



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

### Nedarim Daf Pey Beis

- **Q: Rava** asked **R' Nachman**, according to the **Rabanan**, if a woman makes a neder prohibiting tashmish, is that considered to be a neder of self-affliction or a neder effecting their relationship? **A: R' Nachman** said, a Mishna later in our perek says, if a woman makes a neder not to have tashmish with any Yidden, the husband may be meifer to remove the neder in regard to himself, but she remains assur to all other Yidden. Now, this must mean that it is considered to only be a matter effecting their relationship, because if it was a matter of self-affliction he would be able to be meifer the neder with regard to everybody else as well.
  - **Q:** We find that **R' Huna** said that the anonymous Mishnayos of this perek follow **R' Yose**. If so, this Mishna cannot serve to prove what the **Rabanan** would hold!? We can see this is the case based on our Mishna which mentions the view of **R' Yose** and then ends off the statement and repeats "these are the words of **R' Yose**". This teaches that from that point on, the entire perek is the view of **R' Yose**.
- **Shmuel in the name of Levi** said, a husband can be meifer any neder of his wife except if she makes a neder prohibiting a third party to benefit from her. However, if she prohibits herself to benefit from a third party he could be meifer that neder (it is considered to be self-affliction).
  - **Q:** Our Mishna said, that a neder prohibiting the fruit of one whole country is not considered self-affliction and is therefore not subject to hafarah. If so, how could a neder prohibiting her from one person be considered self-affliction? **A: R' Yosef** said, the case of the Mishna is where she said "the fruit that you will bring to me from this country is assur to me". However, a statement prohibiting all fruit of a particular country would be considered self-affliction.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna said that a neder prohibiting the produce of a particular storekeeper is not self-affliction and is not subject to hafarah. This seems to be the same case as her prohibiting benefit from a third party, and yet the Mishna says he cannot be meifer!? **A:** Here again, the case of the Mishna is where she said "the produce that you bring to me from that person is assur to me".
    - **Q:** The Mishna then said, if this is the only storekeeper that gives the husband credit he could be meifer the neder. If the case is where she only prohibited the produce that the husband brings her, why could he be meifer? She can simply go and get the produce from this storekeeper herself and not be assur from the neder!? The case must therefore be that she prohibited all the produce of the storekeeper, and that must be what happened in the last case as well, and yet we see that he may not be meifer!? **A:** We must say that this part of the Mishna follows **R' Yose**, who holds that this case is not one of self-affliction. **Shmuel** said his Halacha according to the view of the **Rabanan**, who would hold that such a case is a case of self-affliction.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, if a woman makes a neder not to eat 2 loaves of bread, one of which causes self-affliction (it is high quality bread) and one of which does not (it is low quality bread), since the husband may be meifer the neder with regard to the high quality bread (it is a neder of self-affliction), he may also be meifer the neder with regard to the other bread as well. **R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan** said that he may only be meifer the one that causes self-affliction, but not the other one.
  - Another version has **R' Assi** asking **R' Yochanan** what the Halacha would be in this case and **R' Yochanan** answering that he may only be meifer the one that causes self-affliction and not the other one.