

היתר מעלין את האיסור? והתנן גידולי תרומה – תרומה! בגידולי גידולין קאמרין. הא נמי תנינא: גידולי גידולין – חולין! הא קא משמע לן: אפילו בדבר שאין זרעו בלה.

והתנן: הטבל – גידוליו מותרין, בדבר שזרעו בלה. אבל דבר שאין זרעו בלה – גידולי גידולין אסורין! רבויא דרבוי גידולין על עיקרו מותר קא משמע לן.

הדרן עלך הנודר מן הירק

permitted neutralize the prohibition?^N But didn't we learn in a mishna: **The growths of *teruma* are *teruma***,^{NH} indicating that they do not neutralize the prohibition of the original part of the plant? The Gemara answers: **We are speaking of the growths of growths.** Rabbi Yannai permits the *teruma*, not due to the majority of direct growths of *teruma*; he permitted it due to the majority of growths that sprouted from its growths. The Gemara asks: **We already learned that too:**^N **The status of growths of growths of *teruma* is that of non-sacred produce.**^H The Gemara answers: **This teaches us that the growths of growths are permitted even in items whose seeds do not cease, e.g., onions.**

The Gemara asks: **But didn't we learn in a mishna: With regard to untithed produce, its growths are permitted^{NH} in items whose seeds cease; however, concerning items whose seeds do not cease, the growths of growths are forbidden.** The Gemara answers: **It teaches us that if the increase of the growths of growths exceeded^N its primary, original part, that original part is permitted.**

HALAKHA

גידולי תרומה – *teruma* – *teruma*: The status of growths of *teruma* is like that of non-sacred produce in every sense; however, the Sages issued a decree to consider them like *teruma* in that they are permitted exclusively to priests. Therefore, in contrast to *teruma*, these growths may be eaten by a priest who immersed that day, and with impure hands (Rambam *Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhhot Terumot* 11:21).

The status of growths of growths of *teruma* is that of non-sacred produce – גידולי גידולין חולין: The status of growths of growths of *teruma* is like that of non-sacred produce in every sense, even if it was *teruma* from an item whose seeds do not cease. If the growths of growths exceed the growths, the prohibition of the growths are neutralized and permitted to non-priests. The Ra'avad claims that this *halakha* applies only to items whose seeds cease, and not to items whose seeds do not cease. The Radbaz maintains that undoubtedly that was what the Rambam meant as well (Rambam *Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhhot Terumot* 11:22, and see *Kesef Mishne* there).

הטבל – Untithed produce, its growths are permitted – גידוליו מותרין: With regard to one who sows untithed produce, if he is able to gather it before it takes root in the ground, the Sages penalized him and required him to do so. If growths grew from untithed produce, and it was a plant whose seeds cease, the growths are permitted like non-sacred produce. If it was a plant whose seeds do not cease, its growths are forbidden, as are the growths of its growths. Only the quaternary growths are permitted (Rambam *Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhhot Ma'aser* 6:6).

NOTES

גידולי – Growths that are permitted neutralize the prohibition: The Rashba questions the Gemara's formulation here, as this question refers to neutralization of the prohibition of the original plant by the permitted growths, while the difficulty here is a more fundamental one: Isn't it a fact that these growths are not permitted at all, as their legal status is like that of *teruma* itself, and neutralization is not at all relevant? The Ran eases the difficulty somewhat, although he does not completely resolve the problem, as he notes that from the mishna's statement: The growths of *teruma* are *teruma*, one learns that the status of growths is like that of the original plant, from which one can conclude that the growths certainly do not neutralize the prohibition of the original plant.

גידולי תרומה תרומה – The growths of *teruma* are *teruma*: According to the Gemara in *Shabbat* (17b), this is one of the eighteen decrees issued by the Sages on a single day. The reason for the decree is that if the status of the growths was like that of non-sacred produce, which is its status by Torah law, the concern is that the priest would keep impure *teruma* in his possession in order to sow it, and he might inadvertently eat it.

