



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Nedarim, Daf ౧ – Daf ౧౦

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf ౧--60-----

PEREK KONAM YAYIN -- PEREK SHEMINI

MISHNA

- If one makes a neder prohibiting himself to taste wine “today”, he is assur to taste wine until nightfall. If the neder stated he would be assur for “this week”, he is assur that entire week including the Shabbos following the neder. If the neder stated he would be assur for “this month”, he is assur that entire month, and the day of Rosh Chodesh is part of the following month. If the neder stated he would be assur for “this year”, he is assur that entire year and Rosh Hashanah is part of the next year. If the neder stated he would assur for “this shmitta cycle”, he is assur that entire cycle, and the shmitta year which follows the neder is considered to be part of this shmitta cycle.
- If the neder stated he would assur for “one day”, “one week”, “one month”, “one year”, “one seven year cycle”, he would be assur for the entire amount of that time period (e.g., a 24 hour period is a day, a full seven days is a week, etc.).
- If the neder stated he would assur “until Pesach”, he is assur until Pesach begins. If he said “until Pesach begins”, he is assur until Pesach is over. If he says “until before Pesach”, **R' Meir** says he is assur until Pesach begins, and **R' Yosef** says he is assur until Pesach is over.

GEMARA

- **R' Yirmiya** said, in the first case of the Mishna, the person must be matir neder at nightfall before he tastes wine.
 - **R' Yosef** explained, this is so as a gezeira for a case where he says “for one day” (in which case he is prohibited for 24 hours).
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, if so, then in a case where he said “for one day” he should not be permitted to drink wine until nightfall of the following day, as a gezeirah for a case when he says “today”!? **A:** **R' Yosef** said, saying “today” can get confused with “one day”, but the reverse is not true.
 - **Ravina** said, that **Mareimar** told him, your father in the name of **R' Yosef** said that the reason for the view of **R' Yirmiya** is the view of **R' Nosson**, who says that one who makes a neder is as if he built a bamah, and one who keeps it is as if he brought a korbon on it. The **Rabanan** were therefore goizer that he must either be matir the neder or wait for a period longer than he truly accepted.

SHABBOS ZU ASSUR B'CHOL HASHABBOS KULAH

- **Q:** This seems to be obvious!? **A:** We would think that he meant only the weekdays of the week. The Mishna teaches that he means to include Shabbos as well.

CHODESH ZEH ASSUR B'CHOL HACHODESH V'ROSH CHODESH L'HABAH

- **Q:** This seems to be obvious!? **A:** The chiddush is, that even if the month has 30 days, so that the first day of Rosh Chodesh is the 30th day of this month, it is still considered part of the second month and he is no longer subject to the neder.

SHANAH ZU ASSUR B'CHOL HASHANAH KULAH

- **Q:** What is the Halacha is he makes a neder prohibiting wine “for a day” – is that like saying “today” or is that like saying “for one day”? We can't bring a proof from our Mishna that says that when he says “today” he is assur until nightfall, which suggests that if he says “for a day” he would be assur for 24 hours, because the next part of the Mishna which discusses when he says “for one day” has the opposite inference. **A:** **R' Ashi** said, a Mishna says, if he makes a neder not to taste wine for “hashanah”, he is assur for that entire year including the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

13th month if that year is a leap year. Now, the case can't be where he says "the year", because then it is obvious that he would be assur for this entire year including the extra month. The case must be where he said "a year", and the chiddush is that he is only assur for this year, and not for a full 12 month period. This would mean that "a day" is treated like the case of "today".

- The Gemara says, it may be that the case of this Mishna is where he said "the year". The chiddush is, that we would think that we should follow typical years that only have 12 months. The Mishna therefore teaches, that when he says "the year" the neder lasts for the duration of this year, even if it is longer than the typical year.

