



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

Nedarim Daf Mem Beis

MISHNA

- If Reuven makes a neder prohibiting Shimon to benefit from him, in a year other than shmitta Shimon may not go into Reuven's field, and may not even take fruit from Reuven's trees that hang outside his field. In a year of shmitta, although he may not enter Reuven's field, he may take fruit from the trees that hang outside the field.
- If the neder prohibited Shimon from food related benefit, then in a year other than shmitta Shimon may walk into Reuven's field, but he may not eat the fruit. In a year of shmitta, he may walk into Reuven's field and eat the fruit as well.

GEMARA

- **Rav and Shmuel** both say, if the neder prohibiting benefit from "these possessions" (referring to his possessions) was made before shmitta, then Shimon may not enter Reuven's field or eat from the fruit hanging out of his field even on shmitta. If the neder was made on shmitta, he may not enter Reuven's field, but he may eat from the fruit hanging out of his field. **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish** both say, if the neder prohibiting benefit from "my possessions" was made before shmitta, then Shimon may not enter Reuven's field or eat from the fruit hanging out of his field before shmitta, and on shmitta he may not enter the field, but he may eat from the fruit that hangs out of the field.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that the machlokes is that **Rav and Shmuel** hold that a person can make assur something that he currently owns even for a time when he no longer owns it, and **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish** say that a person cannot do that? **A:** If **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish** hold that way, why didn't they say their Halacha even in a case where the neder was made with the words of "these possessions", which is a bigger chiddush and would surely teach the Halacha in a case where he said "my possessions"! Also, a Mishna says that if a father prohibits his son from benefiting from him during the father's life and after his death, the son may not inherit from the father. We clearly see that everyone must hold that a person can make something assur even for a time when he no longer owns it!
 - The Gemara says that the proof from the Mishna is not absolute, because although **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish** hold that a person cannot make something assur for a time when he no longer owns it, it may be that when he specifically says that it should be assur then as well ("after my death"), in that case it will be assur then as well. However, the first question remains.
 - We must say that when he says "these possessions should be assur to you", they remain assur even when he no longer owns them. The machlokes is when he says "my possessions should be assur to you". **Rav and Shmuel** say that in both cases a person can make something assur for a time when he no longer owns it, and **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish** hold that he can only do so when he says "these possessions".
 - **Q:** A Mishna seems to clearly make a difference between the case of where a person says "your possessions" and where he says "these possessions"! **A:** It must be that **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish** said their Halacha regarding a case of "my possessions" (which is why he can't make it assur for when he doesn't own it) and **Rav and Shmuel** said their Halacha regarding a case of "these possessions" (which is why

it can be made assur for a time when he no longer owns it), and in truth they don't argue.

UBISHVI'IS EIN YOREID L'TOCH SADEIHU...

- **Q:** The Mishna says he may eat from the fruit, since that is hefker. For that same reason why can't he walk into the field, since the land is hefker for the sake of getting access to the fruit as well!? **A: Ulla** said, the case is where the trees are on the property line. Since there is no reason to enter the field (he has access from the outside) he may not do so because of the neder. **A2: R' Shimon ben Elyakam** said, the **Rabanan** made a gezeira and prohibited him from entering the field out of concern that he may stay there longer than is necessary to get the fruit (staying there longer would be a violation of the neder).

MISHNA

- If Reuven makes a neder prohibiting himself any benefit from Shimon, Shimon may not lend any items to Reuven and Reuven may not lend any items to Shimon, he may not lend him money or borrow money from him, and he may not sell anything to him or buy anything from him.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What benefit does Reuven have when he lends something to Shimon!? Now, when he lends money and sells him something it is possible that he may benefit (he may get repaid with better currency or get rid of slow moving stock), but what benefit does he get when he lends items to him!? **A: R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** said, the case of the Mishna is where there was a 2-way neder, and Reuven and Shimon were each assur to benefit from each other. **A2: Abaye** said, that the reason he can't lend is a gezeira that it may lead him to borrow.