



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Nedarim Daf Yud Zayin

MISHNA

- There is effect to a neder within the terms of another neder, but there is no effect to a shevuah within the terms of another shevuah.
 - For example, if someone says "I will be a nazir if I eat this bread, I will be a nazir if I eat this bread" and he then eats the bread, he becomes obligated in 2 separate terms of nezirus. On the other hand, if someone says "shevuah that I will not eat this bread, shevuah that I will not eat this bread" and he then eats the bread, he is only chayuv for one violation of a shevuah.

GEMARA

- The Ran quotes a piece of Gemara that is not written in our Gemara. He says, the Gemara asks, a person becomes a nazir just by saying that he will become a nazir, without the need to tie it to eating the bread, so why did the Mishna do so? Also, if it is tied to eating the bread, then for each kezayis that he eats after being warned, he would be subject to a separate nezirus, so why the need for him to repeat the phrase twice!? The Gemara answers, that since we had to introduce the concept of "not eating the bread" with regard to the shevuah (it has to be about something) we mention it regarding the case of nezirus as well, although it is truly unnecessary. Still, in the case of the Mishna, he would be subject to 2 periods of nezirus even if he only ate one kezayis of the bread based on his repeating the phrase.
- **R' Huna** said, nezirus can only take effect on another nezirus if he first says "I am hereby a nazir today" and then says "I am hereby a nazir tomorrow". In that case, since the second nezirus adds one more day to his nezirus (the first nezirus makes him a nazir for 30 days starting today and the 2nd nezirus makes him a nazir for 30 days starting tomorrow, thus adding one day, although the Ran says that the full 30 days for the 2nd nezirus will have to be kept after completion of the first period of nezirus) it takes effect on top of the first nezirus as well. However, if he says "I am hereby a nazir today, I am hereby a nazir today", the second nezirus will not take effect on top of the first nezirus. **Shmuel** said, even if he says "I am hereby a nazir today, I am hereby a nazir today", the second nezirus will take effect on top of the first nezirus.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Huna**, if the Mishna wants to show that at times one thing takes effect on another (a neder) and at times it does not (a shevuah), why didn't it show that point while sticking to neder itself? It could say, sometimes a neder takes effect on another neder (if the second neder adds a day) and sometimes it does not (if it adds nothing)!? **KASHYEH**.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna compares the case of neder to shevuah and says that neder could take effect on top of neder whereas shevuah cannot take effect on top of shevuah. What is the case of neder and shevuah? If the case is where he said I am hereby a nazir today and then says I am hereby a nazir tomorrow, since the second nezirus period must be observed after the first is over without overlap, the comparable case by shevuah would be where he swears not to eat figs and then swears not to eat grapes. Now, in that case the second shevuah would take effect on top of the first (because they are on unrelated items)!? Therefore, it must be that the case of neder is where he says I am hereby a nazir today and then says I am hereby a nazir today. The comparable case of shevuah would be where he says I swear not to eat figs and then says again I swear not to eat figs. The Mishna teaches that the second shevuah won't take effect, but the second

neder will! This refutes **R' Huna!**? **A:** **R' Huna** will say, the Mishna is referring to where he makes a neder by saying I am hereby a nazir today and then says I am hereby a nazir tomorrow, and that is the reason the second neder takes effect on top of the first. The comparable case of shevuah is where he says I swear not to eat figs and then says I swear not to eat figs and grapes. That is comparable to the case of the neder, because in both cases there is overlap (although not in practical observing of the neder, but still overlap in effect), and the Mishna teaches that this takes effect by neder but not by shevuah.

- **Q:** We find a statement of **Rabbah** that suggests that in the case of 2 shevuos that were made like the above, that since the second shevuah takes effect with regard to the grapes it also takes effect with regard to the figs as well!? **A:** **R' Huna** would not agree with this statement of **Rabbah**.
- **Q:** A Braisa says, if someone made 2 nedarim of nezirus, observed the first 30 days of nezirus, separated animals for the korbanos for the end of the first period, and was then able to annul his first vow of nezirus, the second neder is considered to be fulfilled with the observance of the past 30 days and he need not keep nezirus for another 30 days. Now, if this is talking about where he said "I am hereby a nazir today" and then said "I am hereby a nazir tomorrow", how can the Braisa say that the observance of 30 days from the first neder fulfills the second neder, since the second neder goes for one day beyond the first neder!? Rather, it must be that the person says "I am hereby a nazir today" and then said again "I am hereby a nazir today", and we see that the second neder is effective, which refutes **R' Huna!**? **A:** It may be that the Braisa is discussing where he says "I am hereby a nazir today" and then said "I am hereby a nazir tomorrow", and when the Braisa says that the observed days have fulfilled the second neder it means except for the one remaining day of the second neder. **A2:** The Braisa may be discussing where the person accepted 2 periods of nezirus simultaneously. In this case even **R' Huna** would agree that both nedarim take effect.