Huna**, and **R’ Huna** put her into cheirem and immediately freed her. He said we can learn 3 things from here: that a person who says Hashem’s Name in vain must be put into cheirem; that one who is put into cheirem in front of him must be freed in front of him as well; and there does not need to be a space of time between the putting into cheirem and the release from cheirem.
- **R’ Gidal in the name of Rav** said, a talmid chochom may put himself into cheirem and free himself from cheirem.
  - **Q:** This is obvious (since he put himself in, he can take himself out)!? **A:** We would think that we say a prisoner cannot remove himself from prison.
  - This practice was done by **Mar Zutra Chasida**. When he had to put a talmid in cheirem, he would first put himself in cheirem and then the talmid. When he then went home, he would first release himself from cheirem, and would then release the talmid.
- **R’ Gidal in the name of Rav** darshened a pasuk to teach that one may swear to keep a mitzvah. Although we are already under an oath from Har Sinai, we allow people to do this to encourage themselves to fulfill the mitzvah.

-----Daf 7---8-----

- **R’ Gidal in the name of Rav** said, if a person makes an oath to wake up early and learn a certain perek or mesechta, he has obligated himself to a great oath to Hashem.
  - **Q:** He is already obligated to an oath to do so from Har Sinai!? If **Rav** means to say that we allow this oath so that the person should encourage himself to fulfill this mitzvah, **Rav** already taught that in his last statement!? **A:** He teaches that since a person can fulfil his learning obligation by saying shema in the morning and the evening, an oath to learn more than that is effective.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Gidal in the name of Rav** said, if someone tells his friend “let us get up early and learn a particular perek”, the obligation is on the speaker to get there earlier than his friend. We see this from a pasuk where Hashem told Yechezkel to meet Him early, and the Shechina was there before Yechezkel even got there.
- **R' Yosef** said, if one dreamed that he was being put in cheirem, he needs 10 people to free him of this cheirem. These 10 people must be people who learn Gemara. If he can't find 10 such people, he should find 10 who learn Mishnayos. If he can't find 10 such people, he should sit at a crossroads and exchange greetings with 10 people (their reply of “Shalom” will help protect him from harm in the meantime) until he is able to find 10 people who learn Gemara to free him from the cheirem.
  - **Q: Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, what if he knows who put him in cheirem in the dream? Can he go to that person to free him? **A:** He answered, that the person was made a shaliach to put him into cheirem (from Heaven), but was not made the shaliach to free him from the cheirem.
  - **Q: R' Acha** asked **R' Ashi**, what if he was put in cheirem in the dream and then freed in the dream? Is he considered freed? **A:** He said, every dream has some nonsense in it as well. We must be concerned that the freeing from cheirem was the nonsense part, and he is therefore not considered as freed.
- **Ravina's** wife wanted to have her vow annulled. He asked **R' Ashi** whether a husband may act as agent and have the vow annulled for her in front of Beis Din. **R' Ashi** told him, if the 3 people were already gathered together, he may do so. However, if he would have to gather them together, he may not do so for her.
  - We learn 3 halachos from this story: a husband may act as a shaliach for his wife to have her vow annulled; a chochom may not annul a vow in the place of his rebbi; and, that the husband may only do so if the 3 people have already been gathered.
    - With regard to freeing from cheirem, a chochom may do so even in the place of his rebbi. Also, even a single chochom may free one from cheirem (3 people would not be needed).
- It was said in the name of **R' Yehuda bar Illai**, the pasuk that says that the special sun will shine for those who fear Hashem's Name, refers to people who are afraid to say Hashem's Name in vain.
  - **Abaye** said, this special sun has healing powers. **Reish Lakish** said, this refers to healing powers in Olam Habah, not on this world.

