

## Nedarim 26A

After Rabbah defined when Bais Shammai and Bais Hillel have their machlokes, the Gemara brings that Rava had his own definition as to when they argue.

And Rava said	וְרַבָּא אָמַר
everyone (holds)	דְּכֹלֵי עֲלָמָא
any time that the person said	כָּל הֵיכָא דְאָמַר
“If I would have known	אִילוּ הָיִיתִי יוֹדָע
that my father was among them	שְׂאֵבָא בִינֵיכֶם
I would have said	הֵייתִי אוֹמֵר
so-and-so and so-and-so	פְּלוּנִי וּפְלוּנִי
are assur	אַסוּרִין
and (my) father is mutur	וְאָבָא מוֹתֵר
all of them are mutur	כּוֹלָם מוֹתֵרִין
they don’t argue	לֹא נִחְלְקוּ
only (in a case) in which he says	אֶלָּא בְּאוֹמֵר
“If I would have known	אִילוּ הָיִיתִי יוֹדָע
that (my) father was among them	שְׂאֵבָא בִינֵיכֶם
I would have said	הֵייתִי אוֹמֵר
all of them are assur	כּוֹלָכֶם אַסוּרִין
except for (my) father	חוּץ מְאָבָא

According to Rava, in the case in which the person says that he would have changed his words (i.e., he would have said ‘this one and that one’ instead of ‘all of you’), everyone agrees that the entire neder is batul. Since he regrets (all) the words he said, everyone agrees that the entire neder is batul.

The only machlokes is in the case in which the person would not have changed what he said. That is, originally, he said, ‘all of you’ and now he says that he doesn’t regret saying ‘all of you’ but he should have added the words ‘except for my father’.

Rava now explains the machlokes:

Bais Shammai holds	בֵּית שְׁמַאי סְבָרִי לֵה
like R' Meir	כְּרַבִּי מֵאִיר
that said	דְּאָמַר
a person is ‘grabbed’	תְּפֹס
by (his) first expression	לְשׁוֹן רֵאשׁוֹן
and Bais Hillel holds	וּבֵית הִלֵּל סְבָרִי לֵה
like R' Yosie	כְּרַבִּי יוֹסִי
that said	דְּאָמַר
with the end of his words	בְּגִמְרַ דְּבִרְיֹו
he is ‘grabbed’	אֲדָם נִתְפָּס

Rava explains that the machlokes is only in the case in which he says that he would have kept what he originally said, that is, he now says that had he known that his father was among them he would have still said ‘all off you are assur’ but he would have added the words ‘except for my father’. In this case, Rava says that there is a machlokes between Bais Shammai and Bais Hillel based on a machlokes R' Meir and R' Yosie.

R' Meir and R' Yosie argue in case in which a person makes a statement that consists of two contradictory phrases. R' Meir holds that the person is ‘grabbed’ by the first expression. That is, since the person said two contradictory statements, and as such, we have to choose one of them to say that this is what he really meant, we say that the first phrase is the ‘main’ one and halacha will be determined by that phrase.

R' Yosie, however, holds that the second phrase is the ‘main’ phrase and the halacha will be determined by that phrase.

In our case, the machlokes R' Meir and R' Yosie plays out as follows. In the case in which the person says that had he known that his father was among the group, he still would have said ‘all of you are assur’ but he would have added the words ‘except for my father’, Bais Shammai will hold that the first part of his statement will not be batul and therefore the others will still be assur. This is because he holds like R' Meir, that we ‘grab’ the first part of his statement, i.e., in our case we say that the first part is the ikar (main part), and therefore since he is not changing it, it does not become batul.

Bais Hillel however holds like R' Yosie that when faced with a choice between ‘picking’ between the first part of a person’s expression or the last part, we ‘pick’ the last part of his expression (i.e., the part that he ended off with). Therefore, in our case in which the person says that had he known his father was there, he would have added the words ‘except for my father’, we focus on his last words. And since these words change what he originally said (i.e., he originally said that everyone should be assur and now he is qualifying that by saying it should not include his father), Bais Hillel holds that since part of the neder is batul, the whole neder is batul.

To Summarize:

**Rabba:** The machlokes is only when the person says that he would have changed his words. But if the person says that he would not have changed his words, everyone would agree that the neder is not batul.

**Rava :** The machlokes is only when the person says that he would not have changed his words but in the case in which he

says that he would have changed his words, then everyone would agree that the entire neder is batul.

