

תא שמע: "דג דגים שאיני טועם" – אסור בהן, בין גדולים בין קטנים, בין חיים בין מבושלים, ומותר בטריט, טרופה ובציר.

Come and hear a resolution from the mishna above (51b): If one vows: Fish or fishes are *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste them, he is prohibited with regard to all of them, whether large fish or small, and whether raw or cooked. But he is permitted to taste minced sardines and to taste fish brine. The phrase: I will not taste, clearly does not render fish brine forbidden, although it contains that which emerged from fish.

אמר רבא: וכבר יצא מהן.

Rava said: But there is no evidence from here, as the fish brine that is permitted by the mishna may be referring to brine that already emerged from them before the vow was taken, and was therefore not included in the fish that were rendered forbidden by the vow. The dilemma therefore remains unresolved.

Perek VI

Daf 53 Amud a

מתני' הנודר מן התמרים – מותר בדבש תמרים, מסתוניות – מותר בחומץ סתוניות. רבי יהודה בן בתירא אומר: כל ששם תולדתו קרויה עליו, ונודר הימנו – אסור ביצא הימנו, וחקמים מתירים.

**MISHNA** One who vows that dates are forbidden to him<sup>H</sup> is permitted to eat date honey.<sup>N</sup> One who vows that late grapes<sup>N</sup> are forbidden to him is permitted to eat vinegar of late grapes. Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira says: In the case of any food that the name of its derivative is called after its name, i.e., the liquid that emerges from it bears its name, e.g., date honey or vinegar of late grapes, and one vows that the item itself, e.g., the grape, is forbidden to him, he is also prohibited from consuming the liquid that emerges from it. But the Rabbis permit this.

גמ' [חקמים] היינו תנא קמא!

**GEMARA** The statement of the Rabbis is identical to the statement of the first *tanna* of the mishna, who rules that one who vows that dates are forbidden to him is permitted to eat date honey. What is the difference between them?

איבא ביניהו הדא דתנא: כלל זה אמר רבי שמעון בן אלעזר: כל שדרבו לאכול, ודרך היוצא ממנו לאכול, כגון תמרים ודבש תמרים, נדר בו – אסור ביצא ממנו, נדר מיוצא ממנו – אסור בו.

The Gemara answers: There is a difference between them with regard to that which is taught<sup>N</sup> in a *baraita*: Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar said this principle: With regard to anything that is commonly eaten in its existing form, and it is also common to eat the liquid that emerges from it, for example, dates and date honey, if one vowed that it is forbidden to him, he is also prohibited from consuming the liquid that emerges from it. Similarly, if one vows that the liquid that emerges from it is forbidden to him, he is also prohibited from partaking of it.

HALAKHA

Dates are forbidden to him, etc. – מן התמרים וכו' – One who vows that dates are forbidden to him is permitted to eat date honey, and one who vows that late grapes are forbidden to him is permitted to eat their vinegar, in accordance with the ruling of the first *tanna* in the mishna (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nedarim* 9:14; *Shulhan Arukh*, *Yoreh De'a* 217:13).

NOTES

Permitted to eat date honey – מותר בדבש תמרים: The commentaries raise a difficulty: There is a dispute in the mishna between Rabbi Yosei and the Rabbis whether one who vows not to partake of milk may eat whey (51b). The Gemara explains that both sides concede that it depends on the vernacular (52b). In a place where whey is called milk whey, it is forbidden, as the word milk is included in its name, and where it is merely referred to as whey, it is permitted. Accordingly, this mishna seems to contradict both sides of the dispute, as the phrase date honey includes the word date, and nevertheless it is permitted to one who vows that dates are forbidden to him. This problem exists with regard to vinegar of late grapes as well. The Rashba answers that the two *mishnayot* are not comparable, as whey is not substantially transformed from its milk state, whereas date honey and vinegar of late grapes have changed from fruit to an entirely different substance. Therefore, the ruling for the latter foods is more lenient. The Ran explains

