



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

### Nedarim Daf Ayin

- **Q: Rabbah** asked, if the husband or father says "it is confirmed for today", what is the Halacha? Do we consider this as if he said "it should be mufar tomorrow" and it is therefore mufar from tomorrow, or do we say that he didn't say it should be mufar from tomorrow and therefore it is not mufar from tomorrow?
  - **Q:** If we say that since he didn't say so explicitly, it is not considered mufar from tomorrow, what is the Halacha if he only says "it should be mufar for you tomorrow"? Do we say he can't be meifer tomorrow, because he already confirmed it today (the inference of saying it should be mufar tomorrow), or do we say that since he didn't explicitly confirm the neder it will be a good hafarah?
  - **Q:** If we say that it is still considered to be a confirmed neder for today and a hafarah therefore can't be effective tomorrow, what is the Halacha is he says "it is confirmed for an hour"? Do we say it is as if he said it should become mufar after the hour, or do we say that he wasn't explicitly meifer it, and it therefore is not mufar?
  - **Q:** If we say it is not mufar because he didn't explicitly say so, what is the Halacha is he explicitly says "this is confirmed for an hour and then it should be mufar"? Do we say that once confirmed it remains confirmed and hafarah afterward cannot be mufar, or do we say that since he has a full day to be meifer, as long as he is still within that time period he may make this statement and have it be mufar?
    - **A:** This last question can be answered from a Mishna which says, if a woman makes a neder of nezirus and upon hearing about this neder the husband says "and I" (also accept nezirus on myself), the husband can no longer be meifer (he has confirmed the neder by using it as a base for his own neder). Now, why don't we say that the confirmation was only for a short time (so that he could use it as a base for his neder) after which time he can be meifer? It must be that a confirmation is considered a permanent confirmation.
      - The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. It may be that if someone explicitly makes a confirmation effective for a short time period (e.g. an hour) it will only be effective for that time. However, the confirmation of "and I" is the equivalent of him making a permanent confirmation.

### MISHNA

- If the father died during the eirusin, his rights to hafarah are not transferred to the husband. If the husband died, his rights to hafarah are transferred to the father. In this way, the rights of the father are stronger than those of the husband. In another way the rights of the husband are stronger, in that a husband can even be meifer if the girl is a bogeres, whereas a father cannot be meifer for his daughter who is a bogeres.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** Why is it that the rights get transferred to the father but not to the husband? **A:** The pasuk says "binureha beis aviha", which teaches that she remains in her father's house, even if the father has died. This means that she is not considered to be totally in the reshut of the husband and he therefore cannot be meifer her neder on his own.

### MEIS HABAAL NISROKNA RESHUS L'AV

- **Rava** said, this is based on the pasuk of "v'ihm hayo sihiyeh l'ish" – the double verbiage of eirusin (hayo sihiyeh) teaches to compare a girl before her second eirusin to a girl before her

first eirusin. This teaches that just as the father has exclusive rights to be meifer before the first eirusin, he also has exclusive rights to be meifer before the second eirusin.

- **Q:** Maybe this only applies to nedarim that the husband did not know about before his death, but nedarim that he did know about, the father cannot be meifer on his own? **A:** We would know that the father can be meifer nedarim that were not known to the husband based on the pasuk of “binureha beis aviha”.

BAZEH YAFI KOACH HA'AV MIKOACH HABAAL...

- **Q:** What is the case that the Mishna is saying that the husband can be meifer while she is a bogeres? If the case is where she entered eirusin as a naarah and has since become a bogeres, why would it be that the husband can be meifer alone? The death of the father removes her from his reshus and becoming a bogeres removes her from his reshus. We should say that just as upon his death the husband does not get exclusive rights, the same should be upon becoming a bogeres!? Rather the case must be that she went into eirusin as a bogeres. That is the view of **R' Eliezer** in an explicit Mishna, so why would the Mishna repeat it here? **A:** Either we can say that the Mishna here is the main place of this subject, and the Mishna there brings it down only to state that it is the subject of a machlokes between **R' Eliezer** and the **Chachomim**. Or we can say that the Mishna there is the main place for this subject, and the Mishna here brings it down to contrast its first statement that the father's power is stronger than that of the husband. The Mishna contrasts that by showing that there is also a way in which the power of the husband is stronger than that of the father.