



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Mishna

The *Mishna* had stated: If someone says to his friend, “*Konam* that I will enter your house,” or “that I will buy your property,” if the original owner died or sold the house or property, he may enter the house or buy the property. However, if he said, “*Konam* that I will enter *this* house or buy *this* field,” even if the original owner died or sold the property, he is forbidden to enter the house or purchase the property.

Prohibiting Something for After it Leaves his Ownership

Avimi inquired: If one said to his friend, “*Konam*, your entering this house,” and then he dies or sold it to someone else, what is the *halacha*? Does a person have the ability to prohibit something presently in his ownership, and the prohibition will remain even after it leaves his ownership or not?

Rava said: This can be resolved from the following *Mishna*: One who says to his son, “*Konam* that you cannot benefit from me”; if he dies, his son may inherit him (*since the possessions do not belong to the father any longer*). If he said in his vow, “while I am alive and even after I die,” he may not inherit him. It is evident that a person has the ability to prohibit something presently in his ownership, and the prohibition will remain even after it leaves his ownership!

The *Gemora* cites a *Mishna*: If one says, “These fruits are a *konam* upon me,” or “They should be a *konam* upon my mouth,” or “They should be a *konam* to my mouth,” he is forbidden to derive benefit from that which is exchanged for them and what grows from them.

Ra”n Elucidated

[*Since he specified the things that were forbidden to him, he made them like hekdesch for himself. For that reason, he is forbidden what is exchanged from them, just as what is exchanged for and what grows from hekdesch is forbidden.*]

Exchange Items

Rami bar Chama inquired: If he said, “These fruits should be a *konam* upon So-and-so,” what is the *halacha* regarding the items received in exchange for them?

The *Gemora* explains: Do we say that with respect to himself, since he can forbid his friend’s property upon himself, he can likewise forbid to himself what is not yet in existence (*such as the items that he will receive in exchange for the forbidden fruits*)? However, in regards to his friend, we can say that since one cannot prohibit another person’s produce to his friend, he likewise cannot prohibit items that are non-existent

upon his fellow. Or perhaps, the reason that the prohibition includes exchange items is because they are regarded as if they grew from the forbidden item. And then we would say that just like the exchange items are forbidden in a case when he declared a *neder* upon himself, so too, it should apply when he declared a *neder* upon his friend.

Ra"n Elucidated

[He was not asking only about konamos, but was also in doubt regarding all kinds of forbidden benefit in general. This explains why the Gemora will shortly offer a proof from one who marries a woman with fruits of orlah.

He was not inquiring whether it is permitted to exchange these forbidden fruits, for it is certainly forbidden to sell or exchange anything from which it is forbidden to derive benefit. For if you would argue that one would be permitted to sell something which is forbidden to have benefit from, it will emerge that chametz on Pesach will have a value, because he would be able to sell them to an idolater. Why then, would the Mishna say that one who steals them is not liable to pay back? Rather, it is certainly obvious that it is forbidden to sell these items, and Rami's inquiry is regarding one who transgressed and exchanged them.

The inquiry is only relevant to the person who transgressed and exchanged the forbidden items. These exchange items are definitely permitted to other people.

*This is the primary concern: Do we say that the reason that the Mishna ruled that the exchange items are forbidden is because that was the intention of the one who declared the *neder*, and since it is because of his*

*intention, only to himself can he forbid it by *neder*? He would not be able to prohibit it to someone else.*

Or perhaps, it has nothing to do with his intention. Rather, the Rabbinic law is that anything exchanged for a forbidden item is forbidden, and therefore, there would be no distinction whether he forbade it to himself or someone else forbade it to him.]

The Gemora states: Perhaps it can be resolved from the following Mishna: If one marries a woman with fruits of orlah (the fruit that grows from a tree; the first three years of its life, they are forbidden for all benefit), she is not married. If he sold the orlah fruits, and married her with the money, the *kiddushin* is valid.

Ra"n Elucidated

[The Gemora thinks that since it is forbidden to derive benefit from what has been exchanged, even if he transgressed and had benefit and exchanged it for something else, the exchange of the exchange would be forbidden. For that reason, it is problematic that if he transgressed and married with the money, that she be completely married and wouldn't be required to be married again. For if the exchanged items are Rabbinically forbidden, we would require another betrothal.]

The Gemora objects to this: Perhaps it is only initially forbidden to derive benefit from an exchanged item, but if he did derive benefit from it (by exchanging it for another item), he has done so (and he would even be permitted to derive benefit from that secondary exchange item). (47a – 47b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

The prohibition remaining even after the item leaves his possession

Avimi inquired: If one said to his friend, “*Konam*, your entering this house,” and then he dies or sold it to someone else, what is the *halacha*? Does a person have the ability to prohibit something presently in his ownership, and the prohibition will remain even after it leaves his ownership or not?

The Nimukei Yosef cites a Ritva, who quotes the following Yerushalmi: A person will only have the ability to prohibit something presently in his ownership, and the prohibition will remain even after it leaves his ownership. However, he cannot initially prohibit the item only for the time after it leaves his possession.

The Haflaas Nedarim explains: The only reason that someone would have the ability to prohibit something presently in his ownership, and the prohibition will remain even after it leaves his ownership is because it is similar to *hekdesh*. Since the item in question is presently in his possession, the *neder* takes effect and the prohibition remains on this object forever just like *hekdesh*. However, one does not have the ability to consecrate an item that is presently not in his possession, and therefore, a *neder* to prohibit something only for the time after it leaves his possession will not take effect.

The *Korban* Nesanel asks: Why couldn’t this inquiry be resolved from the *Gemora* above (42a-b) which concluded that if one says to his fellow, “These possessions should be forbidden to you”; if he vowed prior to *shemitah*, he may not enter his field and he may not eat from the fruits which are growing on the branches outside of his field even when *shemitah*

arrives? This is because a person has the ability to prohibit something presently in his ownership, and the prohibition will remain even after it leaves his ownership! Shouldn’t the *halacha* be the same in our case where he sold the property to someone else?

He answers that *shemitah* is different. Since the vower has the right to acquire the fruits that are growing just like anyone else, it is regarded as if it is still in his possession, and that is why the fruits remain forbidden. (*This is a tremendous chiddush that something can be considered yours because you have the right to acquire it.*) However, the *Gemora’s* inquiry here is regarding a case where he sold the property. In this case, the item is not in his possession at all, and perhaps, the prohibition will not remain after it leaves his possession.

The *Shitah Mikubetzes* answers that Avimi did not know the conclusion of the *Gemora* above and that is why he made this inquiry.