



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

Nedarim Daf Pey Gimme!

- **Q: R' Yochanan** had said that when a woman makes a neder prohibiting 2 loaves of bread – which causes self-affliction with regard to one of the loaves but not the other – the husband may only be meifer the neder regarding the loaf whose prohibition causes self-affliction. **R' Assi** asked, a Mishna says that if a woman made a neder of nezirus and her husband was meifer without her even knowing, and she then went and drank wine and became tamei to a meis, she does not get malkus (the neder is revoked even without her knowledge). Now, according to **R' Yochanan** the hafarah should only be effective with regard to drinking of wine (which causes self-affliction) but not with regard to the eating of grape seeds or grape skins (that prohibition does not cause self-affliction) and therefore if she eats these things she should still get malkus!? **A: R' Yosef** said, there is no such thing as a less than complete nezirus. A nazir is assur in everything that the Torah states, and if he/she is not, there is no nezirus at all.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, **R' Yosef** seems to suggest that there is no “half nezirus”, but that a korbon would need to be brought for half a nezirus (e.g. if the woman's neder of nezirus was revoked halfway through its term). **A: Abaye** said, we must understand **R' Yosef** to mean that there is also no korbon that must be brought for half a nezirus.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if a woman made a neder of nezirus, became tamei, separated korbanos, and then her husband was meifer, she brings the chatas bird but not the olah bird. According to **Abaye**, if the neder is cut short, why would she bring the chatas bird!? **A:** If **Abaye** is incorrect, why doesn't she also bring the olah and the asham!? We must say, that in truth a korbon is not brought in this circumstance. The reason the chatas is brought is because a chatas bird is even brought for a case of safek, so it is brought in a case like this as well.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that if a woman made a neder of nezirus and became tamei meis and her husband was then meifer, she only must bring the chatas bird. Now, if **R' Yochanan** is correct, since not becoming tamei does not cause self-affliction the neder should remain in effect with regard to tumah and she should have to bring all korbanos!? **A:** Not allowing herself to become tamei is also considered to be self-affliction, because **R' Meir** in a Braisa darshens a pasuk to teach that one who does not eulogize or cry for or bury the dead, will not have anyone to eulogize or cry for or bury him when he dies.

MISHNA

- If a woman makes a neder prohibiting herself to benefit from other people, the husband may not be meifer the neder. However, she may still benefit from leket, shikcha, and peyah.
- If a person makes a neder prohibiting Kohanim and Levi'im to benefit from him, they may take their terumah and maaser against this person's will. However, if the neder specified particular Kohanim and Levi'im, they may not take from him, and other Kohanim and Levi'im should take the terumah and maaser from him.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna first says that the woman's neder is not subject to hafarah (it is not a neder of self-affliction), which is likely because she may benefit from her husband (he is not included in the “other people”). However, the Mishna then says that she may benefit from leket, shikcha, and peyah, which suggests that she may however *not* benefit from her husband (he is included in “other people”)!? **A: Ulla** said, the husband is actually not included in the term “other people” and that is why the neder is not subject to hafarah (she has a means of support and the neder therefore doesn't cause self-affliction). The Mishna then gives *another* reason, and says that she

can take leket, etc., which is another means of support and another reason the neder does not cause self-affliction. **A2: Rava** said, the husband *is* included in the term “other people”. The Mishna is to be understood as giving a reason as to why the neder is therefore not subject to hafarah. To explain this, the Mishna says that the reason is because she can be supported on leket, shikcha, and peyah. **A3: R’ Nachman** said, the husband is not included in the term “other people” and that is why she may benefit from him. The Mishna then teaches, that if they get divorced the husband then becomes included in the term “other people”, and at that time she would only be allowed to benefit from leket, shikcha, and peyah.

- **Q: Rava** asked **R’ Nachman**, how can you say that the husband is not included in the term “other people”? A Mishna says, if a woman makes a neder saying “I am removed from the Jews”, we understand this to mean that she is prohibiting benefit of tashmish with Jews. Therefore, the husband is meifer the neder with respect to himself (it is considered a neder that effects their relationship, and not a neder of self-affliction, since she is anyway assur to have tashmish with all other men) and it remains in effect for all other men. Now, if the husband is not included in the term “other people”, then this neder could not refer to tashmish, because she is totally assur in tashmish with anybody if the husband is not included in that term. If so, the neder would have to be understood as her prohibiting benefit in general from all other people, in which case it is a neder of self-affliction, and the husband should be able to be meifer the neder completely, not only in regard to himself!?
- A:** The case of this Mishna is different. When she says she should be “removed from the Jews” it suggests that she means to prohibit tashmish. There is no need for the neder unless she is including a tashmish that is otherwise mutar to her (i.e. with her husband). Therefore, although typically the husband is not included in the term “other people”, in this case we assume that he is included.