that whey is called milk whey after the milk from which it was extracted, whereas date honey is referred to as such only to differentiate between it and other types of honey. Therefore, according to the first *tanna* of the mishna, it is permitted. **Late grapes [sitvaniyot] – סתוניות:** Most commentaries explain that *sitvaniyot* are grapes that do not ripen fully in the summer and remain on the vine until winter [*stav*]. These grapes never reach a fully ripened state and are barely edible, which is why they are used in the production of vinegar. The Rosh cites an alternate version of the text, which reads: *Sefoniyot*, which he takes to mean grapes from the end [*sof*] of the season. Others explain, probably in accordance with the version of the text cited by the Rosh, that it refers to poor-quality grapes from the ends of the vineyard (*Tosefot Rabbeinu Peretz*). **There is a difference between them with regard to that which is taught, etc. – איבא ביניהו הדא דתנא:** What difference

is derived from Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar's opinion? Several commentaries explain that the Rabbis follow Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar's opinion that if the produce mentioned in the vow is not commonly eaten, the produce is permitted and its derivative is forbidden. This is contrary to the opinion of the first *tanna* that the produce is always forbidden and its derivative is permitted (Commentary on *Nedarim*; Ran). Another explanation, cited in *Tosafot*, is that the Rabbis agree with Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar's opinion only insofar as to prohibit the derivative of a type of produce that is not commonly eaten. Otherwise, they agree with the first *tanna*. A third opinion, also cited in *Tosafot*, is that the first *tanna* concedes that if the produce is inedible, its derivative is forbidden. The dispute is with regard to the produce itself: The first *tanna* holds that it is prohibited, whereas the Rabbis follow Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar's opinion that it is forbidden. This explanation posits that late grapes are in fact commonly eaten.

**Wine is forbidden to him – מן היין:** One who vows that wine is forbidden to him is permitted to partake of apple wine. Similarly, one who vows that oil is forbidden to him is permitted to eat sesame oil. One who vows that honey is forbidden to him is permitted to eat date honey. One who vows that vinegar is forbidden to him is permitted to eat the vinegar of late grapes. One who vows that vegetables are forbidden to him is permitted to eat field vegetables. This is because the names of all these foods have modifiers, and the one who took the vow mentioned only the unspecified term (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nedarim* 9:14; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 217:14–15).

**Oil is forbidden to him – מן השמן:** With regard to one who vows that oil is forbidden to him, if he is in a locale where olive oil is used, e.g., Eretz Yisrael, he is permitted to partake of other types of oil. If sesame oil is the oil that is used in his locale, he may not eat that type of oil but is permitted to partake of other kinds. If both olive and sesame oil are used where he lives, he is prohibited from eating both, even if the majority of the people use only one of them. However, the Rambam rules that one is not liable to receive lashes for eating the type of oil that is used only by a minority of the residents (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nedarim* 9:5; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 217:17).

NOTES

**Kaflutot – קפלוטות:** All commentaries agree that *kaflutot* are a type of leek. However, they describe them differently. Some claim that they are larger than regular leeks (*Arukh; Commentary on Nedarim*, as cited by *Bah*). The Rambam writes that they are a type of leek native to Eretz Yisrael. Rabbi Avraham min HaHar describes them as leeks that grow in the desert.

LANGUAGE

**Kaflutot – קפלוטות:** From the Greek κεφαλωτός, *kephalotos*, meaning head or small head. In this context it refers to the thick heads of leeks.

כל שאין דרכו לאכול, ודרך היוצא ממנו לאכול, נזדר בו – אין אסור אלא ביוצא ממנו, שלא נתביון זה אלא ליוצא ממנו.

**מתני' הנזדר מן היין – מותר ביינ תפוחים, מן השמן – מותר בשמן שומשמן, מן הדבש – מותר בדבש תמרים,**

מן החומץ – מותר בחומץ סתנינות, מן הכרישין – מותר בקפלוטות, מן הירק – מותר בירקות השדה, שהוא שם לוויי.

**גמ' תנא:** הנזדר מן השמן, בארץ ישראל – מותר בשמן שומשמן ואסור בשמן זית, ובבבל – אסור בשמן שומשמן ומותר בשמן זית, מקום שמתפקין מזה ומזה – אסור בזה ובזה.