הא נמי תנינא – We already learned that too: Here too, the Rashba asks: It is explicit that the reference there is to onions, whose seeds do not cease, and the growths of growths of those plants are forbidden. The Rashba and the Ran answer that it is possible that this *baraita* is cited only to explicate the matter, as one might have thought that the statement of Rabbi Hanina Terita'a mentioned onions only as an example, and his ruling applies to all plants, even those whose seeds cease.

הטבל גידוליו – Untithed produce, its growths are permitted

מוותרין: The prohibition of growths of untithed produce whose seeds do not cease is more stringent than standard untithed produce. Until the processing of standard untithed produce is completed with its placement into a pile, it is permitted to eat it in a casual meal. However, one may not eat the growths of untithed produce even in the framework of a casual meal. The status of *teruma* is derived from that of untithed produce through an *a fortiori* inference: If for untithed produce, whose growths are permitted in items whose seeds cease, growths of its growths are forbidden in items whose seeds do not cease; all the more so for *teruma*, whose growths are forbidden even in items whose seeds cease, are the growths of its growths forbidden in items whose seeds do not cease (Rosh). Rabbi Avraham min HaHar explains simply that in the Jerusalem Talmud it is stated that the reason the growths of untithed produce are forbidden is that they contain *teruma*, as untithed produce is forbidden only due to the *teruma* it contains; clearly, the *teruma* itself is prohibited.

רבויא דרבוי – If the increase of the growths of growths exceeded: Rashi and other commentaries explain, based on an inference from the text of the Gemara, that although the growths of growths are forbidden, additional growths beyond that are permitted. *Tosafot* and the Rosh explain, and *Tosafot* cite a variant reading, that even the growths of growths are forbidden only if the volume of all the growths together do not exceed the volume of the original plant; however, if they exceed the volume of the original plant, not only the growths of growths, but the growths themselves are permitted. The Rashba maintains that even growths of the growths of untithed produce are forbidden specifically in terms of the seeds that emerge from the growths, but not in terms of the growths themselves.

מתני' קונם יין שאני טועם היום – אינו אסור אלא עד שתחשך. **שבת זו** – אסור בכל השבת, ושבת שעברה. **חדש זה** – אסור בכל החדש, וראש חדש להבא.

שנה זו – אסור בכל השנה, וראש השנה לעתיד לבא. **שבעה זה** – אסור בכל השבעה, ושביעית שעברה.

ואם אמר יום אחד "שבת אחת" **חדש אחד** "שנה אחת" **שבעה אחד** – אסור מיום ליום.

עד הפסח – אסור עד שיגיע: **עד שיהא** – אסור עד שיצא. **עד לפני הפסח**: רבי מאיר אומר: אסור עד שיגיע, רבי יוסי אומר: אסור עד שיצא.

גמ' קונם יין שאני טועם בו. אמר רבי ירמיה: **לכתחשתך צריך שאלה לחכם**.

MISHNA If one vows: **Wine is forbidden to me as if it were an offering [konam]**, and for that reason I will not taste it today,^H he is prohibited from drinking wine only until the conclusion of that day at nightfall, and not for a twenty-four hour period. If one vows not to drink wine **this week**,^H he is prohibited from drinking wine for the entire remainder of the week. And as Shabbat is considered part of the week that passed,^N i.e., it is the end of the week, he is prohibited from drinking wine on the upcoming Shabbat. If one vows not to drink wine **this month**,^H wine is forbidden to him for the entire remainder of the month; and as the New Moon of the following month is considered part of the next month, he is permitted to drink wine on that day.

If he vowed not to drink wine **this year**,^H he is prohibited from drinking wine for the entire remainder of the year; and as Rosh HaShana is considered to be part of the upcoming year, not the current one, he is permitted to drink wine on that day. If he vowed not to drink wine during **this seven-year Sabbatical cycle**,^H wine is forbidden to him for the entire remainder of the seven-year cycle; and as the Sabbatical Year is considered part of the cycle that passed, he is prohibited from drinking wine during the upcoming Sabbatical Year.

