



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

Nedarim Daf Pey Vuv

- **Q: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** had said, when a woman makes her hands hekdesch for her handiwork, she is not considered as being makdesch something which is not yet in existence (i.e. the handiwork), because her hands are already in existence. The Gemara now asks, a woman is obligated to work for her husband, so how can she even make her hands hekdesch? **A:** She says that when she gets divorced her hands should become hekdesch.
 - **Q:** Can it be that even though something can't be made hekdesch now it can still be made hekdesch for a future time? **A: R' Eila** said, there is no reason that this shouldn't work. If one is selling his field and says to the buyer, when I buy this back from you it should become hekdesch, it would become hekdesch. So there is no reason that this would be different!
 - **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked, these cases are very different!? In that case the field is in his possession at the time of the statement. However, a woman while she is married cannot effect a divorce and can therefore not make her hands hekdesch!? If anything, the woman is more like the case of one who sees a field and says, when I buy that it should become hekdesch, in which case it does not become hekdesch!
 - **Q: R' Pappa** said, this is not a good comparison, because the field and its produce are owned by the same person, whereas the hands of a woman are owned by herself, but the produce of those hands are owned by her husband!? If anything, it is similar to a case where one pledged his field (where the one receiving the pledge may eat the produce), and says that when I redeem the field it will become hekdesch. In that case, it does become hekdesch.
 - **Q: R' Shisha the son of R' Idi** asked, those cases are not alike, because the pledger has the power to redeem the field, whereas the woman does not have the power to divorce herself!? If anything, she is like a case where the pledger agreed that he may not redeem the field for 10 years, and then says that when I redeem it, it should become hekdesch, in which case it does become hekdesch.
 - **Q: R' Ashi** asked, the cases are not the same, because in the case of the field, after 10 years he will have the power to redeem the field, whereas the woman never has the power to divorce herself!? **A: R' Ashi** said, the case of vows is not problematic, because **Rava** has said that vows ("konamos") even remove an item from a lien. Therefore, when the woman vows her hands as konam, it is effective even though they are subject to the husband.
 - **Q:** If so, why did **R' Yochanan ben Nuri** say that he has to be meifer the neder since it will take effect when she gets divorced? It takes effect right now as well! **A:** The Mishna should be understood as giving an *additional* reason – also, even if we say that the **Rabanan** didn't allow her the power to make this hekdesch while she is in the reshus of her husband, he should still be meifer, because she may get divorced and when she does the neder will take effect then.

MISHNA

- If a man's wife made a neder, but he thought it was his daughter who made the neder, or visa-versa, or if she made a neder of nezirus and he thought she had made a neder to bring a korbon, or visa-versa, or if she made a neder not to eat figs and he thought she had made the neder not to eat grapes, or visa-versa, in all these cases, if he was meifer under the wrong understanding he must be meifer again with the proper understanding.