

Nedarim 21a

The daf starts with the Mishna continuing its description of נְדָרִי זְרוּזִין.

The Mishna tells us that although the seller says that he will not accept less than four dinarim, and the buyer says that he will not pay more than two dinarim, in reality:

Both of them are agreeable (to the price of) three dinarim

The Ran explains that the Mishna is saying that in reality both the seller and the buyer want the sale to take place at a price of three dinarim. And this that the seller made a neder that he will not sell it for less than four dinarim, was not because that was really what he wanted, but rather it was done just to motivate the buyer to be willing to buy the object for more than two dinarim. And this that the buyer made a neder that he will not buy the object for more than two dinarim, was also done to motivate the seller, that is, he made the neder in order to get the seller to agree to sell the object for less than four dinarim. But in reality, despite their nedarim, both the seller and the buyer are agreeable to the price of three dinarim. Therefore, their nedarim are not chal, as neither of them had the intention to make an actual neder. That is, despite what they said, we take their true intentions into consideration.

The Ran explains that although we normally have a rule of דְּבָרִים שֶׁבְּלֵב אֵינָם דְּבָרִים, (words of the heart are not considered words), since it is normal for a seller and buyer to ‘negotiate’ in this manner, their true intentions are not considered דְּבָרִים שֶׁבְּלֵב.

גמרא

Two Explanations as to Why נְדָרִי זְרוּזִין are Not Chal

The Mishna said:

Four nedarim	אַרְבַּעָה נְדָרִים
the Chachamim permitted etc.	הִתִּירוּ חֲכָמִים כּו'
R' Abba bar Mamal said	אָמַר לִיה רַבִּי אַבָּא בַר מָמַל
to R' Ami	לְרַבִּי אַמִּי
“You said to us	אָמַרְתָּ לָנוּ
in the name	מִשְׁמִיה
of R' Yehuda Hanasi	דְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה נְשִׂיאָה

Who is the Tanna (of the Mishna)

(that taught) the four nedarim

it is R' Yehuda

that said in the name of

(it is) R' Tarfon (who said)

(that) in actuality

not of one of them is a nazir

for nezirus was not given

except for “in a clear manner”

R' Tarfon holds that when a person accepts nezirus upon himself, he must do so in a clear manner. That is, his declaration must make it clear that he will be becoming a nazir. But if at the time that he accepts his nezirus, it cannot be determined if he is a nazir or not, the nezirus is not chal. Therefore, in the case in which two people see a person approaching, and one of them says, “I am a nazir if that person is so-and-so”, and the other person then says, “I am a nazir if that person is not so-and-so”, R' Tarfon holds that neither of them is a nazir. This is because their nezirus status could not be determined at the time of their declaration (but rather they had to wait to see the identity of the approaching person). And therefore, since a person’s nezirus status must be determined at the time he declares himself to be a nazir, nezirus cannot be accepted conditionally (as we don’t know at the time of the declaration if the condition will be fulfilled or not).

The Ran explains that if you hold this way with regard to nezirus, you will also hold this way with regard to nedarim as there is a hekesh between nezirus and nedarim (i.e., the same way nezirus cannot be accepted conditionally, so too nedarim cannot be made conditionally).

Based on this, R' Ami in the name of R' Yehuda Hanasi said that this is the explanation of our Mishna when it says that נְדָרִי זְרוּזִין are not chal. As previously explained, נְדָרִי זְרוּזִין are nedarim that are made on condition, and therefore, in accordance with the shita of R' Tarfon they cannot be chal.

That is, in the Mishna’s case, both the buyer and the seller make a neder that should be chal only if they do not get the price they want, i.e., the neder is conditional on the price that will be paid. The Gemara now understands that this is why the nedarim are not chal, as the Mishna is in accordance with the shita of R'

מֵאֵן תָּנָא

אַרְבַּעָה נְדָרִים

רַבִּי יְהוּדָה הִיא

דְּאָמַר מִשׁוּם

רַבִּי טַרְפוֹן

לְעוֹלָם

אֵין אֶחָד מֵהֶן נָזִיר

לְפִי שֶׁלֹּא נִיתְּנָה נְזִירוֹת

אַלָּא לְהַפְלָאָה

Tarfon who holds that a conditional nezirus, and by extension a conditional neder) cannot be chal (see footnote).¹⁰⁶

Rava said	רְבָא אָמַר
you can even say (the Mishna)	אֶפְלוּ תִּימָא
is the Rabbanan	רַבָּנָן
did the Mishna say	מִי קָתְנִי
‘they both wanted’	שְׁנֵיהֶן רָצוּ
‘they both want’	שְׁנֵיהֶן רוֹצִין
the Mishna said	קָתְנִי

The Mishna tells us that “they both want the price of three dinarim”. This implies that they were agreeable to this price all along. That is, although they made their nedarim, we understand that they did not really mean what they said, but rather all along they were both agreeable to the price of three dinarim, and that is why the nedarim are not chal.

