



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h
Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Sources

The *Gemora* offers an alternative source for how we know that both the *arusah*'s husband and father must revoke her *nedarim*. It was taught in the Beis Medrash of Rabbi Yishmael: It is written [Bamidbar 30:17]: *Between a man and his wife, between a father and his daughter.* We derive from here that the father and the husband of a betrothed *na'arah* jointly revoke her *nedarim*.

The *Gemora* asks: What does Rabbi Yishmael learn from the other verse: *And if she will be to a man and her vows are upon her?*

The *Gemora* answers: He uses it for Rabbah's other exposition (*if a na'arah was betrothed and then her husband either died or divorced her; another man betrothed her; her father has a right to revoke her vow before the second betrothal, just as he has the right before her first betrothal*).

The *Gemora* asks: What does Rabbah do with Rabbi Yishmael's verse?

The *Gemora* answers: It is to teach us that the husband may revoke her vows if they relate to matters that are between him and her (*even if they are not vows involving personal affliction*).

The Ra”n Elucidated

[*The Yerushalmi states: “Every neder and every oath of prohibition to afflict the soul, her husband will uphold it and her husband will terminate it.” I only know this of nedarim that involve affliction of the soul. From where do we know matters that are between him and her? It is written: “between man and his wife.” These are for the husband. From where do we derive it about her father? Just as the husband only terminates nedarim that involve affliction of the soul and matters that are between him and her, so too, the father can only terminate nedarim that involve affliction of the soul and matters that are between him and her. And this is not in accordance with the Rambam, who wrote that a father can terminate any nedarim of his daughter.*] (68a1)

Cut in Half or Weakens?

The *Gemora* inquires: When the husband (*or the father*) revokes the *arusah*'s *neder*, is it cut away in half, or does he weaken the entire *neder*?

The *Gemora* suggests a practical difference between the two: If she made a *neder* against eating two olive-volumes [of a certain food] and the husband revoked it, and she went and ate both. If we say that he cuts her *neder* in half, then, she will incur lashes (*for eating one*). If, however, he weakens the vow, she has merely violated a prohibition (*but will not receive lashes*).

The Ra"n Elucidated

[Why is it necessary to mention two olives? Behold, in Mesechet Shevuos, Rav Pappa said that for konamos there are lashes for the smallest amount? It can be answered that since there is an opinion there that even for konamos one doesn't get malkos unless there is an olive-size, it presented it this way here, so that it would be according to all opinions.

Another answer: It was presented in this manner because of oaths, because oaths are included in nedarim, as the Gemora said above, "a great neder he made to the God of Yisrael," and for an oath, if there is less than a minimum amount there is no malkos.

Another answer is that the word "lokeh" here doesn't mean lashes, but rather, it means that he is punished by bringing a korban, referring to me'ilah, for according to all opinions there is no korban for less than a minimal amount. We find the word "lokeh" used similarly in Meseches Bava Metzia.]

The Gemora attempts to resolve the inquiry from the following Baraisa When was it said that if the husband died, his authority to revoke her nedarim passes over to her father? It is in the case where her husband did not hear her neder before he died, or he heard it and revoked it, or he heard it and remained silent, and he died on that very same day. This is where we learned that if the husband died, his authority passes over to her father.

The Ra"n Elucidated

[When it says, "and he died on that very same day", it refers to the case where he heard and was quiet, that only if he died on that day, that the husband has still not upheld it, the father is able to terminate it. But not

if he died the next day, because the husband has upheld it, for since he didn't terminate it, he revealed his will that he was happy with it. Therefore the father, who comes by his power, is not able to terminate it.

But if he heard and terminated it, even if he died the next day, the father is able to terminate it. For even though when the husband died, his termination became null and the father must terminate the portion of the husband along with his own portion, nonetheless, since he already terminated it, even though his termination has become null, it is impossible that it be like upholding with respect to the husband. For behold, he has nonetheless revealed his will that he was not happy about the neder, and what else could he have done?]

The Baraisa continues: However, if the husband heard about her neder and he confirmed it, or he heard it and remained silent, and he died on the following day, the father is unable to revoke this neder.

The Baraisa continues: If her father heard her neder and revoked it, and he died before the husband managed to hear of it, this is where we learned that if the father died, his authority does not pass over to the husband (for since the father died before the revocation was complete, his revocation is nullified, and the husband does not have the ability to revoke the neder by himself).

If her husband heard about her neder and revoked it, and he died before the father managed to hear of it, this is where we learned that if the husband died, his authority passes over to the father.

If her husband heard about her neder and revoked it, and the father died before he managed to hear of it, the husband cannot revoke the neder, for the husband

may only revoke the *neder* in partnership with her father.

If her father heard about her *neder* and revoked it, and the husband died before he managed to hear of it, the father can repeat and revoke the portion of the husband. Rabbi Nosson said: These are the words of Beis Shammai. Beis Hillel, however, said: The father cannot revoke her *neder* in this case.

We learn from this *Baraisa* that according to Beis Shammai, the *neder* is cut away in half, and according to Beis Hillel, it is weakened.

The Ra"n Elucidated

[Beis Shammai holds that the father is able to terminate the neder in such a case, and that termination of the portion of the husband alone is sufficient, because the termination of the father, since he did not die, has not become null.

But Beis Hillel maintains that he cannot terminate at all, even if he again terminates his own portion and the portion of the husband. And the Gemora offers the following reason: According to Beis Shammai, the father is cutting the neder in half. When the father terminates first, he terminates only his portion, and the portion of the husband is not diminished at all, rather, it remains completely, and it is significant, that it be inherited by the father. And according to Beis Hillel, it has been weakened, and when the father terminates his portion, the portion of the husband becomes diminished, and it doesn't have enough significance to be inherited by the father, for since the father is still in existence, his termination has not become null, and the neder remains in its weakened state. And since the portion of the husband has been weakened, the father is not able to terminate it.] (68a1 – 69a1)

DAILY MASHAL

It is evident from our Gemora that if the husband revokes his wife's vow it is not revoked retroactively; rather, it weakens the strength of the vow. This is in contrast to when a sage revokes a vow; there, the vow is revoked retroactively. Accordingly, it may be asked: Why is it that the Torah mentions only the revoking of the husband and not the revoking of a sage; isn't his revoking much stronger?

The Chozeh of Lublin answers: On the contrary! This is precisely the reason the Torah does not mention the revoking of a vow by a sage, for since he revokes the vow retroactively, people will become wanton with making vows, as they would think that there is no sin anyway (for a sage can revoke it retroactively as if there was never a vow); accordingly, this option is not mentioned in the Torah at all.