-----Daf נ"ו---61-----

- **Q:** What is the Halacha if he made a neder that he will not taste wine "for a yovel"? Is the year of Yovel part of the cycle or not? **A:** There is a Braisa in which there is a machlokes between **R' Yehuda** and the **Rabanan** whether the year of Yovel is considered to be the first year of the next shmitta cycle (**R' Yehuda**) or whether it is not considered part of the next cycle and is instead only the 50th year of the previous cycle (**Rabanan**). From here we can see that according to the **Rabanan** the year of Yovel would be subject to the neder, and according to **R' Yehuda** it would not be.

AHD HAPESACH ASSUR...

- **Q:** This seems to say that **R' Meir** holds that a person would not say something which would lead to a safek, and as such, when he says "until before Pesach" he means before any part of Pesach begins, whereas **R' Yose** holds that a person would do so, and therefore the neder may mean before the last second of the last day of Pesach. However, there is a Mishna in Kiddushin that says, if a man has 2 daughters from one wife, and then has 2 daughters from another wife, and he says "I was mekadesh my older daughter, but I do not know if it was the older of the older set, the older of the younger set, or the younger of the older set who is older than both of the younger set, **R' Meir** says all the daughters become assur to marry (since they may already be mekudeshes) except for the youngest of the younger set. **R' Yose** says that they are all mutar except for the oldest of the older set. In this Mishna it is **R' Meir** who says that one would say something that would lead to a safek and **R' Yose** says that one would not!? **A: R' Chanina bar Avdimi in the name of Rav** said, we must reverse the shitos in our Mishna. In fact we find a Braisa that suggests that the shitos in our Mishna must be reversed.

MISHNA

- If one makes a neder to prohibit wine "until the cutting of the grain", or "until the grape harvest", or "until the olive harvest", he is assur to drink wine until the period (e.g. the harvest) begins.
 - The general rule is, any point in time whose length is set (e.g. Pesach is always 7 days), and a neder is made "until that period" begins, the person remains subject to the neder until the beginning of the period. On the other hand, if the neder was made "until it is" this period in time, he remains subject to the neder until the entire period has passed. If a neder is made with reference to a period in time whose length is not set (e.g. a harvest), then whether he says "until the harvest" or says "until it is the harvest" he remains subject to the neder only until the beginning of the period.
 - For example, if the neder is made "until the fig harvest" or he says "until it is the fig harvest", in both cases he will only be assur until the people start to gather the fruits in their baskets.
 - If the neder is made "until the fig harvest is over", he remains subject to the neder until the knives used for the harvest have been folded and put away.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, when the Mishna makes reference to the picking of fruits in the basket, it refers to a basket of figs, not a basket of grapes (figs are picked by hand and are therefore referred to as "kayitz").
 - A Braisa says, if one makes a neder not to eat the fruits of the "kayitz", he is only assur to eat figs. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, grapes are included in the category of figs for this purpose and are therefore also assur.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The **T”K** hold that “kayitz” refers to picking by hand and only figs are picked by hand. **R’ Shimon ben Gamliel** holds that when the stems are very dry, even grapes are picked by hand. Therefore grapes are also included in “kayitz”.