But according to the reasoning of R' Tarfon, even if they would have really meant what they said at the time of the nedarim, the nedarim would still not be chal (as they were conditional). Therefore, what the Mishna should have said is that “they agreed”, that is, they agreed now to this price but were not agreeable to the price at the time the nedarim were made. And by saying this, we would know that even though they ‘were serious’ about what they said when they made their nedarim, the nedarim are still not chal as they were conditional.

¹⁰⁶ According to the Reasoning of R' Tarfon, Why Does the Mishna Pick a Case in Which They Both Agree to a Price of Three Dinarim?

The Ran asks that if the explanation of the Mishna is that conditional nedarim cannot be chal, then seemingly the end of the case is unnecessary. The Mishna concludes that even though the seller made a neder not to accept less than four, and the buyer made a neder to pay more than two, in the end, they both agree to a price of three. But according to R' Tarfon, this piece of information is irrelevant. What difference does it make if they both end up agreeing to three? Even if they would not agree to this, the nedarim would still not be chal, as according to R' Tarfon, conditional nedarim are not chal at all.

The Ran answers that the Mishna picked this case as it contains a chiddush. The case in which R' Tarfon says that a conditional nezirus cannot work is the case in which two people accept nezirus upon themselves that are depended on if the approaching person is or is not a particular person. In this case, it is impossible for both of them to become nezirim. Therefore, one could have thought that it is specifically this case that is lacking הַפְּלָאָה - ‘clarity’. That is, since we know that one of these ‘acceptances’ cannot be chal, neither on them can be.

However, this is not true in our case. In our case, it could be that both of their nedarim will come to be. The seller said that the money should be assur if he charges less than four dinarim and the buyer said that the object should be assur if he pays more than two. Therefore, if they both end up agreeing to three, they would have both violated what they wanted to happen, and as such, both of their nedarim would be chal. If so, one could have thought that in this case there is not such a lack of clarity, and therefore, they can both be chal, even though they are conditional.

However, the Mishna did not say this, and as such, Rava says there must be another way of explaining the Mishna. Therefore, Rava holds that the reason the nedarim are not chal is not because they were made in a conditional manner, but rather the reason is because in reality they never meant what they said at the time they made their nedarim.¹⁰⁷

The Case of טְפֵי מְסָלַע and בְּצִיר מְשָׁקֶל

Ravina said to Rav Ashi	אָמַר לִיה רַבִּינָא לְרַב אָשִׁי
If he (the seller) said to him	אָמַר לוֹ
“More than a sela”	טְפֵי מְסָלַע
and the other (i.e., the buyer) says	וְהֵלָה אָמַר
“Less than a shekel”	בְּצִיר מְשָׁקֶל
(in this case) is it a (valid) neder	נִדְרָא הוּי
or is it just a (neder) of zerizus	אוּ זְרוּזִין הוּי

The Ran in his second explanation explains the Gemara as follows. When the seller says that he will sell it for more than a sela, he is saying that he will only sell it for five dinarim. And when the buyer says that he will buy it for less than a shekel, he is saying that he will not buy it for more than a single dinar (a sela is four dinarim, and therefore the amount more than a sela is five dinarim, and a shekel is two dinarim and therefore the amount less than a shekel is one dinar).

Therefore, the Mishna needs to teach that even in this case, the nedarim are not going to be chal (in accordance with the shita of R' Tarfon).

¹⁰⁷ Can the Sale Take Place at a Price Other than 3 Dinarim?

