



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

Nedarim Daf Gimmel

- **Q:** The Gemara said that the Mishna explains yados before kinuyim, because yados are learned via a drasha, which makes it more beloved to the Tanna. This reason is valid if we follow the shita that says that kinuyim are simply verbiage of nedarim in other languages. Therefore, it is clear that they work and yados are a more novel concept. However, according to the view that kinuyim are words created by the **Rabanan** to effectuate a neder, kinuyim are actually more novel than yados (which are at least learned from pesukim) and should therefore have been explained first!? **A:** As we stated earlier, the Mishna doesn't actually give the general rule for yados, and we are told that we should insert that language into the Mishna. Once we must insert it into the Mishna, it should be inserted at the very beginning, before discussion of kinuyim, and it can then be said that yados are explained first because yados are listed first as well.
- **Q:** Where is the concept of yados written in the pasuk? **A:** A pasuk says, "ish oh isha ki yafli lindor neder nazir l'hazir LaShem". A Braisa says, the double verbiage of "nazir l'hazir" teaches that the kinuyim of nezirus create nezirus and that the yados of nezirus create nezirus. The fact that the pasuk puts neder next to nezirus teaches us a hekesh between the two. We learn that just as yados are effective for nezirus, yados are effective for nedarim as well. We also learn that just as one transgresses "lo yacheil" and "lo si'acheir" when he doesn't keep his promise or delays in delivering on his promise, the same would be for nezirus. Also, just as a father and husband can annul the nedarim of his daughter or wife, a father and husband may do the same for the nezirus of his daughter or wife.
 - **Q:** Why do we need the hekesh to teach us that yados are effective in creating a neder? Just as there is double verbiage by nezirus there is also double verbiage by nedarim, and we should therefore be able to learn yados by nedarim from the double verbiage ("lindor neder") without the hekesh!? **A:** If the double verbiage of neder would have been written with the noun before the verb ("neder lindor") as it is written by nezirus ("nazir l'hazir") then we could learn it from there without the hekesh. Since it does not do it that way, it shows that the pasuk wrote this double verbiage in the style that people speak, and not to use it to learn a drasha.
 - **Q:** This answer is valid according to the view that sometimes the Torah writes in the way that people speak and not for a drasha. However, according to the view that double verbiage is always to be used for a drasha, what will we darshen with these words? **A:** That view will say that the pasuk is teaching that yados of nedarim are effective in creating nedarim. The hekesh would then teach that yados by nezirus are also effective, as is learned from the hekesh to nedarim. We would then say that the double verbiage by nezirus teaches that a vow of nezirus can take effect on top of another vow of nezirus (and they would have to be observed consecutively).
 - **Q:** According to the view that the verbiage of nezirus teaches regarding yados, how does he learn the Halacha of one nezirus taking effect on another nezirus, according to the view that one nezirus does take effect on top of another nezirus (which is itself a matter of dispute)? **A:** The pasuk could have said "lizer" and instead says "l'hazir". We can therefore learn 2 drashos from this word.
 - In Eretz Yisrael they said, there is a Tanna who learns the effectiveness of yados from the words "lindor neder" and another Tanna who learns it from the pasuk of "kol hayotzei mipiv yaaseh".

- **Q:** The Braisa quoted above said that just as one transgresses “lo yacheil” and “lo si’acheir” when he doesn’t keep his promise or delays in delivering on his promise, the same would be for nezirus. Now, one transgresses lo yacheil of a neder when he promises to do something (e.g. eat a piece of bread) and doesn’t do it. How is that applied to nezirus? As soon as one says he will be a nazir, he is automatically a nazir!? If he then does something a nazir may not do, he transgresses a different lav, but not the lav of lo yacheil, because he is in fact a nazir!? **A: Rava** said, it makes him be oiver 2 lavim (he would be oiver lo yacheil and the other lav for doing something he may not do as a nazir).
 - **Q:** How does one violate lo si’acher by nezirus? As soon as he says he will be a nazir, he becomes a nazir, and it therefore becomes impossible for him to delay this promise!? **A:** The case would be where he said “when I want to begin, I will become a nazir”. Therefore it does not take effect immediately.
 - **Q:** If that is the case, he can’t be said to be delaying the nezirus, because it does not take effect until he wants it to!? **A: Rava** said, the case is where he says, I will not leave this world before being a nazir. In this case, he is obligated to accept it upon himself immediately, since a person does not know when he will die.
 - **A: R’ Acha bar Yaakov** said, the case is where he was standing in a cemetery when he accepted the nezirus. It cannot begin until he leaves and makes himself tahor. If he delays in doing so he would be oiver lo si’acher.
 - **Q:** That is only true according to the view that the nezirus in that case will not take effect immediately!? Also, we are taught that **Mar Bar R’ Ashi** said that all agree that in this case the nezirus would take effect immediately!? **A:** Still, if he delays in becoming tahor he would be oiver lo si’acher for delaying the onset of tahor nezirus.
 - **R’ Ashi** said, based on this, if a nazir purposely makes himself tamei, he will be oiver lo si’acher of a tahor nezirus.