-----Daf 20-----62-----

AHD SHEYAVOR HAKAYITZ AHD SHEYIKAFU HAMAKTZUOS

- A Braisa says, this means until *most* of the people have put their knives away.
- A Braisa says, once most people have put their knives away, the figs that remain in the field are mutar with respect to stealing, and are patur from maaser (they are considered to be hefker).
 - **Rebbi and R’ Yose the son of R’ Yehuda** were someplace where most people had already put their knives away. **Rebbi** ate from the figs still remaining and **R’ Yose** did not. The owner came and asked “Why are you not eating? Most people have already put away their knives!” Still, **R’ Yose** did not eat, because he felt that the owner said that sarcastically, and was truly upset that people were eating his figs.
 - **R’ Chama bar R’ Chanina** once told his attendant to eat such figs, but he refused. **R’ Chama** said, **R’ Yishmael the son of R’ Yose** told me in the name of his father that such figs are mutar with regard to stealing and are patur from maaser!
 - **R’ Tarfon** was once eating such figs. When the owner of the field came, he stuffed **R’ Tarfon** into a sack and planned to kill him. **R’ Tarfon** said “Woe is to Tarfon, because this man will kill him”. When this man realized that the man he had in the sack was **R’ Tarfon**, he put him down and ran away. **R’ Avahu in the name of R’ Shimon ben Gamliel** said, **R’ Tarfon** forever regretted having saved himself by using the “crown of Torah” for his personal benefit.
 - **Rabbah bar Chana in the name of R’ Yochanan** said, whoever uses the Torah for his personal benefit will be uprooted from the world. We see this from a kal v’chomer from Belshatzar, who only used the klei kodesh, which had lost their kedusha, and yet he was uprooted from the world. Surely one who uses Torah, whose kedusha remains forever, will be uprooted from the world.
 - **Q:** If **R’ Tarfon** was eating the fruit after most knives had been put away, why was the owner so angry? **A:** This man had much of his fruit stolen from him throughout the year. When he saw **R’ Tarfon** eating from the tree he thought that this was the thief who had stolen from him all year long.
 - **Q:** If so, why was **R’ Tarfon** troubled for having revealed who he was, since it was done to prevent unjustified harm to come upon him!? **A:** **R’ Tarfon** was very wealthy and could have paid his way out of the situation instead of using his name and status.
 - A Braisa learns from a pasuk that one should not learn Torah for honor. Rather one should learn for the sake of Hashem, and honor will come to him.
 - **R’ Eliezer bar R’ Tzadok** taught a similar statement as well.
 - **Rava** said, it is permissible for a talmid chochom to state who he is when he is in a place where no one knows him.
 - **Q:** If so, why did **R’ Tarfon** regret having done so? **A:** **R’ Tarfon** was very wealthy and could have paid his way out of the situation instead of using his name and status.
 - **Rava** asked a contradiction between pesukim – one says it is permissible for a talmid chochom to reveal his righteousness and the other says that it is not. He answered, that one pasuk is discussing where people know him (so he should not) and the other is discussing a place where he is not known.
 - **Rava** said, it is permissible for a talmid chochom to say who he is so that his case be heard first in Beis Din. We learn this from the fact that the pasuk refers to the sons of Dovid as Kohanim (although they were not). This teaches that just as a Kohen is given priority, a talmid chochom must be given priority as well.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Rava** said, a talmid chochom may also state who he is to save himself from having to pay taxes.
 - **Rava** also said, a person may claim to be a goy (to tax collectors) if that will save him from having to pay taxes.
 - **R' Ashi** sold his forest to goyim who worshipped fire. **Ravina** said to him, this should be assur as “lifnei iver lo sitein michshol”! **R' Ashi** said, most wood is used for regular fires, not for avodah zarah. As such, it is mutar for me to sell this to them.

MISHNA

- If one made a neder prohibiting something until the grain harvest, the item remains assur until the people have begun to harvest the wheat, and not the earlier time of the barley harvest. However, this all depends on the place in which the neder was made.
 - If the neder was made in the mountains, the time of the neder is until the harvest in the mountains. If it was made in the valley, we use the harvest of the valley.
- If a neder is made prohibiting an item “until the rains” or “until it is the rains”, the item remains assur until the second set of rainfalls for the year. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, it is assur until the *time* of the second set of rainfall, even if it did not rain.
- If the neder is made “until the rains stop”, **R' Meir** says the items remains assur until the month of Nisnon is over. **R' Yehuda** says until Pesach is over.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, if one made a neder in the Galil to be in effect until the summer, and he then went down to the valley, he must keep the neder until the summer of the Galil, even though the summer of the valleys has already begun.

-----Daf לד--63-----

AHD HAGESHAMIM AHD SHEYAHU GESHAMIM AHD SHETEIREID REVIYA SHNIYA...