The Gemara will now ask from the second part of the Mishna that the Gemara quoted earlier. The Gemara previously quoted the Mishna in which the Chachamim and R' Akiva argue if we say that once part of a neder is batul, the entire neder is batul.

Rav Pappa asked to Rava	אֵיִתִּיבִיהּ רַב פָּפָא לְרַבָּא
(the Mishna there said) how	כִּיצַד
(did) R' Akiva say	אָמַר רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא
(that) a neder	נָדַר
that part of it became mutur	שְׁהוּתָא מִקְצָתוֹ
all of it becomes mutur	הוּתָא כּוּלָּא

The Mishna will now explain the case in which R' Akiva holds that once part of a neder become batul, the whole neder becomes batul. To do this, the Mishna will list three separate cases.

The first case:	
(If a person says) “Konam	קוֹנָם
that I will not benefit	שְׂאִינִי נְהִנָּה
from any of you”	לְכֹלְכֶם
(if) one of them became mutur	הוּתָא אֶחָד מֵהֶן
all of them will become mutur	הוּתְרוּ כּוּלָּם

The second case:	
(If he said) “I will not benefit	שְׂאִינִי נְהִנָּה
not from this one and not from this one	לֹא לְזֶה וְלָזֶה
if the first one became mutur	הוּתָא הָרִאשׁוֹן
(then) all of them become mutur	הוּתְרוּ כּוּלָּם

And the third case:	
(If) the last person becomes mutur	הוּתָא הָאַחֲרֹן
the last one is mutur	הָאַחֲרֹן מוּתָר
and all of them are assur	וְכוּלָּן אֲסוּרִין

The Gemara will now ask from this Mishna on the shita of Rava. In order to understand this question, we will need to review the shitos of Rabba and Rava. In the case in which he says that he would have changed his words, Rabbah says there is a machlokes if we are mevatal the entire neder and Rava disagrees and says that in this case there is no machlokes and everyone agrees that the entire neder is batul.

The Gemara now asks:	
It is good according to Rabba	בְּשַׁלְמָא לְרַבָּא
he can establish the raysha	מוֹקִיָּם לֵה לְרִישָׁא
that he said “to this one and this one”	דְּאָמַר לְזֶה וְלָזֶה
and the sayfa	וְסִיפָא

that he said “to all of you” דְּאָמַר לְכֹלְכֶם

The Mishna said that this is the shita of R' Akiva. This would seem to imply that this is only the shita of R' Akiva and not like the Rabbanan who argue on R' Akiva. That is, although R' Akiva holds that once a neder becomes partially batul the whole neder becomes batul, the Rabbanan argue with him. And as such, if the Mishna is going to list cases in which part of the neder becomes batul, and the Mishna is going to say that this is the shita of R' Akiva, the implication is going to be that this is only the shita of R' Akiva and is not the shita of the Rabbanan.

In the Gemara’s question, the Gemara is going to call the first two cases the raysha (i.e., the cases in which the entire neder becomes batul) and the sayfa is the last case (i.e., the case in which the neder does not become totally batul).

The Mishna said that in the first two cases the entire neder is batul in accordance with the shita of R' Akiva. The Gemara says that we can understand that in these two cases the person says that had he known his father was there, he would have said different words. There are two possibilities.:

1. Originally, he said, “All of you” and he now says that had he known his father was there he would have specified each person. That is, in order to protect the honor of his father, he would not have said ‘all of you’ as this implies his father, a disrespectful thing to do, but rather he would have said ‘to this one and to this one’.
2. The second possibility is that he originally said, ‘to this one and that one’ and now he says that had he known that his father was there he would have said ‘all of you’. This change also would have been done to protect the honor of his father. If a person spends time specifying each and every person, an onlooker might think that the person will end up mentioning his father, something that is obviously disrespectful to the father. Therefore, this person now says that it would have been better for me to say, ‘to all of you except for my father’. The advantage with saying this is that there is virtually no time that one might be under the impression that he means to include his father as he **immediately** says, ‘except for my father’. As opposed to where he singles each person out. If he is mentioning each person by name, there is no room for him to say except for my father. In this case, the only way the onlooker will know that he doesn’t mean to include his father is to wait until he is finished, that is, it will take time until this happens and during all that time it could

appear that this person is being disrespectful to this father.

In other words, there are two ways to look at it.

1. Some might think that it is more respectful to single out each individual person (because if you say ‘all of you’ this implies that even the father is included).
2. And others might say that saying ‘all of you is the better option’ (because if you single people out, it will take a while until people realize that you are not including the father).

