

27 Tammuz 5775  
July 14, 2015



Nedarim Daf 51

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

### ***Bar Kappara and Rebbe***

Bar Kappara said to Rebbe’s daughter, “Tomorrow I will drink wine to your father’s dancing and your mother’s singing.”

[\*\*\* How could Bar Kappara suggest that he would listen to the singing of Rebbe’s wife? Shouldn’t that be forbidden on account of *kol islah*? (*Rosh, Ben Yehoyada, Shalmei Nedarim*)]

Ben Elesah, a very wealthy man, was the son-in-law of Rebbe. Bar Kappara was invited to the wedding of Rabbi Shimon the son of Rebbe. At the wedding, Bar Kappara asked Rebbe, “What is meant by the word *to’eivah* (abomination) when the Torah writes: *You shall not lie with a man as one lies with a woman, it is a to’eivah*? Every explanation suggested by Rebbe was refuted by him, so Rebbe said to him, “Explain it yourself.” He replied, “Let your wife come and pour me a drink first.” She came and did so. He then said to Rebbe, “Arise and dance in front of me and then I may tell it to you.” Bar Kappara said (*after Rebbe danced*), “This is what the Merciful One is saying: *to’eh atah bah* (*you are straying with this one*).

For his second cup he asked him, Bar Kappara asked Rebbe, “What is meant by the word *tevel* (perversion) when the Torah writes: *A woman shall not stand before an animal for mating, it is a tevel*?” Every explanation

suggested by Rebbe was refuted by him, so Rebbe said to him, “Explain it yourself.” He replied, “Do for me like you did before and I will tell you.” After Rebbe complied, Bar Kappara said *‘tevel hu’* means: Is there any spice (*enjoyment*) in it? Is intimacy with an animal different than all other intimacies (*that the woman will pursue it*)?

Bar Kappara further questioned, “What is meant by the word *zimah* (depravity) when the Torah writes: *Do not profane your daughter to make her a harlot, lest the earth become lewd and the land become filled with zimmah*?” Bar Kappara said, “Do for me like you did before and I will tell you.” After Rebbe complied, Bar Kappara said *‘zimmah’* means *zo mah hi* (*who is this child; we would not know for certain who is the father of the child born from this woman*).

Ben Elesah could not endure all this (*the manner in which Bar Kappara was treating his father-in-law*), so he and his wife left.

The *Gemora* asks: What was known about Ben Elesah? The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: Ben Elesah did not throw away his money for nothing (upon receiving an expensive haircut), but, he wanted to show people the haircut of a *Kohen Gadol*.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: A *Kohen Gadol* should take a Lulianic haircut. Rav Yehudah explains: It is an

extremely unique type of haircut. How is that? Rava said: The end of one hair reaches the roots of the neighboring hair and such was the haircut of a *Kohen Gadol*. (51a)

### **Mishna**

The *Mishna* states: If a person prohibits himself by vow from what is prepared in a pot, he is prohibited only from what is prepared by extensive boiling.

If a person says, “*Konam* that I do not taste that which goes down in a pot,” he is prohibited from anything which is cooked in a pot. (*This Mishna is basically the same as the Mishna on 49a. Perhaps the Mishna should not have been cited before; its correct location is here.*) (51a)

### **Pots and Pans**

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: If one made a *neder* that he will not eat anything which goes in a pot, he is prohibited to eat even food that went into a pan, for it initially went into a pot (*it was their practice when frying food in a pan that they would first cook it a little in a pot*). If one made a *neder* that he will not eat anything which goes in a pan, he is permitted to eat food that went into a pot.

If one made a *neder* that he will not eat anything which is completed in a pot, he is permitted to eat food that was completed in a pan. If one made a *neder* that he will not eat anything which is completed in a pan, he is permitted to eat food that was completed in a pot.

If he made a *neder* that he will not eat anything that went down in an oven, he is only forbidden in bread. However, if he said, “Anything which is prepared in an

oven is forbidden to me,” he is not allowed to eat anything that was prepared in an oven. (51a)

### **Mishna**

The *Mishna* states: If one makes a *neder* prohibiting himself from “the pickled food,” he is only forbidden from eating pickled vegetables. (*The Ra”n explains: Since he mentioned it with the definite article “the,” it means that which is most commonly pickled.*) If he says that he will not taste pickled food, he is forbidden to eat all pickled foods. (*The Ra”n explains: Since he mentioned it without the definite article, it means anything which is pickled.*)

If one makes a *neder* prohibiting himself from “the undercooked food,” he is only forbidden from eating undercooked meat. If he says that he will not taste undercooked food, he is forbidden to eat all undercooked foods. (51b)

Rav Acha the son of Rav Avya asked Rav Ashi: What is the *halacha* if he said, “that which is pickled”? What is the *halacha* if he said, “that which is undercooked”? What is the *halacha* if he said, “that which is roasted”? What is the *halacha* if he said, “that which is salted”? Are all foods of that type forbidden or only the most common one? (*The Ra”n explains: In the Mishna, he mentioned it with the definite article “the,” it means that which is most commonly pickled; here, he used the prefix (daled) “of.” Does this have the same connotation as “the”?*)

The *Gemora* leaves this question unresolved. (51b)

### **Mishna**



The *Mishna* states: If one makes a *neder* prohibiting himself from “the roast,” he is only forbidden from eating roast meat; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. If he said, “Roast that I will not taste,” he is forbidden to eat anything which is roasted. If one makes a *neder* prohibiting himself from “the salted food,” he is only forbidden from eating salted fish. If he said, “Salted food that I will not taste,” he is forbidden to eat anything which is salted.