- **R' Zeira** said, the machlokes is where he says “ahd hageshamim” (until the rains). However, if he says “ahd hageshem” (until the rain), all would agree that he means until the time of rain (even if no rain actually came).
 - **Q:** A Braisa in Mesechta Taanis brings a machlokes as to when the times of the first, second, and third rains are. The Gemara there asked, the time of the first rain would be when we begin to ask for rain, the time of the third rain would be when people must begin fasting for rain, but what is the significance of knowing the time of the second rains? **R' Zeira** said, it is significant in regard to nedarim. The Gemara brings another Braisa in which **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says it is possible to have the first, second, and third rains all accounted for with 7 consecutive days of rain. Now, presumably the case of nedarim is where he says “until the rain”, as is typical. If so, according to **R' Zeira**, everyone agrees that for purposes of nedarim we do not need the rain to actually come, so why does **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** insist to be talking about a case when it actually rained? **A:** The case there must be where the person made the neder “until the rains”, in which case the **Rabanan** say that the neder continues until it actually rains the second set of rains.

MISHNA

- If a person made a neder saying “I will not taste wine for the year” and then the year became a leap year, he remains assur to wine for the entire year including the extra month.
- If the neder was made “until the beginning of the month of Adar” and the year then became a leap year, he is assur until the beginning of the first Adar.
- If the neder was made “until the end of Adar” and the year then became a leap year, he is assur until the end of the first Adar.

GEMARA

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- We see from the Mishna that when a person says “Adar” without specifying which one he means, he refers to the first Adar.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, **R’ Meir** says if one dates a document in the first Adar he should write “Adar Rishon” and in the second Adar he only needs to write “Adar”. **R’ Yehuda** says, in the first Adar he writes “Adar” and in the second Adar he writes “Adar Sheini”. Our Mishna seems to only follow **R’ Yehuda**!? **A: Abaye** said, the Mishna can follow **R’ Meir** as well. The Braisa is discussing where the person knew that there were 2 Adars, and therefore the second Adar is the one left unspecified. Our Mishna is discussing where he did not know that there would be 2 Adars. Therefore, a reference to “Adar” was a reference to the first Adar. This difference can be learned from a Braisa as well.

MISHNA

- **R’ Yehuda** says, if one makes a neder “not to taste wine until it is Pesach”, he would be allowed to drink wine the night of Pesach, because he meant to make it assur until that night, when it is a time that all people drink wine. If one makes a neder “not to taste meat until it is the fast (Yom Kippur)”, he would be allowed to eat meat for the meal before the fast, because he meant to make it assur until the time that all people eat meat (for the meal before Yom Kippur begins).
 - **R’ Yose** his son says, if one makes a neder “not to taste garlic until it is Shabbos”, he would be allowed to eat garlic on Friday night, because he meant to make it assur until the time that all people eat garlic, which is Friday night (based on Ezra’s enactment).
- If a person tell his friend “I make a neder not to benefit from you if you don’t accept a gift of a kor of wheat and 2 barrels of wine for your son”, that neder can be annulled even without a chochom, because the friend can respond, “you want to give me these gifts to honor me, however, my non-acceptance is itself an honor”. Similarly, if a person says to his friend “I make a neder that you are assur to benefit from me if you don’t give a kor of wheat and 2 barrels of wine to my son”, **R’ Meir** says the neder is effective until the items are given to his son, and the **Rabanan** say that it is ineffective, because the person can say “it is as if I have received the gift from you” and in that way he can remove the neder.
- If a person was being pressured to marry a certain girl and he therefore made a neder prohibiting this girl to benefit from him forever, or he was divorcing his wife and made a neder prohibiting her to benefit from him forever, these women may benefit from him, because he only meant to prohibit matters of tashmish, and not general benefit.
- If a person was being pressured to eat by his friend’s house and he therefore made a neder prohibiting himself to enter that friend’s house, or made a neder prohibiting his drinking even a drop of cold water from this friend, he is still allowed to enter this friend’s house and drink this friend’s cold water, because he truly only meant to prohibit eating and drinking a meal at his friend’s house.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK KONAM YAYIN!!!