The Ran explains that even if they both had intention for three dinarim, they are not bound by this amount. That is, if the seller would like to sell it for less than three dinarim, or if the buyer would want to buy it for more than three dinarim, they would be able to do so. That is, even though they had in mind for three, they did not verbalize this, and in this regard, we will say דְּבָרִים שֶׁבְּלֵב שְׁבִלְב (that is, we don't recognize what he thinks in his heart, and they would not have to worry about violating the neder, as the neder was just said to motivate the other).

However, the Ran continues and says that the seller would not be able to sell it for two dinarim. This is because even though we say that the seller didn't really mean what he said with regard to not selling it for less than four dinarim, there was a reason why he said it. He said in order to counteract the buyer's offer. The buyer said he wants to pay just two dinarim, and to this, the seller responded and made his neder. That is, the neder was made specifically to ensure that he will not accept the buyer's offer. Therefore, since this was the עִיקָר (main point) of the neder, he will not be able to accept two dinarim. And this is true with regard to the buyer as well. Although he will be able to pay more than two dinarim, he will not be able to pay as much as four. His neder was made specifically to prevent him from paying so much, and therefore he will not be able to pay this amount.

The Ran concludes that although this is his shita, there are others who disagree and hold that since the Mishna is saying that the nedarim are not chal, they are not chal at all, and they could pick any price they want.

In this case, perhaps since the gap between the two of them is so great, we say that it cannot be that they are just saying what they are saying as a negotiation tactic. That is, if they would really agree to a price in the middle, they would never move so far away from it (i.e., if they would both agree to three, they would not say one or five, and if they do, it must be that they do not agree to three).

Or perhaps even in this case, we say that they are both agreeable to an 'in-between' price, and the only reason why they made such nedarim is in order to encourage the other person to agree to a different price.

He said to him	אָמַר לִיה
We learned it in a Mishna	תְּנִינָא
if someone is pressuring his friend	הִיא מְסָרַב בְּחֵבִירו
that he should eat	שְׂיֹאכַל
next to him (i.e., to come to his house)	אֶצְלו
and (this person) said back to him	וְאָמַר לו
“Konam your house	קוֹנָם בֵּיתְךָ
that I will enter it	שְׂאֲנִי נִכְנֵס
a drop of cold (water)	טִיפַת צוּגָן
that I will taste”	שְׂאֲנִי טוּעֵם

The person makes a neder that the other person's house should be assur to him with regard to entering it, and he then adds that even a drop of the other person's cold water should be assur to him. And in this case the Mishna says :

It is mutur to enter his house	מוֹתֵר לִיכְנֹס לְבֵיתו
and to drink his cold (water)	וְלִשְׁתּוֹת הַיָּמִינוּ צוּגָן

for he did not have in mind	שֶׁלֹא נִתְכוּוֹן זֶה
only for the sake (of forbidding)	אֶלֶּא לְשׁוּם
to eating and drinking	אֲכִילָה וְשִׁתִּיה
but why	וְאִמָּאי
but he said a drop of cold (water)	וְהָא טִיפַת צוּגָן קָאָמַר
rather (it must be that)	אֶלֶּא
people talk this way	מִשְׁתַּעֲי אִינִישׁ הַכִּי
here too also	הַכָּא נָמִי
people talk this way	מִשְׁתַּעֲי אִינִישׁ הַכִּי

The Mishna says that even though this person made a neder to assure himself from going into his friend's house and from drinking even a drop of his water, his real intention is just to say that he does not want to eat in his friend's house but not that he actually wants to forbid the going into the house or the drop of water.

If so, seemingly we have a proof to our question. We asked if a person would exaggerate his position (i.e., the price he is willing to pay/accept) by saying something that is far away from what his friend wants. And seemingly this is exactly what happened here. The other person asked him to eat (i.e., a regular meal), and this person responded by making a neder not to drink even a drop of cold water (something that is very far from a regular meal). And yet the Mishna still says that the neder is not chal, as we understand that he made his neder to just push off the other person. If so, we see that the heter of גְּדָרֵי זְרוּזִין applies even when the two sides are far apart.