The *baraita* continues: Conversely, with regard to anything that is not commonly eaten as it is, and it is common to eat the liquid that emerges from it, if one vowed that he will not eat from it, he is prohibited from consuming only the liquid that emerges from it, as this person intended to prohibit himself from eating only from the liquid that emerges from it. The first *tanna* does not distinguish between dates, which are commonly eaten in their original state, and late grapes, which are not. In both cases, he rules that the produce itself is forbidden and the derivative is permitted. By contrast, the Rabbis agree with Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar's ruling with regard to produce that is not commonly eaten in its original state. They permit the produce itself and prohibit that which has emerged from it. Therefore, in the last case of the mishna, they permit eating the late grapes and prohibit eating their vinegar, whereas in the first case they prohibit both dates and date honey.

**MISHNA** One who vows that wine is forbidden to him<sup>h</sup> is permitted to partake of apple wine, i.e., cider, as the unspecified term wine refers only to grape wine. One who vows that oil is forbidden to him is permitted to partake of sesame oil, as the unspecified term oil refers only to olive oil. One who vows that honey is forbidden to him is permitted to eat date honey, as the unspecified term honey refers only to bee honey.

One who vows that vinegar is forbidden to him is permitted to partake of vinegar of late grapes, as vinegar is typically made from wine. One who vows that leeks<sup>b</sup> are forbidden to him is permitted to eat *kaflutot*,<sup>nl</sup> a type of leek. One who vows that vegetables are forbidden to him is permitted to eat wild field vegetables, as this type of vegetable has a modifier<sup>b</sup> and is not referred to by the unspecified term vegetable.

**GEMARA** It is taught in a *baraita*: With regard to one who vows that oil is forbidden to him,<sup>h</sup> if he is in Eretz Yisrael he is permitted to eat sesame oil and is prohibited from eating olive oil, as in Eretz Yisrael the unspecified term oil refers to olive oil. And if he took the vow in Babylonia, sesame oil is forbidden to him, as oil in Babylonia was generally made from sesame seeds, and it is permitted for him to eat olive oil, which was rarely used there. If he takes the vow in a locale where people use both this type of oil and that type, he is prohibited from eating both this type and that.

BACKGROUND

**Leeks – כרישין:** *Allium porrum*, known as *kerishin* or *karti* in the Talmud, is an edible vegetable botanically related to onion and garlic. Its long, flat leaves, ranging from 5–30 cm in length, form the equivalent of a stalk. Nowadays these leaves are primarily eaten cooked, as seasoning in soup or with meat. In the Far East, however, leeks are still eaten raw. Some commentaries note that the *hatzir* mentioned among the foods desired by those who left Egypt (see Numbers 11:5) refers to leeks, which were commonly grown in vegetable gardens in ancient Egypt.

**Modifier – שם לוויי:** A modifier is a special appellation added to the name of an item so as to distinguish the item from the normal meaning of the word. For example, typical vinegar in talmudic times was made from sour grape juice, so the unspecified word vinegar would refer to that type of vinegar. Adding the modifier: Of late grapes, as in the mishna, indicates that one is referring to a different type of vinegar. The unspecified word wine refers to wine made from grapes. Its unmodified form does not include wine or cider made from other fruits. The unspecified word vegetables refers to vegetables cultivated in a garden, as opposed to the modified term: Field vegetables. It is implied in the *baraita* that the general meaning of a word depends on the local custom. In a place where people use mainly sesame oil, that oil is considered regular oil, and olive oil is referred to as olive oil. This definition can also depend on the time of reference. During the Sabbatical Year, the unspecified term vegetables refers to field vegetables as opposed to garden-grown ones.



Leeks

פְּשִׁיטָא! לֹא צְרִיכָא, דְּרוּבָא מִן חַד  
מִסְתַּפְקִין. מַהוּ דְּתִימָא: אִיזִיל בְּתַר  
רוּבָא, קָא מְשַׁמַּע לֵן: סְפַק אִיסוּרָא  
לְחוּמְרָא.

The Gemara asks with regard to the last statement: **Isn't it obvious** that he is prohibited from eating both types of oil? The statement seems superfluous. The Gemara answers: **No**, it is not superfluous. It is **necessary** only to teach that this is the *halakha* even **where most people use only one type of oil**. **Lest you say: I should follow the majority** and permit the other kind of oil, the *baraita* teaches us that an **uncertain Torah prohibition** is treated **stringently**. Therefore, the other type is forbidden as well, as it is possibly included in the meaning of the vow, although it is used only by a minority of the residents.

