



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

Nedarim Daf Chuf Vuv

- **Rabbah** said that **B"S** and **B"H** would agree that if the person who made the neder on the figs said, "had I known my father was in that group of people, I would have said that the entire group is assur except for my father", that the entire group would be assur from the neder and the father would remain mutar, since there was only one change to his original neder (the addition of the last part). The machlokes would be in a case where the person says, "had I known that my father was in the group, I would have made the neder by saying you and you are assur, but my father should remain mutar" (this changes the original neder in 2 ways). In that case **B"S** say the other people would remain assur and **B"H** say that everyone would be mutar (because a neder that becomes batul in part becomes batul in its entirety). **Rava** said, in this second case all would agree that everybody in the group is mutar. The machlokes is when he says like the first case. In that case **B"S** hold like **R' Meir** who says that when a person says two things we follow the first expression of the person (and since the first part of his new statement confirms his previous neder, the neder remains, albeit with the father being excluded based on the second part of his statement and this would not make the neder become batul) and **B"H** hold like **R' Yose**, who says that we follow even the last expression of a person as well (and the neder is considered to become batul with regard to the father, and therefore the entire neder is considered batul based on the partial neder becoming batul).
 - **Q: R' Pappa** asked **Rava**, a Mishna explains the case in which **R' Akiva** says that a neder that becomes batul in part becomes batul in its entirety. The Mishna says, (Case 1) if a person says "I make a neder not to benefit from any of you", if the neder then becomes batul with regard to one of the people it becomes batul with regard to everybody. If the person says "I make a neder not to benefit from this person, and that person, etc.", then (Case 2) if the neder becomes batul for the first person it becomes batul for all the people. However, (Case 3) if it becomes batul for the last person, it remains in effect for the other people. Now, this Mishna makes sense according to **Rabbah** who says that **B"H** say that we say the principal of batul in part is batul in its entirety only where the maker of the neder says he would have changed the entire neder, because we can say that Cases 1 and 2 are discussing where the maker of the neder said he would have changed his language (and that is why it becomes batul in its entirety), and Case 3 is where he would not have changed his language, and therefore it does not become batul in its entirety. However, according to **Rava**, it makes sense that Case 1 can be said to refer to where he would not have changed his language, but would have simply added to exclude his father, and that is why only according to **R' Akiva** it is batul and the **Rabanan** would argue. However, in Cases 2 and 3 he is changing his language. If so, even the **Rabanan** would agree that the neder is entirely batul, so why does the Mishna say it is only **R' Akiva** who says so!? **A: Rava** said, even according to **Rabbah** this Mishna is problematic, because in Case 3 the ruling is different not because he excluded the "last one", but rather because he didn't change his language! Therefore, the Mishna should be explained as follows. Case 1 is referring to where he excluded his father, and therefore the entire neder becomes batul (since it became batul in part). Cases 2 and 3 are dealing with a different case altogether. The case is where a person makes a neder not to benefit from someone, and he then says regarding a second person that "he should be like him (the first person)", and then regarding a third person he says "he should be like him (the second person)". In that case, if the first person's neder becomes

batul, all the nedarim become batul (because they are linked to the first one), but if the last person's neder becomes batul it does not effect the two earlier nedarim.

- **Q: R' Ada bar Ahava** asked **Rava**, a Mishna says, if a person says "I make a neder not to eat onions, because onions are not good for the heart" and then someone tells him that Kufri onions are good for the heart, the Halacha is that the neder becomes batul in regard to Kufri onions, and then becomes batul in its entirety since it became partially batul. We find that **R' Meir** paskened this way in practice. Presumably, the case is where he says, that had he known that the Kufri was good for his heart he would have said that all onions are assur, but the Kufri is mutar. Now according to **Rava**, in that case **B" S and R' Meir** would hold that the neder is *not* batul!? **A:** The case is that he says had he known that Kufri was good for the heart he would have said "this onion is assur, and this one, and this one, etc., but the Kufri is mutar". In that case everyone would agree that the neder becomes batul.
- **Q: Ravina** asked **Rava**, a Braisa says, **R' Nosson** says we can have a neder that is only partially batul. The case would be where a person made a neder not to benefit from a basket of figs, and then realized that there were some high end figs in there as well, and says had I known that these special figs were there I would not have made this neder. **R' Nosson** says that the other figs would remain assur but the high end ones would be mutar. **R' Akiva** then came and said, a neder that becomes partially batul becomes batul in its entirety. Presumably, the case here is where he said, had I known that the better figs were there I would have said "these figs and these figs are assur, but the better figs are mutar" (he is completely changing his language) and we see that it is only **R' Akiva** who says that the whole neder becomes batul, not like **Rava** said!? **A:** The case is where he says, had I known that there were better figs I would have still said that basket of figs are assur, but I would have added that the better figs should remain mutar. In that case it is only **R' Akiva** who says that the entire neder becomes batul.
- **Q:** Who is the Tanna of the following Braisa? The Braisa says, if one made a neder not to benefit from 5 people, if he became mutar to benefit from one of them he becomes mutar to all of them (i.e. this is a case where he says he would have completely changed the language of the neder had he realized that his father was one of the people). If he says "except for one of them" that person is mutar but the rest remain assur (i.e. this is a case where he would have kept the neder and only added a statement to except his father). **A:** According to **Rabbah** the first part follows **R' Akiva** and the second part follows everybody. According to **Rava**, the second part follows the **Rabanan** and the first part follows everybody.