He said to him	אָמַר לִיה
----------------	------------

Nedarim 21b

Is it similar	מי דמי
with regard to (the case of)	גבי
(of a neder involving a drop) of cold (water)	צונן
(we apply the principle) that tzaddikim	צדיקים
say a little	אומרים מעט
and they do a lot	ועושים הרבה

The Gemara answers that it could be that it is specifically in this case that we say that the person does not mean what he says, even though his response is far away from what his friend said. This is based on the rule that in general, tzaddikim (righteous people) say little and do much. Therefore, it could be that this person is concerned, that if he agrees to drink even a small drop of cold water (i.e., if he says a little), he will end up eating a large amount of food (i.e., he will end up doing a lot). Therefore, it order to prevent this he had to say that he wants to assure even a small drop of water, even though that is not his true intention. And therefore, we say that this person is allowed to drink that small drop of water because, in reality, he was always agreeable to doing so. However, this line of reasoning would not apply to our Gemara's case, and as such, the Gemara is left with its sofek, as will be explained.

(But) here it is a sofek	הכא ספיקא הוא
maybe	דלמא
less than a selah	פחות מסלע
and more than a shekel	ויותר על שקל
they (mean) to say	קאמר
and it is (a case) of zerizim	וזרזין הוי
or maybe	או דלמא
'they meant to be specific'	דוקא קאמר
and it is a neder	ונידרא הוי

The Gemara concludes:

You should ask (i.e., it remains an unresolved question) תבעי

The Gemara is left with its question. When the seller says that he will not accept less than a sela and the buyer says that he will not give more than a shekel, do they really mean what they say,

and if so, if they go against what they said, their neder will cause the issurim that they mentioned? Or do we say that they never really meant to make a neder, and this that they said that they were making a neder, was only to persuade the other party to agree to move closer to his position?¹⁰⁸

Do the Four Nedarim Mentioned in the Mishna Need שאלה?

The Mishna listed four nedarim that the Rabbanan were matir, and on this the Gemara says:

Rav Yehuda said	אמר רב יהודה
that Rav Asi said	אמר רב אסי
these four nedarim	ארבעה נדרים הללו
need a Chacham to be matir (them)	צריכין שאלה לחכם
(but) when I said this	כי אמריתא
before Shmuel	קמיה דשמואל
he said	אמר
the Tanna taught	תנא תני
four nedarim	ארבעה נדרים
the Chachamim were matir	התירו חכמים
and you say	ואת אמרת
they need	צריכין
a Chacham to be matir (them)	שאלה לחכם

Shmuel said that it cannot be that these four nedarim need a Chacham to be matir them because the Mishna implies otherwise. The Mishna says that the Chachamim were matir them, and this implies that they were matir them totally, without the need to do anything else (i.e., without the need to go to a Chacham to be matir them).

Can a Chacham be Matir a Neder with חרטה?

The previous Gemara quoted a statement from Rav Yehuda in the name of Rav Asi that Shmuel rejected. The Gemara will now bring a different version of that quote.

amounts that they said, they would not have said such specific amounts. If they were just picking amounts in order to pressure the other person, they would have picked more general numbers. And if they did make the effort to be so specific, it must be that this is really what they want.

Or do we say that perhaps even in this case, they are saying these amounts in order to pressure the other person?

And on this, the Gemara brings a proof from the Mishna that describes a person making a neder not to drink even a drop of water. In this case, as well, the person was being very specific, and if so, this is similar to our Gemara's case.

¹⁰⁸ The Ran's First Explanation of the Gemara's sofek

Above we explained the Gemara according to the second explanation of the Ran (and of many other Rishonim), here we will bring the first explanation that he mentions. In this explanation, he says that case of the Gemara is that the seller says he will not accept less than a dinar and a perutah, and the buyer says that he will not pay more than a shekel minus a perutah. According to this the Gemara's question is as follows. Can say that their statements are only a negotiating tactic if they were so specific? That is, if they didn't really mean the

Rav Yosef
learned that statement
with these 'words'
Rav Yehuda said
that Rav Asi said
a Chacham is not allowed
to be matir
only if they are similar
to these four nedarim
(this is because) he holds
we don't 'open' (i.e., we are not matir a neder)
with regret

רב יוסף
מתני לה להא שמעתא
בהאי לישנא
אמר רב יהודה
אמר רב אסי
אין חכם רשאי
להתיר
אלא כעין
ארבעה נדרים הללו
קסבר
אין פותחין
בחרטה

The Ran explains that there are two ways to be matir a neder. The standard way is for the Chacham to find a pesach (opening). That is, the Chacham finds a fact, that if the person would have known this fact at the time of the neder, he would not have agreed to make the neder. In other words, the Chacham determines that the neder was made under false pretense, that the person never had in mind to make the neder under the actual circumstances (i.e., the circumstances that he did not know about). This is similar to the four nedarim of our Mishna. In our Mishna as well, the person never meant to make these nedarim and that is why they are mutur.