-----Daf 70--64-----

PEREK REBBI ELIEZER -- PEREK TESI’I

MISHNA

- **R’ Eliezer** says, “an opening” to annul a neder may be based on the honor of the person’s father or mother (that is, we ask him if you knew that making this neder would embarrass your parents, would you have made the neder, and if he says he would not have made the neder we can annul the neder based on that). The **Chachomim** say that this would not be an effective “opening”.
 - **R’ Tzadok** says that **R’ Eliezer** would also say the opening may be based on the Honor of Hashem. The **Chachomim** said to him, if so, there will never be a neder at all!
 - **The Chachomim** would agree with **R’ Eliezer**, that a neder that is between him and his parents may use his parent’s honor as an opening to annul that neder.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Eliezer** also said that an opening for a neder may be based on “nolad” (a new development that did not exist at the time of the neder). The **Chachomim** say, a neder cannot be annulled based on nolad.
 - An example of nolad would be where a person made a neder prohibiting benefit from a particular person and that person later on became a sofer, or married off a child, and the one who made the neder said, had I known that this person would become a sofer or would so soon marry off a child I would not have made the neder!
 - Another example would be where a person made a neder not to enter a particular house, and that house then became a shul. He then says, had I known this house would become a shul, I would have never made the neder!
 - In all these cases, **R' Eliezer** would say the neder can be annulled based on this, and the **Chachomim** say that it could not be annulled based on this.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What did the **Chachomim** mean when they said, “If so there will no longer be nedarim!”? **A: Abaye** said, it means that there will no longer be proper annulment of nedarim, because a person will always say that had he known it would be a slight to the Honor of Hashem he would not have made the neder. He will say this even when he doesn't mean it (i.e. he would have made the neder even had he known that), because he is embarrassed to say otherwise. Therefore, there will be improper annulments. **Rava** said, the concern was that people will know this can be used as an opening for annulment, and will therefore no longer go to a chochom for annulment (which must be done as part of the process).
 - **Q:** Our Mishna said that the **Chachomim** agree, that where a person made a neder between himself and his parents, that his parent's honor may be used as an opening. Now, this makes sense according to **Abaye**, because if a person has enough chutzpah to make a neder between himself and his parents, he will also not be embarrassed to say that he would have made the neder even though he knew it would embarrass his parents. However, according to **Rava**, why are the **Chachomim** not concerned in this case that people will use this opening to annul a neder on their own, without going to a chochom? **A:** Since he knows that for all other nedarim he would have to go to a chochom, he will go to a chochom in this case as well.

V'OHD AMAR R' ELIEZER POSCHIN B'NOLAD...

- **Q:** Why does **R' Eliezer** say that nolad can be used to annul a neder? **A: R' Chisda** said, he learns it from Moshe, who made a neder to Yisro that he will not leave Midyan without permission. The pasuk says that Hashem told Moshe to return to Mitzrayim because “all the people (Dasan and Aviram) who wanted to kill you have died”. This occurrence is a case of nolad, and yet it was used to annul Moshe's neder and allow him to leave Midyan.
 - The **Rabanan** say that Dasan and Aviram did not actually die, rather they became poor (which is the equivalent of death). Therefore, the annulment of Moshe's neder had nothing to do with their death (since they did not actually die), and as such, there is no proof that nolad may be the basis for an annulment.
 - **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** learns from a pasuk that a person without children is considered dead (Rachel told Yaakov, “give me children, and if not, I am dead”).
 - A Braisa learns from pesukim that there are 4 people who are considered as if they are dead: a poor person, a metzora, a blind person, and one who doesn't have children.

-----Daf 70--65-----

- A Braisa says, if one makes a neder to in some way benefit a friend, the neder may only be annulled in the presence of the friend.
 - **R' Nachman** said, we learn this from Moshe, where the extra word of “Go” in the pasuk teaches that Hashem told Moshe to annul his neder in Midyan by Yisro, since the neder was made for the benefit of Yisro (that Moshe will not leave Midyan). We know that Moshe had made a neder because the pasuk

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

uses the word “Vayoel”, which means a neder, as we see that the word “alah” used by Tzidkiyahu means that he made a neder to Nevuchadnetzar.

