



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

Nedarim Daf Mem Zayin

HA'OMER L'CHAVEIRO...

- **Q:** Avimi asked, if Reuven makes a neder that prohibits Shimon to enter “this house” (which Reuven owns at that time) and Reuven then dies or sells the house to someone else, what is the Halacha for Shimon to then enter the house? Can one make something that he currently owns assur even for a time when he no longer owns it, or not? **A:** Rava said, a Mishna says that if a person makes a neder that his son may not benefit from him “during my life or after my death”, he does not inherit his father after his death. We clearly see that a person can make something assur for a time when he no longer owns it. **SHEMA MINAH.**
- **Q:** A Mishna says, if someone made a neder prohibiting “these fruits” on himself, he is even assur to things gotten in exchange for these fruits or things that grew from these fruits. **Rami bar Chama** asked, what if someone makes a neder to prohibit another person from “these fruits”, would the person likewise become assur in things exchanged for those fruits? Do we say that regarding a person himself, since a person can make another person’s fruit assur on himself, he can also make assur on himself things that do not yet exist (i.e. the exchanged items), but regarding another person, since a person cannot make someone else’s items assur on someone else, maybe he also can’t make assur on the person something that does not yet exist? Or do we say that the items exchanged for the original subject of the neder are considered to be extensions of that original item, and are therefore assur to the other person as well? **A:** R' Acha bar Menyumei said, a Braisa says, if a person makes a neder to prohibit his wife from benefitting from him, and she needs money and therefore goes and borrows money from people, the lender can then go and collect payment from the husband. Now, the payment of the loan by the husband is essentially an exchange for the money lent to his wife, and yet we see that this is permitted for the wife to benefit in this way! From here we see that when the neder is on another person, the exchange of the original items are mutar.
 - **Rava** said, this Braisa is not a good proof, because it may be that an outright exchange done l’chatchila is assur like the initial prohibited items, but an exchange that is done b’dieved (the exchange only becomes an exchange after the husband pays back the lenders) is not assur.
 - **A:** Maybe we can bring a proof from a Mishna that says, if someone is mekadesh a woman with orlah, it is not an effective kiddushin. However, if he exchanges the orlah from another item, and is mekadesh her with the other items, it is an effective kiddushin. We see that the exchanged item is not assur to benefit as was the original assur item.
 - The Gemara says, this too is no proof, because it is again an example of a b’dieved, and not a l’chatchila.