



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

Nedarim Daf Daled

- The Gemara had asked how it is possible for one to be oiver on lo si'acher for the promise of nezirus, since the moment that the promise is made he becomes a nazir. The Gemara gave some answers and now continues with more.
 - **R' Acha the son of R' Ika** said, a nazir can be oiver the lav of lo si'acher if he doesn't shave his head when he is supposed to. This is so even according to the view that shaving of the head is not essential. Still, it is a mitzvah, and delaying it would be an issue of lo si'acher.
 - **Mar Zutra the son of R' Mari** said, a nazir can be oiver lo si'acher if he delays in bringing the obligatory korbanos at the end of his nezirus period.
 - **Q:** We would not need to learn this from the hekesh, because we could learn this from the pasuk that teaches that all korbanos that are delayed in being brought are subject to lo si'acher!? **A:** We would have thought that since there is a novelty with regard to the halachos of nezirus, the lav does not apply. The hekesh therefore teaches that it does apply.
 - **Q:** What is the novelty? It can't be based on the fact that a person cannot make a neder to bring the chatas of a nazir, because that applies to any chatas!? **A:** The Gemara says, the novelty is that a person who accepts nezirus only with regard to the aspect of eating grapes seeds, is considered to have accepted a full nezirus upon himself, with regard to all laws of nezirus. Since there is this novelty, we would think that the lav of lo si'acher wouldn't apply. The hekesh teaches that it does.
 - **Q:** This answer doesn't work according to **R' Shimon**, who says that this person would *not* be subject to nezirus based on this qualified promise!? Also, this novelty is a chumra, and would therefore not be a reason to prevent a lav from taking effect!? **A:** The novelty is, that although a nazir must bring 3 korbanos, if he only brings one and shaves his head he becomes free from nezirus. Since that is the case, we would think that lo si'acher would not apply. The hekesh therefore teaches that it does.
 - **A:** We can also say that the novelty is as stated above, that a person cannot make a neder to bring the chatas of a nazir. Although we asked that one cannot make a neder to bring any other chatas either, we would say that other chatas are brought to bring a kaparah, and they are therefore subject to lo si'acher. The chatas of a nazir is not, and we would therefore think it should not be subject to lo si'acher.
 - **Q:** The chatas of a woman who gave birth is not brought for kaparah and yet is subject to lo si'acher!? **A:** Her chatas permits her to eat kodashim, which she must do for mitzvos (e.g. the Korbon Pesach). Therefore, that makes sense that it is subject to lo si'acher. However, the chatas of a nazir would be thought not to be subject to lo si'acher.
 - **Q:** The Gemara earlier quoted the Braisa that said that a hekesh teaches that just as a father may annul the vows of his daughter and a husband may annul the vows of his wife, a father may also annul the nezirus of his daughter and a husband may annul the nezirus of his wife. Why is a

hekesheh needed to teach this? Why can't we learn this directly from nedarim, since it is seemingly a similar concept!? **A:** We would think that they can annul nedarim, because there is no time limit associated with nedarim. However, nezirus has a time limit, and therefore it may be that they can't annul the nezirus. The hekesheh therefore teaches that they can annul nezirus as well.

HA'OMER L'CHAVEIRO MUDAR ANI...

- **Shmuel** said, all the phrases of the Mishna (e.g. "I am separated from you", "I am distanced from you", etc.) only create a neder if they are accompanied by the phrases of the next part of the Mishna ("that what I eat from you", "that what I taste from you").
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if one says "I am vowed from you" or "I am separated from you" or "I am distanced from you", he has created a neder and is therefore assur. If one says "that what I eat from you" or "that what I taste from you", he is likewise assur. We see that even the first statements alone create a neder!? **A:** The Braisa means to say, that the first phrases create a neder *only when* the second phrases are added afterwards.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if one says "that what I eat from you" or "that what I taste from you", he is assur. If one says "I am vowed from you" or "I am separated from you" or "I am distanced from you", he is likewise assur. This can't be understood as the previous Braisa was understood. If so, we see that each set of phrases alone can create a neder, not like **Shmuel** said!? **A:** The Braisa should be understood as saying that the first list of phrases is necessary to be stated to create a neder *even if* the second list was said as well.
 - **Q:** That would mean that both Braisos are saying the exact same thing!? Also, if this is correct, why would the Braisa twice say that the person is "assur" (since it is one Halacha stated in the Braisa it should only be stated once)!? **A:** **Shmuel** must have said that when a person adds "that what I eat from you" or "that what I taste from you", the person becomes assur in the other person's possessions, but the "other person" remains mutar in the possessions of the one who made the neder. However, if a person only says "I am vowed from you" or "I am separated from you" or "I am distanced from you", they each become assur in each other's possessions.
 - **R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** said this as well.