The second possible way for a person to request that his neder should become mutur is by expressing regret (חרטה). That is, he says that he only made the neder out of anger, etc., but now he regrets doing so.

According to this version of what Rav Asi is saying, a Chacham cannot be matir a neder with just regret, as this is not similar to our Mishna. Our Mishna tells us, that it is specifically because we determine that the person never meant the neder that we say that the nedarim are mutur, but it is not because the person simply regrets what he did.

Although R' Asi said that a Chacham cannot be matir a neder with חרטה, the Gemara will bring two stories in which others disagreed with this.

There was a certain man

ההוא

that came before
Rav Huna (in order to be matir his neder)
He (Rav Huna) said to him
“Were you in the right state of mind (lit. was your heart לבד עלך (mind) on you)”
He said (back) to him
“No”
and he permitted it

דאתא לקמיה
דרב הונא
אמר ליה
לבד עלך
אמר ליה
לא
ושרייה

The Ran explains that Rav Huna was asking the person if he was in the same state of mind then as he is now. That is, Rav Huna wanted to know why this person regretted making this neder. Was it simply because he no longer wanted to deal with the consequences of the neder? That is, there is no difference between now and then, but even so, this person regrets the fact that he is being affected by his neder. The Ran explains that this is not considered 'real' חרטה, and as such, Rav Huna would not be able to be matir the neder.

However, if the person is now in a different state of mind, then Rav Huna would be able to be matir the neder. For example, if the person made the neder because he was angry, and now, when he is no longer angry, he regrets making the neder, this חרטה would work. This is what Rav Huna was asking, and when the person answer that indeed, he was in a different state of mind then, Rav Huna was matir the neder because of his חרטה.

And this is not like what Rav Asi said. Rav Asi said that a Chacham only has the ability to be matir a neder if the Chacham can find a pesach, that is, he determines that the neder was made under false pretense. But if the person just has חרטה, that would not be a reason to be matir the neder.¹⁰⁹

The Gemara brings another story with regard to the question if a Chacham has the ability to be matir a neder with חרטה.

There was a certain person
that came before
Rabbah bar Rav Huna (to be matir his neder)
he said to him
“If there would have been
ten people

ההוא
דאתא לקמיה
דרבה בר רב הונא
אמר ליה
אילו היו
עשרה בני אדם

¹⁰⁹ **The Three Levels of חרטה (A Summary)**

In our sugya, there are three levels of regret that a person could have that might be able to revoke a neder.

1. If the person simply regrets the consequence of his neder. That is, if a person just regrets making the neder because he now has to deal with its consequences, the Ran tells us that in this case no one would hold that a Chacham can be matir the neder.
2. If the person has regret because he was not in his regular state of mind when the neder, this is the case in which there is a machlokes if a

Chacham can be matir with חרטה or not. Rav Asi said that a Chacham cannot be matir a neder with חרטה, and others hold that the Chacham could be matir the neder with חרטה.

3. The case in which there is no machlokes if a Chacham can be matir the neder or not, is the case in which the Chacham can find a pesach from another place. That is, he finds a reason to say that the neder was made under false pretense.

that would have (tried) to appease you
 at that time
 would you have made the neder”
 he said to him
 “No”
 and he was matir it

שְׁפִיכֵי סוּף
 בְּאוֹתָהּ שָׁעָה
 מִי נִדְרָתָהּ
 אָמַר לָיָהּ
 לֹא
 וְהִתִּירוֹ

Rabbah bar Rav Huna was saying that if there would have been people around this person at the time he made the neder, and these people could have convinced him not to make the neder, then this proves that the person was not in his regular state of mind when he made the neder. It would prove that it must have been that the person made the neder as a rash decision. Because if he would have been in his regular state of mind, he would have made the neder despite the fact that the people around him would try to convince him not to make the neder. In other words, from the fact that he is saying that he would not have made the neder shows us that he now has תְּרֻטָה for making the neder, and this is why Rabbah bar Huna was matir it.

If so, we see that Rabbah bar Huna was willing to be matir the neder solely because the person had תְּרֻטָה and Rabbah bar Huna does not require that the neder be made under false pretense in order for a Chacham to have the ability to be matir it. (This is the simple explanation of the Gemara, ועיי ברין מה שכתב בזה).