### -----Daf 9-----

#### MISHNA

- If a person says “like the neder of resha'im” (meaning a neder, because righteous people don't make nedarim at all), it is an effective neder, either in regard to nezirus, or a korbon, or a shevuah.
- If a person says “like the neder of the kesheirim”, it is not an effective neder (because righteous people don't make nedarim). If he says “like the nedavos of the kesheirim” (they do give nedavos), it is an effective neder in regard to nezirus or a korbon.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** Maybe the person meant to say that he is *not* making a neder like that of resha'im, so why is it an effective neder? **A: Shmuel** said, the Mishna is discussing where after saying “like the neder of resha'im”, he adds “am I” – which would make him a nazir, or he adds “on me” – which would obligate him to bring a korbon, or he adds “from it” – which would obligate him as a shevuah.
  - **Q:** Maybe when he says “am I” he meant to say that he will observe a fast!? **A: Shmuel** said, the case is where there is a nazir walking by him as he makes the statement
  - **Q:** Why is he subject to a shevuah not to eat when he says “from it”? Maybe he means that he *will* eat from eat? **A: Rava** said, the case is where he specifically said he will *not* eat from it. The chiddush is that this is considered to be a shevuah and he is therefore obligated to live by it.

#### KINIDREI KISHEIRIM LO AMAR KLUM KINIDVOSAM NADAR...

- **Q:** Who is the Tanna who holds that it is inappropriate to make a neder, but it is appropriate to make a nedava? It seems not to be **R' Meir** or **R' Yehuda**, because a Braisa says that **R' Meir** says it is better to never make a neder at all (even if you end up fulfilling the promise), and **R' Yehuda** says the best is if someone makes a neder

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

and fulfills it. We see that neither of them make a difference between a neder and a nedavah!? **A:** We can say that our Mishna follows **R' Meir**, and in the Braisa he was only referring to a neder, not a nedavah.

- **Q:** Our Mishna says, if he says “like the nedavos of the kesheirim” (they do give nedavos), it is an effective *neder* in regard to nezirus or a korbon. We see they make nedarim!? **A:** Change the word to read that it is an effective “nedavah” of nezirus or korbon.
- **Q:** Presumably a neder should not be made because of the risk that it will not be fulfilled. Why isn't a nedavah frowned upon for the same reason? **A:** It is a good thing if done like Hillel, who would make a nedavah of a korbon and not make it kadosh until it was already in the Azarah. By doing so it prevented any violation of the nedavah.
  - **Q:** This can explain how a korbon can be brought as a nedavah in a righteous way. How will a nedavah of nezirus be able to be done in a righteous way? **A:** The case would be as we find in a Braisa, that teaches that Shimon Hatzadik said he never ate from the asham of a tamei nazir except for once, when he saw that the nazir had absolute pure intention, because he had accepted nezirus so that he could cut his hair off for the sake of Hashem. Such a promise of nezirus, being so pure in intent, will clearly not be violated and would be considered a righteous thing.
    - **Q: R' Mani** asked, why is it that he didn't eat from the asham of a tamei nazir (presumably because it was being brought for an aveirah)? All ashamos are brought for an aveirah, and he therefore should not have eaten from any asham!? **A: R' Yonah** said, the reason is that when a nazir becomes tamei and he must then recount days of nezirus, he begins to regret having accepted nezirus upon himself, and that leads to the entire promise of nezirus to become nullified, thereby making the korbon that they bring as being truly chullin, which should never have been brought as a korbon in the first place.
      - **Q:** Based on this reasoning, he should not have eaten from a tahor nazir either, because of the regret he may have felt!? **A:** If he only keeps his originally planned term, he doesn't regret it, and the korbon is therefore a valid korbon. It is only when he becomes tamei, thereby increasing the days of nezirus, that he begins to regret.