הַנּוֹדֵר מִן הַיֶּרֶק בְּשָׂאָר שְׁנֵי שָׁבוּעַ –  
אָסוּר בְּיִרְקוֹת הַגֵּינָה וּמוֹתֵר בְּיִרְקוֹת  
הַשָּׂדֶה, וּבְשִׁבְעֵית אָסוּר בְּיִרְקוֹת  
הַשָּׂדֶה וּמוֹתֵר בְּיִרְקוֹת הַגֵּינָה. אָמַר רַבִּי  
אֲבָהוּ מִשּׁוּם רַבִּי חֲנִינָא בֶּן גַּמְלִיאֵל:

The *baraita* continues: With regard to **one who vows that vegetables are forbidden to him**, if he takes the vow **during the first six years of the seven-year Sabbatical cycle**, he is **prohibited from eating garden vegetables and permitted to eat field vegetables**. **But if he takes the vow during the Sabbatical Year**, he is **prohibited from eating field vegetables**, which are commonly eaten in the Sabbatical Year, **and he is permitted to eat garden vegetables**, which are rarely consumed during that period, as it is prohibited to work the land. **Rabbi Abbahu said in the name of Rabbi Hanina ben Gamliel:**

Perek VI  
Daf 53 Amud b

לֹא שָׂנוּ אֲלֵא בְּמִקּוּם שְׂאִין מְבִיאִין  
יֶרֶק מִחוּצָה לְאֶרֶץ לְאֶרֶץ, אֲבָל בְּמִקּוּם  
שְׂמִבְיֵאִין יֶרֶק מִחוּצָה לְאֶרֶץ לְאֶרֶץ –  
אָסוּר.

They taught that if he takes the vow in the Sabbatical Year he is permitted to eat garden vegetables **only if he is in a place where people do not bring vegetables from outside of Eretz Yisrael**. **However, in a place where people bring vegetables from outside of Eretz Yisrael**, where the *halakhot* of the Sabbatical Year do not apply, **to Eretz Yisrael**, he is **prohibited** from eating garden vegetables as well, as they are widely available, and therefore included in the unspecified word vegetable.

בְּתַנָּאִי: אִין מְבִיאִין יֶרֶק מִן חוּצָה לְאֶרֶץ  
לְאֶרֶץ. רַבִּי חֲנִינָה בֶּן גַּמְלִיאֵל אוֹמֵר:  
מְבִיאִין יֶרֶק מִחוּצָה לְאֶרֶץ לְאֶרֶץ. מֵאִי  
טַעֲמִיהָ דְּמֵאן דְּאָמַר אִין מְבִיאִין? אָמַר  
רַבִּי יִרְמְיָהּ: מִשּׁוּם גּוֹשׁ.

The Gemara comments that this distinction is like a dispute between *tanna'im* cited in a *baraita*: **One may not bring vegetables from outside of Eretz Yisrael to Eretz Yisrael**. **Rabbi Hananya ben Gamliel says: One may bring vegetables from outside of Eretz Yisrael to Eretz Yisrael**. The Gemara asks: **What is the reason of the one who said that one may not bring vegetables from outside of Eretz Yisrael?** **Rabbi Yirmeya said: It is because a clod of earth** might be brought with the vegetables to Eretz Yisrael. Earth from outside of Eretz Yisrael is ritually impure, and bringing it to Eretz Yisrael would spread ritual impurity in the land.

מִתְנַי' מִן הַכְּרוּב – אָסוּר בְּאִיסְפָּרְגוּס,  
מִן הָאִיסְפָּרְגוּס – מוֹתֵר בְּכְרוּב.

**MISHNA** One who vows that **cabbage** is forbidden to him<sup>H</sup> is **prohibited from eating isparagus**,<sup>NLB</sup> as that is a type of cabbage. However, one who vows that **isparagus** is forbidden to him is **permitted to eat cabbage**. One who vows that **pounded beans** are forbidden to him is **prohibited from eating pounded bean stew** [*mikpa*].<sup>L</sup> **However, Rabbi Yosei rules that he is permitted to eat it.**

HALAKHA

Cabbage is forbidden to him, etc. – **מִן הַכְּרוּב**: One who vows that cabbage is forbidden to him is prohibited from eating *isparagus*. However, one who vows that *isparagus* is forbidden to him is permitted to eat cabbage. Likewise, one who vows that pounded beans are forbidden to him is prohibited from eating pounded bean stew, whereas one who vows that stew

is forbidden to him is permitted to eat pounded beans. One who vows that stew is forbidden to him is prohibited from eating garlic, but one who vows that garlic is forbidden to him is permitted to eat stew (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hillkhot Nedarim* 9:10; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 217:10).