All this applies if he said that he would not drink wine on this day or this week, but if he said that wine is forbidden to him for **one day**,^H or **one week**, or **one month**, or **one year**, or **one seven-year cycle**, he is prohibited from drinking wine from the day and time he took the vow to the same time the next day, or week, etc.

If he takes a vow that wine is forbidden to him until Passover,^H it is forbidden to him until Passover arrives. If he said: **Until it will be Passover**,^H it is forbidden to him until Passover ends, as he may have intended for the vow to apply as long as it was still Passover (Rosh). If he said: **Until before Passover**,^{NH} Rabbi Meir says: It is forbidden to him until Passover arrives. Rabbi Yosei says: It is forbidden to him until it ends.

GEMARA We learned in the mishna that if one says: **Wine is forbidden to me as if it were an offering [konam]**, and for that reason I will not taste it today, he is prohibited from drinking wine only until nightfall. **Rabbi Yirmeya said: Even when darkness falls he is not permitted to drink wine immediately; rather, he is required to request that a halakhic authority dissolve his vow.**^H

NOTES

And Shabbat is considered part of the week that passed – **ושבת שעברה**: There are two main interpretations of this phrase. Most commentaries, including *Tosafot*, the Rosh, and the Ran, explain that the vow takes effect for the duration of the week and includes the upcoming Shabbat, which is considered the final day of the week that has passed. Similarly, if one takes a vow for: This seven-year cycle, it applies during the Sabbatical Year, which is the conclusion of that cycle. Conversely, a vow taken with regard to: This month, or: This year, does not include the upcoming New Moon or Rosh HaShana, which are considered the beginning of the upcoming month and year, respectively.

An alternate interpretation is presented in the Commentary on *Nedarim*, according to which this phrase should be rendered: And the Shabbat of the week that has passed. This refers to a case where one takes a vow on Shabbat prohibiting wine for: This week. In that case, although Shabbat is viewed as the last day of the week, the vow applies to that day, i.e., the

Shabbat of the week that has passed, as well as the upcoming six days. Similarly, if one takes a vow for: This month, on the day of the New Moon, it applies to that day and to the rest of the month. The Ran disagrees with this interpretation and argues that if a vow was taken on Shabbat for: This week, it is in effect only until the end of that week, i.e., the end of the Shabbat on which he took the vow.

Until before [lifnei] Passover – עד לפני הפסח: This formulation can imply that the vow should be in effect until right before Passover. Alternatively, it can imply that the vow is in effect until right before the last day of Passover (see Rosh). This is because the word *lifnei* can also be interpreted as a form of the word *lifnot*, to turn away, or leave, in which case it means that the vow takes effect until the end of Passover, when the Festival concludes (see *Kiddushin* 65a and Rashi there, and Rashba on *Nedarim* 61b).

HALAKHA

Wine... I will not taste today – **יין שאני טועם היום**: If one vows to that wine is forbidden to him today, he is prohibited from consuming wine until nightfall (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nedarim* 10:1; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 220:1).

This week – **שבת זו**: If one vows that wine is forbidden to him this week, he is prohibited from consuming wine for all the days of that week up to and including Shabbat, but he may drink wine on Sunday (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nedarim* 10:2; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 220:3).

This month – **חדש זה**: If one vows that wine is forbidden to him this month, he is prohibited from consuming wine the entire month, but he may consume wine on the New Moon of the next month (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nedarim* 10:3; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 220:4).

This year – **שנה זו**: If one vows that wine is forbidden to him this year, he is prohibited from consuming wine for the remainder of the year, regardless of when during the year he made the vow. He may consume wine on Rosh HaShana of the following year (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nedarim* 10:4; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 220:6).

This seven-year cycle – **שבעה זה**: If one takes a vow for this seven-year cycle, the vow applies for the remaining years of that cycle, including the upcoming Sabbatical Year. The vow is no longer in effect beginning on Rosh HaShana of the year following the Sabbatical Year (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nedarim* 10:5; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 220:9).