- The neder of Tzidkiyahu happened when he saw Nevuchadnetzar eating a live rabbit, which would have been very embarrassing for people to find out about. Nevuchadnetzar therefore made him promise that he would not tell anybody about what he saw. Later, Tzidkiyahu wanted to tell people, with the hope that it would remove Nevuchadnetzar from power. He therefore went to the Sanhedrin and had the neder annulled. When Nevuchadnetzar heard that he was telling people about what he saw he asked him how he can go back on a neder! Tzidkiyahu responded that he had the neder annulled. When he questioned the Sanhedrin about this, they confirmed that they have the power to annul nedarim. He asked them, are you allowed to annul a neder when the person who benefits from the neder is not present!? They told him that it is only when he is present. When Nevuchadnetzar heard this, he had the cushions removed from under the Sanhedrin and forced them to sit on the ground.

MISHNA

- **R’ Meir** says that there are some things that are like “nolad”, but are not quite nolad and may therefore be used as an opening to annul a neder. The **Chachomim** did not agree with him.
 - The Mishna gives examples. If a person makes a neder not to marry a particular woman because her father is evil, and they then tell him that the father has died or that he has repented, or if one makes a neder not to enter a particular house because there is an evil dog or snake inside, and they then tell him that the dog died or the snake was killed, these cases are like nolad but not quite like nolad, and they therefore make the nedarim null and void. The **Chachomim** did not agree with this.

GEMARA

- **Q:** If the father died, that is certainly a new development (nolad) and should not render the neder ineffective!?
A: **R’ Huna** said, **R Meir** holds that since he specifically said that his problem is the girl’s father, it is almost as if he made the neder dependent on that reason, and when the father is no longer in the picture the neder becomes automatically annulled. Therefore the new fact is not being used as an opening. **A2:** **R’ Yochanan** said, the case is where he is told that the father died or did teshuva before the neder was made. Therefore, it is not a fact that came about after the neder was made. The neder was made under a mistaken premise and was therefore never effective to begin with.
 - **Q:** **R’ Abba** asked, the Mishna later says, if one makes a neder not to marry a particular woman because she is not pretty, or she is too dark, or too short, and it turns out that she has none of these issues, he is allowed to marry this woman, because the neder was made on a mistaken basis. Now, according to **R’ Huna** we can say that the earlier Mishna (our Mishna) teaches the case where he makes his neder dependent on something, and this later part discusses a neder made on a mistaken basis. However, according to **R’ Yochanan** the earlier Mishna already discusses a neder on a mistaken basis, so why would the later Mishna teach the same thing!? **KASHYEH.**

MISHNA

- **R’ Meir** also said that we use an opening from the Torah to annul a neder for a person. We say to him, had you known that by making the neder to prevent someone from benefitting from you, you would be oiver for the lav of “lo sikom” and “lo sitor” and “lo sisna es achicha bilvavecha” and “v’ahavta l’rei’acha kamocho”, or that you would be oiver the mitzvah of “v’chei achicha imach” if the person is poor and you now can’t support him based on the neder, would you have made the neder? If he says, had I known this I would never have made the neder, it is mutar and the neder may be annulled.

GEMARA

- **Q:** **R’ Huna bar R’ Katina** asked **Rabbah**, why is it that a person can be said to be obligated to support a particular poor person? Why can’t he say that the obligation rests on all Yidden, and I will give money to the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

general collection fund along with everybody else, thereby not violating my neder and not violating the obligation to support the poor person!? **A:** He answered, when a person becomes poor, he is first supposed to try and be supported by his friends and family. If that is not available, he then turns to the communal fund. Therefore, if the person who is the subject of the neder is a friend or family to the one who made the neder, the obligation to support him does first fall on the one made the neder, and only afterwards falls on the community as a whole.