NOTES

*Ispargus* – אִיסְפָּרְגוּס: Several commentaries maintain that this is a kind of cabbage (Commentary on *Nedarim*; Rosh). Rav Hai Gaon is cited in the *Arukh* as explaining that it is a drink made from cabbage soaked in wine. The Rambam states that *isparagus* is water in which cabbage was pickled. It is forbidden because the water in which a food was pickled shares its name. The Rid agrees with the Rambam's definition. However, he claims that only with regard to a vegetable that is not commonly eaten raw, are the vegetable and its pickled water considered one and the same with regard to vows. In talmudic times this was true of cabbage.

LANGUAGE

*Ispargus* – אִיסְפָּרְגוּס: From the Greek ἀσπάραγος, *asparagos*, this word refers to a species of cabbage that was ground up, soaked in wine, and used as an energy drink. The term may be connected to the Greek σπάραγμα, *spargma*, which means something crushed or ground.

Stew [*mikpa*] – מִקְפָּה: Apparently a thick cooked dish that was composed mainly of ground grits. Garlic was added to give it flavor.

BACKGROUND

*Ispargus* – אִיסְפָּרְגוּס: Some identify *isparagus* as a type of cabbage. Others are of the opinion that this is a reference to the stalk of kale, a vegetable similar to wild cabbage.



Kale bundle

One who vows that stew is forbidden to him is permitted to eat pounded beans – מן המקפה מותר בגריסין: First, this is because not all stews are made from pounded beans. Furthermore, stew is only one particular dish made from pounded beans.

One who vows that stew is forbidden to him is prohibited from eating the garlic – מן המקפה אסור בשום: Some commentaries maintain that this refers to the garlic in the stew (Rabbi Natan bar Yosef, cited in *Shita Mekubbetzet*). Others claim that it refers to garlic in general. Although he is permitted to eat pounded beans, garlic is forbidden, as garlic was the main flavor in stew, and no stew was made without it, as opposed to pounded beans, which were not an essential ingredient (Rosh).

One who vows that garlic is forbidden to him is permitted to eat stew – מן השום מותר במקפה: Some commentaries explain that the one who took the vow assumedly meant only raw garlic (*Shita Mekubbetzet*). Others claim that he is prohibited from eating the heads of garlic found in stew. The rest of the stew is permitted, even if it is flavored with garlic (Ritva).

*Hitta* or *hittin* – חטתה חטין: One explanation is that the singular form of wheat indicates bread, whereas the plural refers to raw wheat, as elaborated in the *baraita* below. Therefore, the one who took the vow is prohibited from tasting both. Another opinion is that using both terms indicates inclusion of all forms of wheat (Rosh). The Rambam claims that the expression referred to in the mishna is wheat of wheat, which is a Hebrew form of speech that stresses greatness, e.g., the Song of Songs. This follows the Rambam's opinion mentioned with regard to fish (51b).

Rabbi Yehuda says, etc. – רבי יהודה אומר וכו': The wording of this statement seems to indicate a dispute between Rabbi Yehuda and the unspecified *tanna* of the mishna. This understanding is indicated by the Rambam as well (see *Tosafot* and *Rid*). However, the Commentary on *Nedarim* and the Rosh maintain that there is no disagreement. Rabbi Yehuda simply adds to the mishna's statement.

*Hitta* that I will not taste, etc. – חטתה שאני טועם וכו': Why does the singular *hitta* refer to bread, whereas the plural *hittim* connotes wheat grains? In the Jerusalem Talmud, it is explained that that is simply the way people speak. The Ran explains that bread is eaten as a singular item, as opposed to grains of wheat, which are separated from each other when eaten raw.

## HALAKHA

*Hitta* or *hittin* that I will not taste – חטתה חטין שאני טועם: One who vows that wheat is forbidden to him is prohibited from eating raw or cooked wheat grains. One who vows: *Hitta* or *hittin* are *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste them, he may not taste any wheat products, including flour and bread. One who vows: *Hitta* is *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste it, he may not taste bread. However, he is permitted to taste wheat grains. One who vows: *Hittim* are *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste them, he is permitted to taste bread but is prohibited from tasting raw grains of wheat, in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nedarim* 9:9; *Shulhan Arukh*, *Yoreh De'a* 217:20).

