



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

Mishnah

The *Mishnah* states: If a person makes a *neder* prohibiting himself from milk, he is permitted in whey (*the liquid remaining from the milk after it has curdled*). Rabbi Yosi prohibits it. If his *neder* was from whey, he is permitted in milk. Abba Shaul says: If one makes a *neder* prohibiting himself from cheese, he is forbidden to eat all cheese, whether salted or unsalted.

If one makes a *neder* prohibiting himself from meat, he is permitted in the gravy and the bits of meat (*that fall from the meat while it is cooking*). Rabbi Yosi prohibits it.

Rabbi Yehudah said (*as support for Rabbi Yosi*): It once happened (*when one made a neder against eating meat*) that Rabbi Tarfon forbade him from eating eggs which had been cooked with it. They said to him: It was indeed so! But when does this prohibition apply? It is only when he says, “This (*specific piece of*) meat is forbidden to me.” For one who prohibits something with a *neder* and it mixes with something else, if it contains enough to impart flavor to the entire mixture (*if there is not sixty times as much permitted food*), it is forbidden.

If one makes a *neder* prohibiting himself from wine, he is permitted in cooked food which has in it the taste of wine. However, if he said, “*Konam* this wine that I will not taste,” and it fell into a cooked dish, if it contains enough to impart flavor to the entire mixture, it is forbidden. (51b3 – 52a2)

Lentils and Whey

[The *Mishnah* had stated: If a person makes a *neder* prohibiting himself from milk, he is permitted in whey (*the liquid remaining from the milk after it has curdled*). Rabbi Yosi prohibits it.]

The *Gemora* asks a contradiction from the following *Baraisa*: If a person makes a *neder* prohibiting himself from lentils, he is forbidden in lentil cakes. Rabbi Yosi permits it.

Ra”n Elucidated

[*The Yerushalmi states that ashishim are lentils that are kneaded and fried in honey. The two statements from Rabbi Yosi are seemingly contradictory. For if here it is permitted because, since there is honey in it, it is called ashishim (and not lentils); certainly regarding whey, which is something entirely different than milk, it should not have been forbidden?*]

The *Gemora* answers: There is no difficulty, for in truth, the *Tanna Kamma* and Rabbi Yosi do not actually disagree. Each one of them is ruling based upon the language of the people in their locality. (*They all agree that a neder will only prohibit the specific foods mentioned in his vow. The Tanna Kamma and Rabbi Yosi are merely discussing the differences of language that is used in their respective localities.*) In that of the Rabbis, milk is called “milk,” and whey, “whey”; but in that of Rabbi Yosi, whey too is called “whey of milk.”

It was taught in a Baraisa: He who vows [abstinence] from milk, is permitted whey; from whey, is permitted milk; from milk, is permitted cheese; from cheese, is permitted milk; from gravy, is permitted meat sediment; from meat sediment, is permitted gravy. If he says, 'This meat be forbidden me,' the meat itself, its gravy and its sediment, are forbidden him. If he vows [to abstain] from wine, he may partake of food which contains the taste of wine; but if he says, 'Konam that I taste not this wine,' and it falls into food, if the taste of wine is [perceptible] therein, it is forbidden. (52b1)

Mishnah

The *Mishnah* states: If one makes a *neder* prohibiting himself from grapes, he is permitted in wine. If he makes a *neder* prohibiting himself from olives, he is permitted in oil. If one said, "Konam these olives and grapes that I will not taste," he is forbidden in them and what emerges from them. (52b1 – 52b2)

That which Emerges from the Item

[The *Mishnah* had stated: If one said, "Konam these olives and grapes that I will not taste," he is forbidden in them and what emerges from them.] Rami bar Chamah inquires: Which expression in the *neder* is the cause that prohibits anything which emerges from the olives and grapes? Is it because he said "these," or is it because he said "that I will not taste"?

Rava said: Let us resolve this inquiry from the following *Mishnah*: If one says, "These fruits are a *konam* upon me," 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. It would seem that something which emerges from them would be permitted!

The *Gemora* rejects this proof: In truth, even something which emerges from them is forbidden. The *Mishnah* preferred to teach us a greater novelty; namely, that something which is exchanged for the prohibited item is regarded as things which grew from it, and is therefore, forbidden.

Come and hear (from the *Mishnah* below): 'In regard to my eating,' or 'in regard to my tasting,' he is permitted [to benefit] from what is exchanged for them or what grows of their seeds. This implies that their juice is forbidden! — Because the first clause does not mention their juice, the second clause omits it too.

The *Gemora* suggests a proof from our *Mishnah*: Rabbi Yehudah said (as support for Rabbi Yosi): It once happened (when one made a *neder* against eating meat) that Rabbi Tarfon forbade him from eating eggs which had been cooked with it. They said to him: It was indeed so! But when does this prohibition apply? It is only when he says, "This (specific piece of) meat is forbidden to me." For one who prohibits something with a *neder* and it mixes with something else, if it contains enough to impart flavor to the entire mixture (if there is not sixty times as much permitted food), it is forbidden. (It is evident from the *Tanna Kamma* that when someone prohibits a specific item, by saying "these fruits," anything which emerges from it, including taste, will be forbidden.)

The *Gemora* concludes that if one says "these," he certainly is prohibiting anything which emerges from it. Rami's inquiry is if the term "that I will not taste" is sufficient to cause this prohibition.

The *Gemora* suggests a proof from a *Mishnah* above: 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. (Although he said

“that I will not taste,” he is still permitted in brine, which emerges from the fish.)