Therefore, in both these cases, that is, both in the case in which the person first said ‘all of you’ and then says he would have said ‘this one and that one’, or in the case in which the person first said ‘this one and that one’ and then says he would have said ‘all of you’, in both these cases the person is saying that he would have changed his words, and as such, the entire neder is batul in accordance with the shita of R' Akiva. That is, in accordance with R' Akiva's shita and not the shita of the Rabbanan. According to the Rabbanan, even in a case in which the person says that he would have changed his words, they still hold that only part of the neder becomes batul and not the entire neder.

And in the sayfa, even R' Akiva agrees that you don't say that the entire neder is batul. This is because in the sayfa the person is not saying that he would have changed his words. Either at first, he says, ‘all of you’ and now he says that he would have added the words ‘except for my father. Or the case is one in which originally he said, ‘this one and this one’ and now as well even after he knows that his father was in the group he would have still said ‘this one and this one’, but he would have just not included his

father. In both of these cases the person is not changing his words and that is why R' Akiva would agree that the neder is not batul.

That is, if this person holds that saying ‘this one and that one’ is more respectful (i.e., option one), then this person is saying that he is happy that he singled out every one them but he should have just added the words “and my father is mutur”.

And if this person holds that saying the words “all of you” is more respectful (option two), then what this person is now saying is that he is happy that he said the words “all of you” except for the fact that he should have added the words “except for my father”.

In other words, we understand the sayfa very well, as in the sayfa the person is not regretting what he said but rather he is just saying that he should have added words (and the exact case will depend on the particular person).

(The Ran points out that at this point of the Gemara, when the Mishna refers to the first one person or the last one person, it is lav davka (not particular) and in the intent is to say any one of them. That is, the Mishna is discussing if one of them becomes mutur does that affect all of these people (and whether that person is last or first is irrelevant). The Gemara later on will say that this understanding in the first one or last one is incorrect but at this point of the sugya, this is how the Gemara understands it.)

The Gemara now comes to its question:

**But according to you**

**it is good**

**the raysha**

**we can establish it**

**(as a case) that he said “all of you”**

**אָלָא לְדִידָךְ**

**בְּשֵׁלְמָא**

**רִישָׁא**

**מוֹקִים לָהּ**

**דְּאָמַר לְכוּלְכֶם**

## Nedarim 26B

But the sayfa	אֵלָא סִיפָא
that he said	דְּאָמַר
‘from this one and that one’	לְזָה וְלְזָה
(is) it (really just) R' Akiva	רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא הִיא
(but) why	אֲמַאי
do the Rabbanan argue on him	פְּלִיגֵי רַבְנָן עֲלֵיהּ
but you said	וְהָאֲמַרְתָּ
according to everyone it is mutur	דְּבַרְיָ הַכֵּל מוֹתֵר

Although previously the Gemara understood the term raysha that is mentioned in the Mishna as referring to the first two cases and the sayfa to referring to the third case, the Gemara now understands the term raysha to be referring to the first case and the term sayfa to be referring to the last case (see footnote where we quote the Ran’s explanation as to why the Gemara switches).<sup>144</sup>

The Ran explains the Gemara as follows. In the first case (what the Gemara now calls the raysha), the person said that ‘all of you are assur’ and in the second case (what the Gemara now calls the sayfa) the person says, ‘this one is assur and this one is assur’. The Gemara assumes that this is what he is now saying. That is, in both cases the person originally said that ‘all of you

<sup>144</sup><sup>144</sup> Why Does the Gemara Switch its Understanding of What the Terms Raysha and Sayfa Refer to?

When the Gemara discuss the shita of Rabbah, the Gemara refers to both case one and case two as the raysha and only case three as the sayfa. And yet, while discussing the shita of Rava, the Gemara refers to the first case as the raysha and the second case as the sayfa. But why is there is difference? If according to Rabbah both cases one and two are referred to as the raysha, why would there be a difference with regard to Rava?

The Ran answers that according to Rabbah both cases one and two are the same in the aspect that they are both cases in which the person says that he would have changed his wording had he known that his father was among the group. Therefore, since they are both the same case, i.e., they belong to the same group of cases, they are both labeled with the same term, the raysha.

But as the Gemara says (and will be explained in the next footnote) according to Rava, the first case is a case in which the person would not have changed his wording and the second one was one in which he would have changed his wording. Therefore, they cannot be put together as they are different cases. As such, the case is referred to as the raysha and the second case as the sayfa.

<sup>145</sup> According to Rava, Why Can the Gemara Not Just Say that Both Case One and Case Two Are Cases in Which the Person Does Not Change the Wording of the Neder?

