



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

Nedarim Daf Pey Zayin

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna seems to suggest that we darshen the word “osah” in the pasuk to teach that the hafarah must be done for the right person, or else it will not be effective. However, regarding the obligation to tear one’s clothing upon hearing of the death of certain people, there are additional words in the pasuk which would also suggest that the tearing obligation is only fulfilled if it is done with the right person in mind, and yet a Braisa says that if the tearing was done with the wrong person in mind (e.g. he heard that his father died and tore his clothing on that basis, and was then told that it was his son who died, and not his father) he has fulfilled the obligation!?
- **A:** The Braisa is discussing where he heard that a relative died but did not know which relative. He tore his clothing without knowing the specifics and then found out about it. In that case he would have fulfilled the obligation. However, our Mishna is discussing where he was told one specific thing and then learned that he was given wrong information. In that case the hafarah would not be effective.
 - There is a Braisa that clearly makes this difference in regard to the Halacha of tearing for the death of a relative.
 - **A: R' Ashi** said, the Braisa is discussing where he heard the corrected information “toch kedei dibur” of tearing his clothing. Therefore, he has fulfilled his obligation. Our Mishna is discussing where he did not get the corrected information toch kedei dibur, and the hafarah was therefore done improperly and is not effective.
 - A Braisa clearly makes this distinction with regard to the tearing obligation.
 - The Gemara paskens that toch kedei dibur is effective in making a later statement or action to be considered as part of the first one, except for the cases of one who curses Hashem (a retraction is ineffective), avodah zarah, when one is mekadash a woman, and when one divorces his wife.

MISHNA

- If a woman makes a neder making it assur for her to eat “these figs and grapes” and the husband confirmed the neder with regard to the figs, the entire neder is confirmed. If he was meifer with regard to the figs, he must still be meifer with regard to the grapes (this may mean that the hafarah is effective only in regard to the figs, or it may mean that the hafarah is not effective at all – Ran).
 - If she splits the statement in two, and says “konam my tasting this fig and my tasting this grape”, it is considered to be two separate nedarim.

GEMARA

- Our Mishna follows the view of **R' Yishmael** in a Braisa (where he says exactly as the first segment of our Mishna) based on a drasha of the words “ishah yikimenu v'ishah yifeirenu”. **R' Akiva** argues in the Braisa and darshens this pasuk to teach that just as a confirmation on part of the neder is a confirmation on the entire neder, so too a hafarah on part of the neder is a hafarah on the entire neder.
 - **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the **Chachomim** argue on both these views and say that just as a hafarah on part is effective only on part of the neder, so too a confirmation on part is effective only on part of the neder.

AMRAH KONAM T'EINAH

- **Rava** said, our Mishna is following the view of **R' Shimon** who says that a shevuah addressed to multiple people is only considered to be separate shavuos if it is separately addressed to each person with distinct words of shevuah.

MISHNA

- If a man said "I knew that my wife made a neder but did not know that I have the ability to be meifer it", he may be meifer the neder on the day that he realizes that he has the ability to do so.
- If he said "I knew that I have the ability to be meifer certain nedarim, but did not know that this neder was of the type that I could be meifer", **R' Meir** says he may not be meifer the neder (his partial knowledge is not enough to allow for hafarah), and the **Chachomim** say that he may be meifer (partial knowledge is sufficient).

GEMARA

- **Q:** A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** says that the pasuk of "b'lo re'os" teaches that a blind person would not be subject to galus if he kills b'shogeg. **R' Meir** says that the pasuk comes to include a blind person in the galus obligation. Now, in this Braisa **R' Meir** says the blind person's partial knowledge is sufficient whereas **R' Yehuda** says that it is not. This contradicts their views in our Mishna!? **A:** **Rava** said, the two subjects cannot be compared, because they are learned from different drashos of their respective pesukim.