



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

Nedarim Daf Pey

IHM ERCHATZ

- **Q:** What did she say that made this part of the neder? If she said “all the fruits of the world should be assur to me if I bathe”, then why do we allow hafarah? Let her not bathe and thereby not make the fruits of the world assur on her!? Also, if that were the case, **R' Yose** would agree that this would be a case of self-affliction, because if she were to bathe she would become assur to eat all the fruits of the world! If she said “if I bathe, the pleasure of ever bathing again should be assur to me”, and the reason he could be meifer is because she can never bathe more than once, which would make her disgusting, and the reason **R' Yose** says he may not be meifer is because he holds that not bathing may be disgusting but is not considered to be self-affliction – then **R' Yose** should not have said “this is not a neder of self-affliction”, rather he should have said “this is not a *condition* of self-affliction”!? **A:** The case is where she said “it will be assur to me to bathe forever if I bathe today”. **R' Yose** holds that a one day ban on bathing does not make her disgusting to the point of allowing hafarah.
 - **Q:** What is the case of where she says “ihm lo erchatz”? If she said “bathing should be assur to me forever if I do not bathe today”, why would we allow hafarah? Let her bathe today and not become assur!? **A: R' Yehuda** said, the case is where she says “bathing should be forever assur to me if I do not take a bath in smelly water”.
 - **Q:** This would mean that the comparable case of applying makeup would be where she said “putting on makeup should be forever assur to me if I don't put on smelly makeup”. Now, putting on smelly makeup is not considered putting on makeup at all! That would be considered to be dirtying herself!? **A: Rava** said, the first case of the Mishna is where she says “bathing should be forever assur to me if I bathe today” and the second case is where she simply makes a shevuah never to take a bath. Similarly, the next cases of the Mishna are where she says “putting on makeup should be assur to me forever if I put on makeup today” and the second case would be where she simply makes a shevuah never to put on makeup.
 - **Q: Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, if so the Mishna should have stated “these are the nedarim *and shavuos* that he may be meifer”!? **A: R' Ashi** answered, either we can say to change the Mishna to actually read “and shavuos”, or we can answer that shavuos are sometimes referred to as nedarim as well.
- **Q:** How could the **Rabanan** say that not bathing is considered to be self-affliction? Regarding Yom Kippur a Braisa says that one does not get kares for bathing. Now, if not bathing causes affliction, then bathing on Yom Kippur should carry the kares penalty!? **A: Rava** said, we learn from the pasuk regarding Yom Kippur that the only non-affliction assur with kares is regarding an affliction that can be seen on that day. The affliction of not bathing cannot be seen until a few days later, and is therefore not subject to kares. Regarding nedarim the pasuk says that if the neder will lead to affliction it is subject to hafarah, and not bathing does lead to an eventual affliction.
- **Q:** How could **R' Yose** say that not bathing is not an affliction? In a Braisa **R' Yose** says that not washing clothing is a terrible affliction (to the point that one may use water to wash his clothing even if that will not leave over enough water to allow other people to drink). If not washing clothing is an affliction, surely not washing oneself is an affliction!? **A: R' Yose** holds that not washing clothing is worse than not bathing, as we find that **Shmuel** said, not washing clothing causes one to lose his mind, whereas not bathing only causes skin ailments.