When the Gemara explained the shita of Rabba, the Gemara said that both the first case and second cases are cases in which the person would have changed his words. In the first case, the person originally said, ‘all of you’ and then when he finds out that his father was in the group, he says that had he known that he would have said this ‘one and that one’. And the second case is also a case in which he says that he would have changed his words had he known that his father was in the group, that is, although he originally said, ‘this one and that one’, he now says that had he known his father was there, he would have

should be assur’ and then discovers that his father is assur. In the first case the person still says that he would have said ‘all of you are assur’ but he would have added the words ‘except for my father’. And in the second case, the person says that he would have changed from what he said originally and instead he would have said ‘this one and that one’.

In other words, in the first case, he does not change what he would have said (but he would have just added the words ‘except for my father,’) and in the second case he would have changed from what he said. And this leads to the Gemara’s question. If it is really true that in the second case we are dealing with someone who says that he would have changed his words (from saying ‘all of you’ to say ‘this one and that one’), why does the Mishna refer to this as the shita of R' Akiva?

According to Rava, in a case that the person says that he would have switched his words, everyone agrees that the entire neder is batul. And yet the Mishna implies not that way, and if so, we see from the Mishna not like the shita of Rava. (See footnote where we quote the explanation of the Ran as to why the Gemara could not just establish both case one and case two as cases in which the person did not change his words, and if so, that would be why both these cases are only the shita of R' Akiva).<sup>145</sup>

And since both cases are cases in which the person changes his words, we understand very well why R' Akiva holds that the entire neder is batul.

But if so, why can’t we say the same approach with regard to Rava? That is, why can we not say that both the first and second case of the Mishna are cases in which he says that he would not have changed his words and that is why these cases are cases in which only R' Akiva would hold that the entire neder is batul.

That is, the first case is a case in which he says, ‘all of you’ and when he finds out that his father is among them, he says that he would still say ‘all of you’ but would have added the words ‘except for my father. And the second case would be a case in which he says, “this one and that one’ and even after he finds out that his father was among them, he would still say ‘this one and that one’. And if so, we understand that since both these cases are cases in which the person would not have changed his wording, that it is why it is specifically R' Akiva who says that the entire neder is batul, and this would be in accordance with the shita of Rava who says that the machlokes is only in a case in which the person would not have changed his words. But in a case in which he would have changed his words, everyone would agree that the entire neder is batul.

The Ran answers that the Gemara could not answer this because according to this setup, the first case and the second case would be virtually the same, and as such, there would be no need to repeat the same halacha twice. That is, according to this, both the first case and the second case tell us the halacha that when the person says that he would not have switched his words, it is specifically R' Akiva who holds that even so, the entire neder is batul. The fact that in the first case he said, ‘all of you’ and in the second case he said ‘this one and that one’ should not make a difference as the integral point of the halacha is that even when the person does not change his words, the entire neder is batul. Therefore, it would not make a difference as to what the person said, and as such, there would be no need to repeat the cases.

However, according to Rabbah there is a need to say both cases. As explained previously, both in the case that the person changes from his original statement of ‘all of you’ to a ‘statement of ‘this one and that one’, or in the case in which he changes from ‘this one and that one’ to ‘all of you’, it is considered

Rava said to him (to Rav Puppa) **אָמַר לִיה רַבָּא**  
 and according Rabbah **וְלַרְבָּה**  
 according to R' Akiva **לְרַבִּי עֲקִיבָא**  
 is it good (understandable) the sayfa **מִי נִיחָא סִיפָא**  
 (but) with what do you establish it **בְּמַאי מוֹקִים לָהּ**  
 that he said **דְּאָמַר**  
 'all of you' (in the beginning and in the end) **לְכוּלְכֶם**  
 (but if so) which one is the first **הִי דִין הוּא רִאשׁוֹן**  
 and which one is the second **וְהִי דִין הוּא אַחֲרֹן**

Rava is now asking that even according to Rabbah, we cannot understand the Mishna, as follows. In the third case of the Mishna, R' Akiva says that the neder is not batul but rather if the person who became mutur is the last one, then all of the previous people will still be assur (i.e., as the neder is not batul).

But what is the case? Seemingly the case has to be that originally, he did say 'all of you' and now he also says 'all of you' as well, and the point is that since he is not changing his words, the others are still going to be assur.