Pounded bean that I will not taste – גריס שאני טועם: One who vows: Pounded bean is *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste it, is prohibited from tasting cooked pounded beans. However, he is permitted to chew raw ones. One who vows: Pounded beans are *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste them, is prohibited from tasting raw pounded beans and permitted to taste cooked ones. One who vows: Pounded bean or pounded beans are *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste them, may not taste either raw or cooked pounded beans (*Shulhan Arukh*, *Yoreh De'a* 217:21).

מן הגריסין – אסור במקפה, ורבי יוסי מתיר. מן המקפה – מותר בגריסין, מן המקפה – אסור בשום, ורבי יוסי מתיר. מן השום – מותר במקפה.

מן העדשים – אסור באשישים, רבי יוסי מתיר. מן האשישים – מותר בעדשים.

"חטתה חטין שאני טועם" – אסור בהן, בין קמח בין הפת. "גריס גריסין שאני טועם" – אסור בהן, בין חיין בין מבושלין. רבי יהודה אומר: "קונם גריס או חטתה שאני טועם" – מותר לכוס חיים.

גמ' תנא. רבי שמעון בן גמליאל אומר: "חטתה שאני טועם" – אסור לאפות ומותר לכוס: "חטים שאני טועם" – אסור לכוס ומותר לאפות: "חטתה חטין שאני טועם" – אסור בין לכוס בין לאפות.

"גריס שאני טועם" – אסור לבשל ומותר לכוס: "גריסין שאני טועם" – אסור לכוס ומותר לבשל: "גריס גריסין שאני טועם" – אסור בין לבשל בין לכוס.

הדרן עליך הנודר מן המבושל

One who vows that **pounded beans** are forbidden to him is **prohibited from eating pounded bean stew**. However, Rabbi Yosei rules that he is **permitted to eat it**. One who vows that **pounded bean stew** is forbidden to him is **permitted to eat pounded beans<sup>N</sup>** according to all opinions. One who vows that **stew** is forbidden to him is **prohibited from eating the garlic<sup>N</sup>** of the stew. However, Rabbi Yosei rules that he is **permitted to eat the garlic**. One who vows that **garlic** is forbidden to him is **permitted to eat stew<sup>N</sup>**.

One who vows that **lentils** are forbidden to him is **prohibited from eating *ashishim***, a dish made from lentils. However, Rabbi Yosei permits it. It is agreed by all opinions that one who vows that *ashishim* is forbidden to him is **permitted to eat lentils**.

If one says: *Hitta*, wheat in singular form, or *hittim*,<sup>N</sup> wheat in plural form, are *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste them, he is **prohibited from eating wheat, whether as flour or bread**. If one says: **Pounded bean or pounded beans** are *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste them, he is **prohibited from eating them, whether raw or cooked**. Rabbi Yehuda says<sup>N</sup> that if one says: **Pounded bean or *hitta* is *konam*** for me, and for that reason I will not taste them, he is **permitted to chew them raw**, as that is not the normal way to eat them, and therefore was not included in the intention of the vow.

**GEMARA** It is taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Shimon ben Gamliel says that if one vows: *Hitta* is *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste<sup>N</sup> it, he is **prohibited from eating baked wheat, i.e., baked wheat bread, but he is permitted to chew wheat grains**. If one says: *Hittim* are *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste them, he is **prohibited from chewing wheat grains but is permitted to bake them**, as this term is referring to grains of wheat. If one says: *Hitta* or *hittin* are *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste<sup>N</sup> them, he is **prohibited both from chewing wheat grains and from baking wheat bread**.

Similarly, if one says: **Pounded bean** is *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste<sup>N</sup> it, he is **prohibited from cooking pounded bean, i.e., from eating a dish of cooked pounded beans, as that is what the word pounded bean commonly means, but he is permitted to chew raw pounded beans**. If one says: **Pounded beans** are *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste them, he is **prohibited from chewing pounded beans but is permitted to cook them**. If one says: **Pounded bean or pounded beans** are *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste them, he is **prohibited from both cooking and chewing pounded beans**.