



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

Nedarim Daf Pey Aleph

- They sent from Eretz Yisrael – be careful to wash clothing and to bathe, be careful to always learn Torah with a group of people, and be careful with the sons of poor people, because a pasuk is darshened to teach that Torah will come forth from these children.
 - **Q:** Why is it that it is not often the case that talmidei chachomim have children who are talmidei chachomim? **A: R' Yosef** said, it is so that they not think that Torah is an automatic inheritance for them (and that they will automatically be successful in Torah). **R' Shisha the son of R' Idi** said, it is so that they not treat themselves as aristocrats over the people. **Mar Zutra** said, it is because they force rule over the people. **R' Ashi** said, it is because they call people “donkeys” (they don't treat people with respect). **Ravina** said, it is because they do not make a bracha on Torah before learning, as we find that this is also the reason that Eretz Yisrael was destroyed.
- **Isi ben Yehuda** didn't show up to **R' Yose's** yeshiva for 3 days, because he was bothered with not having a basis for **R' Yose's** ruling that the needs of a city to wash their clothing could preempt the needs of another city for drinking water. **Vardimus the son of R' Yose** explained to him that we learn this from the pasuk that describes the use by the Levi'im of the open spaces around their cities. The pasuk says it may be used for their animals, their wealth “u'lechol chayasam”. The word “chayasam” can't refer to animals, because that is already stated in the pasuk. It can't mean to say that they can use this space for their everyday living, because that is obvious. It must mean to teach that they can use a water source in that area to launder their clothing. It is called “chayasam” because washing clothing removes a terrible affliction from a person.

AMAR R' YOSE EIN EILU NIDREI INUY NEFESH

- **Q:** According to **R' Yose**, although the husband may not be meifer these nedarim based on them being self-afflictive (he holds they are not), may he be meifer them as being nedarim that effect the relationship between husband and wife? **A:** In the Mishna **R' Yose** said “these are not nedarim of self-affliction”. This would suggest that he would agree that they are considered matters that effect the relationship.
 - **Q:** It may be that he was responding to the **T”K** who said that these are nedarim of self-affliction, and he therefore said that they are not, but in truth he may hold that they are not even considered to effect their relationship either!? If so, the question returns, can he be meifer these nedarim or not? **A: R' Ada bar Ahava** said, he can be meifer them, and **R' Huna** said, he cannot, because a husband is not concerned that his wife's lack of bathing will injure him during tashmish.
 - There is a Braisa which is a proof to the view of **R' Ada bar Ahava**. Among other things, the Braisa says that if a woman makes a neder not to apply makeup it is considered to be a matter effecting the relationship, and as such the husband may be meifer it. The follows the view of **R' Yose** (because he says such a neder is not considered to be a neder of self-affliction) and the Braisa says that he may be meifer the neder. We see that **R' Yose** would hold that such a neder is subject to hafarah as being a matter effecting their relationship.
 - **Q:** The Braisa also said, if she makes a neder that she will not have tashmish, he may be meifer the neder as something effecting the relationship. What is the case? If she said that “the pleasure of having tashmish with me should be assur to you”, that neder would never even take effect (she is obligated to have tashmish with her husband) and therefore he would not even have to be meifer!? **A:** The case is where she says “the pleasure of having tashmish with

you should be assur on me". In that case he would have to be meifer so as not to make her transgress her neder.

- A Braisa says, if people prohibit something to themselves although that thing is truly mutar, a person who does not prohibit this thing to himself should not do the prohibited act in front of the other people. This is based on the pasuk of "lo yacheil devaro" (their custom has the status of a neder). Another interpretation of the pasuk teaches that a chachom may not annul his own neder. This follows the view of **R' Gamliel** quoted in earlier Braisa, where he said this Halacha.