But Rava now asks that if that is the correct understanding of the third case, then it does not make a difference if his father was first or second. The reason why the neder is still in effect for the other people, even though his father became mutur, is because the person is saying that he does not have regret for what he said with relation to everyone else (that is, the only thing he regrets is not the fact that he said 'all of you' but rather he just regrets not adding the words 'except for my father').

If so, the point is that even though his father becomes mutur, this does not affect the others, and it is completely irrelevant if his father was first or last. And yet, the Mishna does make the point of differentiating between if he was first or last, and if so, Rava now says that there must be a different way to understand the cases of the Mishna.

Because of this question, Rava gives a different explanation of the Mishna's three cases.

Rather **אֵלָא**  
 (the case of the) raysa **רִישָׁא**  
 is when he said 'all of you' **דְּאָמַר לְכוּלְכֶם**

as if the original statement was made in error as he would not have said it had he known that his father was there, as the original statement is considered disrespectful to this father. That is, when faced with the question of which statement is considered more disrespectful, the statement of 'all of you' or the statement of 'this one and that one', one could say either way. This is true because each statement has a reason to say why it is the more disrespectful of the two (and that is why he now changes to the other statement).

and the (case of) the sayfa **וְסִיפָא**  
 is for example **כְּגוֹן**  
 that he made this one depended **שֶׁתְּלָאן זָה**  
 with that one **בְּזָה**  
 and he said "so-and so **וְאָמַר פְּלוּנִי**  
 is like so-and-so **כְּפְלוּנִי**  
 and so-and- so is like so-and-so **וּפְלוּנִי כְּפְלוּנִי**

Rava explains that the Mishna is saying two separate halachos. The raysa is discussing where he says, "all of you" and he then discovers that his father is among them. In this case, R' Akiva says that since the neder becomes batul with regard to his father, it becomes batul with regard to everyone else as well.

The Ran explains that Rava is saying that the exact case of the raysa will depend on whether you hold like him or you hold like Rabbah. If you hold like him, that the machlokes is even in a case in which the person did not change his words, then the case could be one in which the person says that he still wants to say, 'all of you' but I would have added the words 'except for my father'. And according to Rava, this is the case in which R' Akiva says that once a part of the neder is batul, the whole neder is batul, and the Chachamim will argue and say that since he is not changing his mind with regard to this that he said 'all of you', the neder is not batul.

And if you hold like Rabbah, that if the person does not change his words, then everyone agrees that the neder is not batul, then you have to say that indeed in this case the person did change his mind (that is, although originally he said 'all of you', he now says that he would have said 'this one and this one'). And since he is now changing his mind, R' Akiva (and not the Chachamim) hold that the entire neder is batul.

And in the second and third case, we are discussing something else entirely. In these two cases, the person makes a number of nedarim, but he makes one depended on the other. That is, he makes a separate neder on each person but makes them dependent on each other (i.e., he says this one should be assur like that one). Therefore, if one of them becomes mutur, that might or might not affect the others. If he is from the first ones, and the later nedarim were made on the condition that this one is assur, then once he become mutur all the later ones become assur. But

Therefore, since each statement has a reason to say that the person would have not said had he known that his father was there, we need both cases to teach us that each one of these reasons are correct. In other words, each one of these cases has a chiddush that the other one does not, and that is why we need both them.

if the last one becomes mutur, then this will not affect the earlier ones. In other words, the halacha of the second and third cases are not related to the halacha of a partial neder becoming mutur.

It is also m'du'yik like this  
for we learned in a Baraisa  
if the middle one becomes mutur  
(then the halacha is that) from him  
and downwards (i.e., the later ones)  
are mutur  
and (the ones) above (him)  
are assur

דִּיקָא נְמִי  
דְתַנֵּינָא  
הוֹתֵר הָאֲמַצְעִי  
הִמְנוּ  
וְלַמָּטָה  
מוֹתְרִין  
וְלַמַּעְלָה  
אֲסוּרִין

From this Baraisa we see that the heter does not just depend on whether the neder became batul or not but rather the heter depends on who was linked to who. That is, if the middle one becomes mutur, then only the later ones, i.e., those who were linked to the earlier ones become mutur, but those whose neder were made before this one, stay assur. In other words, the heter in this case is not based on the halacha that once part of a neder becomes mutur the entire neder becomes mutur (because if that was the heter then once one of them became mutur all of them would become mutur) rather the Baraisa is referring to a case in which many interlinking nedarim were made and the question is going to be who is affected by who.