MISHNA

- We may use the financial obligation of a kesubah as an opening to annul a neder.
 - It once happened that a person made a neder prohibiting benefit from his wife (which would require him to divorce her, because he could then not fulfill his onah obligation), and his wife had a kesubah of 400 dinar. This person went to **R' Akiva**, who obligated him to pay the full amount. The person said to **R' Akiva**, my father left an inheritance of 800 dinars. My brother took half of that and I took the other 400. Shouldn't it be enough for her to get 200 and leave me with the other 200 dinars!? **R' Akiva** told him, you must give her the full amount even if you must sell the hair from your head to raise the money! The person then said, had I known that this is so, I would never have made this neder. When **R' Akiva** heard that, he annulled the neder.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Moveable items, such as the coins of the inheritance, are not pledged for a kesubah obligation!? **A: Abaye** said, the inheritance was actually land worth 800 dinars, and land is pledged for a kesubah.
 - **Q: R' Akiva** said that even the hair of his head would be obligated for the kesubah!? **A: R' Akiva** was saying, you must give the full amount of your land, even if that would leave you with absolutely nothing and you would then have to sell your hair to have money to live.
 - **Q:** Shall we say that based on this we see that Beis Din does not assess a debtor to see how much he can pay while still retaining enough to live? **A; R' Nachman the son of R' Yitzchak** said, it may be that **R' Akiva** would allow him to keep some money to live. **R' Akiva** meant to say that after a partial payment we would not rip up the document. Rather, the woman would hold onto it, and would use it to collect the remaining payment when the debtor has more money.

-----Daf 10---66-----

MISHNA

- We may use Yom Tov and Shabbos as an opening to annul a neder (if he prohibited himself to some form of enjoyment and we tell him that it is assur to hold back enjoyment on Shabbos and Yom Tov, and he says had he known that he would never have made the neder).
 - Initially they said that when such an opening is used, the days of Shabbos and Yom Tov become mutar, but the other days remain subject to the neder. However, **R' Akiva** then came along and taught that a neder which becomes nullified in part becomes nullified in its entirety. An example of such a case would be where one made a neder prohibiting benefit from a group of people, and then has the neder nullified with regard to one person in the group. In that case the entire neder would become nullified.
 - If the neder said that "I will not benefit from this one, and from this one, and this one, etc." (with the neder of each person making reference to the neder on the previous person), and the neder becomes annulled with reference to the first person mentioned, the neder becomes annulled with regard to everyone else as well. However, if the neder becomes annulled with reference to the last one mentioned, the last person is no longer prohibited to benefit, but the others remain assur to benefit.
 - If the neder says "that which I benefit from this person should be a korbon (i.e. assur), and that which I benefit from that person should be a korbon", each person would need a separate annulment (because each statement is considered to be a separate neder).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- If a neder is made that says “wine should be prohibited to me, because wine is bad for the stomach”, and then people tell him that aged wine is actually good for the stomach, not only does he become mutar in aged wine, he becomes mutar in all wine (based on the principle of **R’ Akiva**). Similarly, if the neder prohibited all onions since they are bad for the heart, and he is then told that the Kufri onion is good for the heart, he becomes mutar in all onions.
 - Such a story once happened and **R’ Meir** said the person was mutar to eat all types of onions.

GEMARA

- The Mishna said that the word “korbon” (or any verbiage of neder) must be said separately regarding each person to create a separate neder for each person. **Rava** said, this follows the view of **R’ Shimon**, who holds this way.

KONAM YAYIN SH’ANI TO’EIM...

- **Q:** The Mishna seems to say that the neder is annulled because they told him that aged wine is “good” for him, but if it would only be “not bad” for him, the neder would stay in effect. Why should that be? **A:** **R’ Abba** said, even “not bad for him” would annul the neder as well. The Mishna is just making the argument stronger by saying that the wine is not only “not bad” for him, but is rather even good for him.

KONAM BATZAL SHE’ANI TO’EIM SHEHABATZAL...

- **Q:** The Mishna seems to say that the neder is annulled because they told him that a Kufri onions is “good” for him, but if it would only be “not bad” for him, the neder would stay in effect. Why should that be? **A:** **R’ Abba** said, even “not bad for him” would annul the neder as well. The Mishna is just making the argument stronger by saying that the Kufri onion is not only “not bad” for him, but is actually even good for him.