One day, etc. – **יום אחד וכו'**: If one vows that something is forbidden to him for one day, it is forbidden to him for twenty-four hours from the time of his vow. Similarly, if he says that his vow will apply for one week, one month, one year, or one seven-year cycle, his vow remains in effect for the exact amount of time he specified at the moment he took his vow (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nedarim* 10:1–5; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 220:1,3,5,7,10).

Until Passover – **עד הפסח**: If one vows that a particular item is forbidden to him until Passover, it is forbidden to him only until Passover arrives (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nedarim* 10:7; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 220:11).

Until it will be Passover – **עד שיהא הפסח**: If one vows that a particular item is forbidden to him until it will be Passover, it is forbidden to him until the conclusion of Passover (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nedarim* 10:7; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 220:11).

Until before Passover – **עד לפני הפסח**: If one vows that a particular item is forbidden to him until before Passover, it is forbidden to him until the beginning of Passover, in accordance with the Gemara's statement (61b) that this is actually Rabbi Yosei's opinion rather than that of Rabbi Meir. The *halakha* is ruled in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei in cases where he disagrees with Rabbi Meir (Rambam). Others (*Tur*, citing Rosh) maintain that it is forbidden to him until the end of Passover (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nedarim* 10:7; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 220:11).

He is required to request that a halakhic authority dissolve his vow – **צריך שאלה לחכם**: If one vows that a particular item is forbidden to him today, then although the vow expires at nightfall, he may partake of the item that night only after his vow is dissolved by a halakhic authority. This is a rabbinic decree due to the concern that on another occasion he might take a vow using the expression: One day, and might mistakenly think that he is permitted to eat after nightfall in that case as well, as not everyone is mindful of the difference between the two expressions (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nedarim* 10:1; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 220:1).

Perek VIII
Daf 60 Amud b

NOTES

Abaye said to him – אָמַר לֵיהּ: Although the standard text of the Vilna Talmud does not specify who responded to Rav Yosef, the author of the *Bah* emends the text to state that it was Abaye. Alternatively, the Rashash suggests that the text should state: They said to him, and it is a reference to Rav Yosef's students who were present when he explained this *halakha*.

In accordance with whose opinion, etc. – כְּמֵאן אָוּלָא וְכוּ: This refers to Rabbi Yirmeya's statement (60a), that if one takes a vow for: Today, he must keep the vow even after nightfall unless it is dissolved by a halakhic authority. Many commentaries (see Commentary on *Nedarim*, Rosh, and Ran) appear to have had versions of the text in which both citations referred to Rav Yirmeya bar Abba or to Rabbi Yirmeya.

A deficient twenty-nine-day month – הֲדַשׁ חָסֵר: According to the interpretation of the mishna cited in the Commentary on *Nedarim*, the case here is one where the individual took the vow on the first day of the New Moon. The mishna teaches that the vow applies to the upcoming month. According to another interpretation of the mishna (*Tosafot*, Rosh, and Ran), the case is one where the individual took the vow in the middle of the month preceding a deficient month. These commentaries used a different version of the Gemara text, which explains the Gemara as follows: Lest you say that it is forbidden, i.e., the vow still applies, on the first day of the New Moon, the mishna teaches that since people refer to that day as the beginning of the next month, the vow no longer applies.

The Rambam apparently interpreted the statement of the Gemara as follows: If one took the vow in a deficient month but did not know at the time that it would be deficient, one might have thought that the vow should apply to the New Moon of the upcoming month, which would have been the final day of the previous month had the month been a full, thirty-day month; the mishna therefore teaches that this is not the case (Rashash). This interpretation offers an advantage in that the Gemara says that the mishna is referring to a case of a deficient month, whereas the other interpretations argue that the vow was actually taken in the month preceding a deficient month.