If he said, “Fish, fishes that I will not taste,” he is forbidden from eating fish, whether large or small, whether salted or unsalted, whether raw or cooked, but he is permitted to eat chopped *taris* (a large fish; we say that his *neder* only included whole fish) and brine.

If one made a *neder* prohibiting himself from *tzachanah* (many small, salted fish; some of them are chopped up, but most of them are whole), he is prohibited from eating chopped *taris*, but he is permitted to eat brine and fish juice. If one prohibits himself from chopped *taris*, he is allowed to eat brine and fish juice. (51b)

### ***Dag and Dagah***

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar said: If one vows, saying, “Fish (*dag*) that I will not taste,” he is forbidden from eating large fish, but permitted to eat small ones. If he vows, saying, “Fish (*dagah*) that I will not taste,” he is forbidden from eating small fish, but permitted to eat large ones. If he vows, saying, “Fish (*dag*), fish (*dagah*) that I will not taste,” he is forbidden from eating large fish and small ones.

Rav Papa said to Abaye: How do we know that when he says, “Fish (*dag*) that I will not taste,” *dag* implies large ones only? It is because it is written [Yonah 2:1]: *Now Hashem had prepared a large fish (dag) to swallow up Yonah?* But isn’t it also written: Then Yonah prayed to Hashem, his God from the inside of the fish (*dagah*)?

The *Gemora* answers: This is no difficulty: Perhaps the large fish spit him out and he was swallowed again by a smaller one.

But, the *Gemora* asks: What of the verse regarding the plague of blood, where it is written [Shmos 7:21]: *And the fish (dagah) that was in the river died?* Did only the small fish die, not the large?

The *Gemora* concludes: *Dagah* written in the Torah implies both large and small, but regarding vows, the language used by the public is followed. (51b)

### **DAILY MASHAL**

#### ***Large Fish, Small Fish***

Rav Papa said to Abaye: How do we know that when he says, “Fish (*dag*) that I will not taste,” *dag* implies large ones only? It is because it is written [Yonah 2:1]: *Now Hashem had prepared a large fish (dag) to swallow up Yonah?* But isn’t it also written: Then Yonah prayed to Hashem, his God from the inside of the fish (*dagah*)?

The *Gemora* answers: This is no difficulty: Perhaps the large fish spit him out and he was swallowed again by a smaller one.

But, the *Gemora* asks: What of the verse regarding the plague of blood, where it is written [Shmos 7:21]: *And*

*the fish (dagah) that was in the river died?* Did only the small fish die, not the large?

The *Gemora* concludes: *Dagah* written in the Torah implies both large and small, but regarding vows, the language used by the public is followed.

It would seem that according to Abaye, the word *dagah* in the Torah refers only to small fish. Accordingly, we would be compelled to say that only the small fish dies in the plague of blood. Why would this be?

The Rogatchover Gaon explains: The river was dug by the hands of the Egyptians. The Yerushalmi rules regarding fish that swim into one's private water; he acquires only the small ones and not the large ones. Accordingly, it can be explained that only the fish belonging to the Egyptians died, but the large fish, which they did not own, there was no reason for them to die.

The Rama in Shulchan Aruch (C" M 331:1) rules that a worker may return to his home on Friday afternoon, early enough that he will have the time to fill a jug of water and roast a small fish.

The Shach asks: What is the source for the Rama's ruling that it is sufficient if he has ample time to cook a small fish? Perhaps, he should leave his work with enough time to cook a large fish?

The Nitzotzei Ohr answers that the language of the Yerushalmi, which is the source for this *halacha*, is *dagah*, and the Rama understands that to be referring to a small fish.

Rabbi Gershenfeld of Machon Shlomo explains that a boy reaching Bar Mitzva (girl reaching Bas Mitzva)

acquires D'as - the ability to overcome a natural emotion (the 'Regesh\*') by focussing on a wider perspective. For example, overcoming the feeling of depression by focussing on one's positive attributes.

Using the example of a Bar Mitzva Party, the Rav explains that a Bar Mitzva boy can always tell his best friend according to who gave him the best gift. In this case, the Bar Mitzva boy receives his greatest gift from HaShem – D'as!

The reason why D'as is the greatest gift is because even if someone was to give you \$1 million, without D'as you would only spend it on things that your base instincts wanted at that moment. Or, someone without D'as who receives a Porsche will most likely end up in hospital or under arrest for reckless driving!

D'as allows us to gain the most out of life by focusing on the right things. It allows us to appreciate and use all of our resources in the right way. HaShem, who loves us the most and can give us anything chose to give a Bar Mitzva boy the gift of turning him from katan into a gadol – the difference between the two is D'as, because this is the greatest gift, for as it says in the Gemora: 'Anyone who has D'as is like someone who has EVERYTHING'.