Rava rejects this proof, for the *Mishnah* can be referring to brine that emerged from the fish before he pronounced his *neder*, and that is why it would be permitted. (The inquiry remains unresolved and in practice we would rule stringently that anything which emerges from the forbidden item is in fact forbidden.) (52b2 – 52b4)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Something that can become Permitted ***(Davar she'yeish lo Matirin)***

The *Mishnah* states: If one makes a *neder* prohibiting himself from wine, he is permitted in cooked food which has in it the taste of wine. However, if he said, “*Konam* this wine that I will not taste,” and it fell into a cooked dish, if it contains enough to impart flavor to the entire mixture, it is forbidden.

This would imply that if there is not enough to give flavor, it would be permitted. The Ra”n quotes his teachers who ask the following: Something which is forbidden on account of a *neder* is “something that can become permitted” (*davar she'yeish lo matirin*), and we have established that anything that can become permitted is not nullified even in a thousand!?

They answer that when we say that it is not nullified even in a thousand, that refers to something that has been mixed with its own kind. But here, when it says, “and it became mixed,” it is referring to something else that is not the same kind, like the case of eggs that were cooked with it. Anything that is mixed with something else that is not its kind is permitted, provided that it does not give flavor, even if it is “something that can become

permitted.” The Ra”n cites proof to this from a *Mishnah* in *Chalah* and a *Yerushalmi* in our perek.

They, therefore, objected to the statement of the Ri”f in *Meseches Chulin* concerning bread that was baked in an oven with roasted meat. The *Gemora* states that it is forbidden to eat it with a dairy sauce even though it has been established that we are not halachically concerned with vapors. The reason it is forbidden is because the bread is “something that can be permitted,” since one may eat it together with meat. For that reason, it is not nullified, even in a thousand. It is evident from the Ri”f that he maintains that “something that can be permitted” is not nullified even in something that is not its kind.

The Ra”n, however, agrees to the Ri”f. When the *Mishnah* here says that “something can become permitted” becomes nullified in something that is not its own kind, that is referring to something that is forbidden now, but will become permitted in the future, like *nedarim*. For the Ra”n has the following question: Since according to the *Chachamim*, all forbidden things become nullified in their own kind just as in a different kind, why did the *Chachamim* make a distinction in the case of “something that can become permitted,” between its own kind and a different kind?

The reason is as follows: The *Chachamim* and Rabbi Yehudah disagree whether or not something can be nullified in its own kind. Rabbi Yehudah maintains that a forbidden item is not nullified in its own kind, because anything that is similar to another thing does not weaken and nullify it; rather, it preserves it and strengthens it.

The *Chachamim* disagree and hold that a forbidden item and something which is permitted are not similar to each other, even if they are the same kind. This is because one is forbidden and one is permitted. For it is not fitting to follow the similarity of their substance, but rather the difference in their being forbidden and permitted.

It is for this reason that the *Chachamim* learned concerning “something that can be permitted” for the sake of being strict towards the opinion of Rabbi Yehudah. For since the forbidden item is not completely different from the permitted one, because the forbidden one will eventually become permitted, we say that it is not nullified in its own kind. It will only become nullified when mixed with a different kind, for the difference that exists between one kind and another will make up for the equality that is added here because it is “something that can be permitted.” It is the difference between kinds that is the cause of nullification, and equality interferes with nullification.

DAILY MASHAL

Comfort a Mourner with Lentils

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: If a person makes a *neder* prohibiting himself from lentils, he is forbidden in lentil cakes. Rabbi Yosi permits it.

The *Gemora* in Bava Basra 16b states that lentils are a suitable food for the traditional “consolation meal” sent to a mourner. (Indeed, it states that the red lentil pottage that Yaakov fed Esav was actually cooked as a consolation meal for their father Yitzchak after the departure of Avraham Avinu.) Why specifically lentils? The *Gemora* gives two reasons:

1. “Just as lentils have no mouth, so the mourner has no mouth”. Lentils have no kind of cavity.¹

¹ This reminds us of the mourner, who is isolated and often mute in his grief. Presumably this helps console the mourner because it doesn’t challenge him to open up; one of the laws of consoling mourners is that the visitor shouldn’t speak first, because the mourner may perhaps prefer to remain silent.

² The circular shape of the lentil reminds us that misfortunes are part of the life cycle. Virtually every person experiences

2. “Just as lentils are round, so mourning is a revolving wheel among mankind.”²

The *Gemora* then asks: What is the practical distinction between these reasons? The answer is, to console with eggs. Rashi explains that eggs are completely sealed, but they are not quite round. They express the silence and solitude of mourning, but not its cyclical nature.

The *Peninim Yekarim* explains that they argue if there is death without sin or not. The one who holds that we comfort with lentils because they have no mouth maintains that there is no death without sin and accordingly he caused his own death through his actions; and that is why the mourner has no mouth to say why Hashem did this, for it was the person’s own actions that caused his death. However, the other opinion holds that there is death without sin, and he is compelled to die on account of the sin of the serpent; it emerges that the mourner would technically be able to justify and complain Heaven forbid against the ways of the Holy One, Blessed be He. That is why he is comforted with lentils, for we are saying: Just as lentils are round, so mourning is a revolving wheel among mankind on account of the sin of the serpent.

mourning at some time, but by the same token everyone moves beyond mourning too. This is a consolation for the mourner because it reminds him that he is not truly alone in his mourning, since others also have this experience at various times, and because it reminds him that the mourning period will soon pass.