HALAKHA

In accordance with whose opinion is this halakha taught by Rav Yirmeya bar Abba, etc. – כְּמֵאן אָוּלָא וְכוּ: If one takes a vow and states that it applies today, it applies until nightfall; after that time he still requires that the vow be dissolved by a halakhic authority. Some hold that if it was a vow relating to a mitzva, such as a vow to learn Torah or to fulfill a certain mitzva, the vow need not be dissolved, in accordance with the explanations of the Rosh and the Ran (*Shulhan Arukh*, *Yoreh De'a* 220:1).

מאי טעמא? אָמַר רַב יוֹסֵף: גְּזִירָה
"הַיּוֹם" מִשּׁוּם "יוֹם אֶחָד".

The Gemara poses a question: **What is the reason** that he must request the dissolution of the vow once it has already expired? The Gemara answers that **Rav Yosef said:** The Sages issued a rabbinic decree in the case of one who said that his vow applies **today**, **due to** the confusion that might be caused in a case where one said that his vow applies for **one day**, and is therefore forbidden to drink wine for twenty-four hours. There is a concern that if one who said that his vow applies today is permitted to drink wine that night, one who took a vow for one day will think that his vow also expires as soon as it is nightfall.

אָמַר לֵיהּ: אִי הָכִי לִיגְזוֹר בְּ"יוֹם אֶחָד"
מִשּׁוּם "הַיּוֹם"!

Abaye said to him:^N If so, the Sages should likewise decree in the case of one who takes a vow for one day that he must keep the vow until nightfall of the following day, due to the confusion that might be caused in a case where one said that his vow applies today. If the vow expires in the middle of the day, twenty-four hours after he took the vow, people might think that if one takes a vow in the morning and applies it to this day, it also expires in the middle of the day.

אָמַר לֵיהּ: "הַיּוֹם" בְּ"יוֹם אֶחָד" – מִיַּחְלָף:
"יוֹם אֶחָד" בְּ"הַיּוֹם" – לָא מִיַּחְלָף.

Rav Yosef said to him: A vow taken for **this day** might be **interchanged with a vow taken for one day**, and one might erroneously conclude that a vow taken for one day expires at nightfall. However, a vow taken for **one day is not interchanged with a vow taken for today**, and there is no concern that one who takes a vow for today will erroneously conclude that it expires in the middle of the day.

אָמַר רַבִּינָא, אָמַר לִי מְרִימָא: הָכִי אָמַר
אָבוֹךְ מִשְׁמִיָּה דְרַב [יוֹסֵף]: כְּמֵאן אָוּלָא
שְׂמַעְתִּיהּ דְרַב יִרְמִיָּה בְרַ אָבָא – כְּרַבִּי
נָתַן. דְתַנְיָא, רַבִּי נָתַן אֹמֵר: כָּל הַנּוֹדֵר –
כְּאִילוּ בָנָה בְמָה, וְהַמְקַיְיָמוּ – כְּאִילוּ
מִקְטֵר עָלֶיהָ.

Ravina said: Mareimar said to me: Your father said as follows, in the name of Rav Yosef: In accordance with whose opinion^N is this halakha taught by Rav Yirmeya bar Abba?^H It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Natan, as it is taught in a baraita: Rabbi Natan says: Anyone who vows, it is as if he has built a personal altar,^B which is forbidden because one must bring all offerings to the Temple. And one who fulfills the vow, is as though he burns portions meant for the altar in the Temple upon it, i.e., the personal altar, thereby increasing his sin. Consequently, even after he has fulfilled the vow, it is preferable for him to ask a halakhic authority to annul it entirely, so that it will be as if he never took a vow.

"שִׁבְתָּ זֶה" אִסוּר בְּכָל הַשַּׁבָּת כּוּלָּהּ.
פְּשִׁיטָא! מַהוּ דְתַנְיָא: יוֹמֵי דְשַׁבְּתָא
קְאָמַר, קָא מִשְׁמַע לָן.