The Gemara now explains that this question if a Chacham can be matir a neder with תְּרֻטָה or not, is in reality a machlokes Tannaim.

We learned in a Baraisa
 R' Yehuda says
 we say to the person
 “Were you in your right state of mind”
 if he says no
 we are matir it
 Reb Yishmael bar R' Yosie says
 in the name of his father
 we say to the person
 “If there would have been
 ten people
 who would have tried to appease you

תִּנְיָא
 רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר
 אוֹמְרִים לוֹ לְאָדָם
 לֵב זֶה עָלֶיךָ
 אִם אָמַר לֹא
 מִתִּירִין אוֹתוֹ
 רַבִּי יִשְׁמַעְיָאל בְּרַבִּי יוֹסֵי אוֹמֵר
 מִשׁוּם אָבִיו
 אוֹמְרִים לוֹ לְאָדָם
 אִילוּ הָיוּ
 עֶשְׂרֵה בְּנֵי אָדָם
 שְׁפִיכֵי סוּף

at that time
 would you have made the neder”
 if he says no
 we are matir it for him
 The Gemara will now bring several more stories on this topic and the siman (memory trick) to remember them is as follows (each one of these words correspond to one of the following stories):

The sign (for all these cases)
 Asi, Elazar, Yochanan, and Yanai
 There was a certain man
 that came
 before R' Asi (to be matir his neder)
 he said to him
 Do you now have regret”
 he said back to him
 (and) No! (i.e., of course I do)
 and he permitted it

בְּאוֹתָהּ שָׁעָה
 מִי נִדְרָתָהּ
 אִם אָמַר לֹא
 מִתִּירִין אוֹתוֹ
 (סִימָן)
 אֲסִי וְאֶלְעָזָר יוֹחָנָן וְיָנָאִי
 הָהוּא
 דָּאֲתָא
 לְקַמְיָה דְּרַבִּי אֲסִי
 אָמַר לָיָהּ
 כְּדוּ תִּהְיִית
 אָמַר לָיָהּ
 לֹא
 וְשָׂרְיָה

Reb Asi was asking the person if he had תְּרֻטָה for making the neder in the first place or is it only now that he has תְּרֻטָה. That is, is he now in a different state of mind from the time that he made the neder, and he regrets making the neder in back then? Or is the truth that he really does not regret making the neder at that point and it is only now that he regrets the consequence of the neder? To which the person answered rhetorically that of course he has תְּרֻטָה for making the neder in the first place. And because of this R' Asi was matir the neder as R' Asi holds that a Chacham can be matir a neder with תְּרֻטָה.¹¹⁰

The Gemara brings another example of a neder being allowed as the result for the person having תְּרֻטָה for it.

There was a certain person
 that came
 before R' Elazar (to be matir his neder)
 He said to him
 “Do you want the neder”
 He said (back) to him
 “If they would have not angered me”
 I would not have wanted (the neder) at all
 he (R' Elazar) said to him

הָהוּא
 דָּאֲתָא
 לְקַמְיָה דְּרַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר
 אָמַר לָיָהּ
 בְּעֵית נִדּוּר
 אָמַר לָיָהּ
 אִילוּ לֹא מְרַגְזִין לִי
 לֹא בְּעֵינֵי כָּלּוּם
 אָמַר לָיָהּ

¹¹⁰ R' Asi and Rav Asi as Two Separate People

The Ran points out that although we previously quoted Rav Asi as saying that a Chacham cannot be matir a neder with תְּרֻטָה, this is not a contradiction to this that we are now quoting Reb Asi as saying that a Chacham can be matir with תְּרֻטָה, as R' Asi and Rav Asi are two separate people.

it should be	תהא	she came	אתאי
like you want (i.e., the neder is mutur)	כבעית	before R' Yochanan (to be matir her neder)	לקמיה דרבי יוחנן
The Gemara brings another story and there is a machlokes Rishonim as to what exactly the Gemara is trying to prove with this story.		he said to her	אמר לה
There was a certain woman	ההיא איתתא	“If you would have known	אילו הוה ידעת
that made a neder	דאדרתה	that you neighbors would say	דאמרן מגירתיך
against her daughter	לברתה	on (i.e., about) your daughter	עלה דברתך