### -----Daf 10-----

- The Gemara had asked that the Mishna seems to say that nedarim are not a good thing, but nedavos are. This seems not to follow **R' Meir** or **R' Yehuda** of a Braisa. The Gemara has given an answer how the Mishna can follow **R' Meir**. The Gemara now says that the Mishna can also follow **R' Yehuda**. When **R' Yehuda** said in the Braisa that making a neder and fulfilling it is considered to be a noble thing, he actually meant that making a *nedavah* and fulfilling it is a noble thing, and the word “neder” in that Braisa should be changed to “nedavah”.
  - **Q:** Presumably a neder should not be made, because of the risk that it will not be fulfilled. Why isn't a nedavah frowned upon for the same reason? **A:** It is a good thing if done like the shita of **R' Yehuda**, who says that a person should bring the animal into the Azarah, and first make it kodesh there. That prevents violations from happening.
    - **Q:** This can explain how a korbon can be brought as a nedavah in a righteous way. How will a nedavah of nezirus be able to be done in a righteous way? **A:** This would be like **R' Yehuda** in a Braisa who says that the Early Chassidim would accept nezirus just to afford themselves the opportunity of bringing a korbon chatas (they didn't do aveiros and therefore would not have any other opportunity to do so).
      - The Braisa continues and says that **R' Shimon** says these Chassidim would not accept nezirus upon themselves, because one who does so is referred to as a sinner in the pasuk.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Abaye** shows how this view is shared by **Shimon Hatzadik, R' Shimon, and R' Elazar Hakapar** – who adds that if a nazir is called a sinner for having pained himself by abstaining from wine, how much more of a sinner a person would be if he abstained from even more. For this reason, one who fasts is called a sinner.
- Although the pasuk that calls him a sinner is written regarding a tamei nazir, it means to include a tahor nazir as well. The reason it is written by a tamei nazir is that he has doubly sinned (he abstained from wine, and has now become tamei as a nazir).

### MISHNA

- If one uses the verbiage of “konam”, “konach”, or “konas”, these are considered kinuyim for “korbon”. If one says “cheirek”, “cheirech”, or “cheiref”, these are kinuyim for “cheirem”. If one says “nazik”, “naziach”, or “paziach”, these are kinuyim for “nezirus”. If one says “shevusa”, “shekukah”, or “neder b'Mohi” (this is a nickname for Moshe Rabbeinu) these are kinuyim of “shevuah”.

### GEMARA

- **R' Yochanan** says kinuyim are the terms in other languages. **Reish Lakish** says these are words created by the **Chachomim** to use for nedarim, etc.
  - **Q:** Why would the **Rabanan** create words instead of using the regular words? **A:** They didn't want people using the word “korbon” (or the other main words), because it may lead to people saying “korbon LaShem”, which may lead to people saying “LaShem korbon”, which runs the risk of people saying “LaShem” and not completing with the word korbon, and thereby saying the Name of Hashem in vain. We find that **R' Shimon** spells out this concern in a Braisa.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can say that they argue in the machlokes between **B”S** and **B”H** of a Braisa? A Braisa says, **B”S** say that if a neder is made using kinuyim of the kinuyim, it is effective in creating a neder. **B”H** say that it would not create a neder. Maybe we can say that **B”S** hold that kinuyim are other languages, and therefore further kinuyim are also effective, and that **B”H** say that kinuyim are words created by the **Rabanan**, and therefore any other kinuyim would be ineffective? **A:** It may be that all agree that kinuyim are other languages, and the machlokes is whether these additional words are actually words of nedarim in the other languages. **A2:** It may be that **B”S** are goizer the kinuyim of kinuyim so that people not come to treat regular kinuyim as not being a neder, whereas **B”H** are not goizer.
    - The Gemara then lists the kinuyim of kinuyim for nedarim, charamim, nezirus, and shavuos. It then asks whether certain similar terminology would also be kinuyim of kinuyim and leaves it as a **TEIKU**.

### NEDER B'MOHI HAREI EILU KINUYIN

- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, if someone says “by Mohi” it is not a neder. However, if someone says “with the neder of Mohi” (referring to a neder of Moshe) that is considered kinuyim of a shevuah.