§ The mishna stated that one who says: Wine is *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste it **this week**, is **prohibited from drinking wine for the entire remainder of the week**, including Shabbat. The Gemara poses a question: **Isn't it obvious that this is the case?** The Gemara answers: It is necessary, **lest you say that he said the days of the week**, i.e., he meant for his vow to apply only on the weekdays. The *tanna* therefore **teaches us** that the phrase **this week** includes Shabbat.

"הֲדַשׁ זֶה" אִסוּר בְּכָל הַחֹדֶשׁ וְרֵאשׁ
הַחֹדֶשׁ לְהַבְּאָא. פְּשִׁיטָא! כִּי אֵינְצִטְרִיכָא
לְהֲדַשׁ חָסֵר.

The mishna stated: If one says: **This month**, it is **forbidden to him for the entire remainder of the month**, and the **New Moon** is considered part of the **next month**. The Gemara asks: **Isn't this obvious?** The Gemara answers: **When it was necessary to teach this halakha it was for a New Moon preceding a deficient, twenty-nine-day month.^N** In such a case the New Moon is celebrated for two days, the first of which is the thirtieth day of the previous month and the second of which is the first day of the new month. The case here is one where he took the vow on the first day of the New Moon.

BACKGROUND

A personal altar – בְּמָה: Before the First Temple was built, there were periods when it was permitted to sacrifice offerings on personal altars. Once the First Temple was built, it became prohibited by Torah law (see Deuteronomy 12:8–14) to sacrifice offer-

ings anywhere other than in the Temple. Nevertheless, the Bible relates that throughout the First Temple period it remained very difficult to eradicate this practice and people continued to offer sacrifices on personal altars even after the Temple was built.

People call it the New Moon [reish yarha] – קרו אֵינְשֵׁי רֵישׁ יָרְחָא: *Reish yarha* can also be translated to mean the beginning of the month. Since the meaning of vows is determined based upon the colloquial meaning of the terms used in the statement of the vow, the first day of the New Moon is considered the beginning of the following month, even though it is technically the last day of the previous month.

Wine is *konam* for me and for that reason I will not taste it this year – קוֹנָם יַיִן שְׂאֲנִי טוֹעֵם הַשָּׁנָה: The author of the *Bah* emends the text of the Gemara here to match the text of the mishna as it appears on 63a: Wine is *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste it for the entire year.

HALAKHA

People call it the New Moon – קרו אֵינְשֵׁי רֵישׁ יָרְחָא: If one takes a vow and states that it applies for this month, the vow expires before the following New Moon, even if the upcoming New Moon is celebrated for two days. This is because people consider the first day of the New Moon to be the beginning of the upcoming month, even though it actually completes the previous one (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nedarim* 10:3; *Shulhan Arukh*, *Yoreh De'a* 220:4).

Wine is *konam* for me and for that reason I will not taste it for a day – קוֹנָם יַיִן שְׂאֲנִי טוֹעֵם יוֹם: The *halakha* in a case of one who vowed: Wine is *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste it for a day, remains uncertain. Therefore, it is forbidden to him for twenty-four hours, as if he said: One day. However, if he tasted it after nightfall of that day, he is not flogged. As this dilemma was not resolved by the Gemara, one must rule stringently, as in all cases of uncertainty involving Torah law (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nedarim* 10:2; *Shulhan Arukh*, *Yoreh De'a* 220:1).

HALAKHA

Actually, the case is that he said his vow should apply this year – לְעוֹלָם דְּאָמַר הַשָּׁנָה: If one takes a vow and applies it for this year, it applies until the end of the year, and is no longer in effect on Rosh HaShana. If he takes a vow for one year or for a year, the vow remains in effect until the following year on the same date that he originally took the vow, even in the case of a leap year. The ruling in the case of a vow taken for a year is due to the fact that the Gemara did not issue a definitive ruling, and therefore one must be stringent, as the case pertains to Torah law (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nedarim* 10:4; *Shulhan Arukh*, *Yoreh De'a* 220:7; see *Korban Netanel*).