MISHNA

- We may use a person’s own honor and the honor of his children as an opening to annul a neder (if the neder would force him to get divorced). We say to him, if you would have known that people would say that you just divorce women on a whim, or that people would think less of your children or even think they may be illegitimate children, would you have made the neder? If he says he would not have made the neder, we can use this as an opening to annul the neder.
- If one made a neder not to marry a particular woman because she is ugly ,and it turns out that she is beautiful, or because she is dark and it turns out that she is light, or that she is short and it turns out that she is tall, he is mutar to marry her and the neder is ineffective. This is not because she *became* pretty, or light, or tall, rather it is because the neder was made on a mistaken premise and therefore never took effect.
 - It once happened that a person made a neder prohibiting benefit from his sister’s daughter (so that he shouldn’t have to marry her, because he thought she was ugly). The girl was brought to the home of **R’ Yishmael**, and they made her beautiful. **R’ Yishmael** then asked the man, did you really make a neder not to marry this girl? He said, I did not (because she is now a beautiful girl). **R’ Yishmael** then used that as an opening and annulled the neder.
 - At that time **R’ Yishmael** cried and said, all Jewish girls are truly pretty. It is the poverty that makes them ugly. When **R’ Yishmael** passed away, the girls cried a special lamentation (kinah) “Jewish girls, cry over **R’ Yishmael!**”. This was the same kinah that was said for Shaul upon his passing.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna seemed to say that if the girl who was ugly later became beautiful, the neder would remain in effect. The Gemara then brings a story that shows that the neder does become annulled!? **A:** The Mishna is missing words and should be read as saying that **R’ Yishmael** argues on the **T”K** and says that even if the girl actually is ugly, etc., and then became pretty, the neder can be annulled. On that view, the story is then brought.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, the girl in the story had a false tooth, and **R' Yishmael** had it switched out for a gold tooth, at his own expense.
- A man once made a neder that his wife may not have any benefit from him unless she gives her food to taste to **R' Yehuda** and **R' Shimon**. **R' Yehuda** tasted it based on a kal v'chomer. He said, if Hashem allows his name to be erased for the sake of *possibly* making peace between husband and wife in the case of a sotah, then surely I should not worry about my honor and I should taste the food. **R' Shimon** did not taste the food. He said that doing so would dishonor the Torah (by dishonoring a talmid chochom), and it should therefore not be done. Also, he said that doing so would make this person become accustomed to make nedarim.
- A man once made a neder that prohibited his wife to benefit from him until she spits on **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**. She went and spat onto his clothing (and **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** then permitted her to her husband based on that).
 - **Q: R' Acha Midifti** asked **Ravina**, this husband intended to dishonor **R' Shimon**, and her spitting on the clothing did not accomplish that! If so, the condition wasn't fulfilled, and the neder should remain assur!?
A: Ravina answered, **R' Shimon** was so great, that even just spitting on his clothing was considered a tremendous dishonor.
- A man made a neder that prohibited his wife to benefit from him unless she could show **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yose** something that is beautiful about her. **R' Yishmael** wanted to help this woman fulfill the condition of the neder so he asked the people what was beautiful about this woman. They responded that every part of her was ugly, including her name which was "Lachluchis" (which means dirty). **R' Yishmael** said, at least her name is beautiful in the way that it is very befitting for her since she is so ugly a person. With that, he permitted her to her husband.
- There was a man from Bavel who married a woman from Eretz Yisrael. He asked her to cook a couple of lentils, and she took it literally and cooked 2 lentils. He then asked her to cook a lot of lentils and she took it literally and cooked a humongous amount of lentils. He then asked her to bring 2 "butzinei" (meaning melons) and she brought him 2 lamps (which are also called butzinei). He became very angry and told her to take the lamps and break them on the "bava", which means a doorway. She went and broke them on the head of **Bava ben Buta**. When **Bava ben Buta** asked her why she did that, she explained that she was told to do so by her husband. He told her, "You have carried out the will of your husband with such loyalty and dedication, may Hashem give you 2 sons like Bava ben Buta!"

HADRAN ALACH PEREK R' ELIEZER!!!