מהו דתימא: ראש חדש לשעבר הו', ולא ליתפסר – קא משמע לן: קרו אֵינְשֵׁי רֵישׁ יָרְחָא.

This is lest you say that the first day of the New Moon is part of the previous month, and therefore the vow should expire at the end of that day, and wine should not be forbidden to him during the upcoming month. The *tanna* therefore teaches us that since people call it the New Moon^{NH} of the upcoming month, it is viewed as part of the upcoming month, and the vow applies to the new month.

שָׁנָה זוֹ – אָסוּר בְּכָל הַשָּׁנָה בּוֹלְהָ.

§ The mishna states that if one says: **This year**, it is forbidden to him for the entire remainder of the year, and that Rosh HaShana is considered part of the upcoming year.

איבעיא להו: אמר "קונם יין שאני טועם יום" מאי דיניה, ב"היום" או ב"יום אחד"?

A dilemma was raised before the scholars: If one said: **Wine is konam for me**, and for that reason I will not taste it for a day,^H what is the *halakha* in his case? Is it considered as though he said today, and he is prohibited from consuming wine until nightfall, or is it considered as though he said one day, in which case the vow takes effect for a period of twenty-four hours?

תא שמע ממתניתין: "קונם יין שאני טועם היום" – אין אסור אלא עד שתחשך. הא "יום" – ביום אחד דמי.

The Gemara suggests: **Come and hear a proof from the mishna:** If one says: **Wine is konam for me**, and for that reason I will not taste it today, he is prohibited from drinking wine only until the conclusion of that day, at nightfall. The Gemara infers that this *halakha* only applies if he said the word today; therefore, if he said the vow applies for a day, it is considered comparable to a case where he said one day, and the vow is in effect for twenty-four hours.

אימא סיפא: אמר "יום אחד" – אסור מיום ליום, הא "יום" – ב"היום" דמי. אלא מהא ליכא למשמע מינה.

The Gemara rejects this proof: But say the latter clause of the mishna: If he said that wine is forbidden to him for one day, he is prohibited from drinking wine from the day he took the vow to the same time on the following day. This indicates that it is only if he said: One day, that the vow takes effect for twenty-four hours; but if he said it takes effect for a day, it is comparable to a case where he said today, and the vow takes effect only until nightfall. Rather, no inference is to be learned from this mishna.

אמר רב אשי, תא שמע: "קונם יין שאני טועם השנה" – נתעברה השנה – אסור בה ובעיבורה. היכי דמי?

Rav Ashi said: **Come and hear a resolution to this question from the following mishna** (63a): If one vowed: **Wine is konam for me**, and for that reason I will not taste it this year,^N then if the year was extended, i.e., declared to be a leap year, he is prohibited from drinking wine in it and its intercalated month. The Gemara inquires: **What are the circumstances?**

Perek VIII

Daf 61 Amud a

אילימא בדתנני – למה לי למימרא? אלא לאו דאמר "שנה". אלמא: "שנה" ב"השנה" דמי, ו"יום" נמי ב"היום" דיניה.

If we say that it is exactly as it teaches, why do I need to state this *halakha*? It is obvious that a year means that entire year, even if it is a leap year. Rather, is it not referring to a case where he did not say that the vow applies this year, but rather, he said that it applies for a year, and the mishna teaches that the vow applies for the remainder of that year? Apparently, saying that a vow applies for a year is comparable to saying it applies this year; and similarly, the *halakha* in a case where one accepts a vow for a day should also be like the *halakha* in a case where one accepts a vow for today.

לא, לעולם דאמר "השנה". ומהו דתימא הלך אחר רוב השנים, ולא אית בהו עיבור, קא משמע לן.

The Gemara refutes this argument: **No, actually**, the case in the mishna is that he said his vow should apply this year,^H and it was necessary to state this *halakha* lest you say: **Follow the majority of years, which do not have an intercalated month**, and his vow should be understood as referring to a twelve month period. The *tanna* therefore teaches us that the phrase this year means that the vow should last until the end of the year.