**One Who Makes a Neder to Forbid All Onions Because They Are Bad for the Heart**

He asked a question  
Rav Ada bar Ahava to Rava  
(the Mishna says that if a person says) “Konam  
an onion that I will taste  
for an onion is bad for the heart”  
(And then) they said to him  
“But the kufrie (onion)  
is good for the heart”

אֵיתִיבֵיהּ  
רַב אֲדָא בַר אֲהָבָה לְרַבָּא  
קוֹנָם  
בְּצֹל שְׂאֲנֵי טוּעִים  
שְׁהַבְּצֹל רַע לְלֵב  
אֲמְרוּ לוֹ  
וְהֵלֵא הַכּוּפְרִי  
זָכָה לְלֵב

In this case, the Mishna says:

The kufrie (onion) is mutur

הוֹתֵר בְּכּוּפְרִי

and not just the kufrie alone

וְלֹא בְּכּוּפְרִי בְּלֵד

is mutur

הוֹתֵר

but all onions (are mutur)

אֲלֵא בְּכָל הַבְּצָלִים

and there was a story (like this)

מַעֲשֵׂה הָיָה

and R' Meir permitted

וְהִתִּירוֹ רַבִּי מֵאִיר

all onions

בְּכָל הַבְּצָלִים

Initially, this person made a neder not to eat any onions as he thought that all onions are bad for the heart. He then realizes that he made a mistake and says that he regrets making a neder with regard to the kufrie onion (as it is good for the heart). In this case, the Mishna tells us that since the neder is batul with regard to the kufrie onion, the neder is batul with regard to all onions.

The Gemara will now try to figure out the exact case and to see if we have a proof to the machlokes of Rabba and Rava.

Is it not (the case)

מֵאִי לָאוּ

that he said

דְּאָמַר

“If I would have known

אִילוּ הָיִיתִי יוֹדֵעַ

that the kufrie is good for the heart

שֶׁהַכּוּפְרִי זָכָה לְלֵב

I would have said

הָיִיתִי אוֹמֵר

all onions should be assur

כָּל הַבְּצָלִים אֲסוּרִים

and the kufrie should be mutur”

וְכּוּפְרִי מוֹתֵר

That is, the person is saying that now that he knows that the kufrie onion is good for you, he would have still said that all onions should be assur, but he would have just added the words ‘except for the kufrie onion’.

In other words, he would not have changed his words but rather he would have just added the words ‘except for the kufrie onion’. And yet, despite the fact that he is saying that he would not have changed his words, the Mishna brings that R' Meir holds that once part of the neder is assur, the entire neder is assur. If so, we see not like the shita of Rava.

Rava said that in the case in which the person does not change his words, Bais Shammai will hold like the shita of R' Meir that the neder is not batul. And as the Ran explains, the Gemara assumes that if Bais Shammai holds like R' Meir, this implies that R' Meir holds like Bais Shammai. But from the Mishna we see not this way. From the Mishna we see that even in a case in which the person does not change his words, R' Meir still holds that the entire neder is batul.<sup>146</sup>

<sup>146</sup> Is the Gemara’s Question Just on Rava or is it on Rabbah as Well?

The Ran explains that although the Gemara is asking its question on Rava (as explained above), the Gemara is certainly asking on Rabbah as well. According to Rabbah, in the case in which the person does not change his mind, everyone agrees that the neder is not batul, and yet the Mishna says not that way. The

Mishna says that even in the case in which the person does not change his mind the neder is batul.

The Ran explains that although this is true, the Gemara still chooses to ask its question on Rava, as Rava was the one who brought the shita of R' Meir into our sugya. Therefore, since the question is from R' Meir's shita, he chooses to ask the question specifically on R' Meir. Tosefos also explains like the Ran that

The Gemara answers:

No! (this is not the case)	לא
(rather the case is one in which) he says	באומר
“If I would have known	אילו הייתי יודע
that the kufrie is good for the heart	שהכופרי יפה ללב
I would have said	הייתי אומר
these particular onions	בצל פלוני ופלוני
are assur	אסורין
and the kufrie is mutur”	וכופרי מותר
and R' Meir	ורבי מאיר
is in accordance	אליבא
with the shita of R' Akiva	דרבי עקיבא
and in accordance with the shita	ואליבא
of the Rabbanan	דרבנן

The Gemara answers that the Mishna is discussing a case in which the person says that he would have changed his words. Therefore, according to Rabbah that there is a machlokes in this case. R' Meir who the Mishna quoted as being mevatul the neder, will hold like the shita of R' Akiva (who holds that once part of the neder becomes batul the whole neder becomes batul).

And according to Rava, R' Meir will even be in accordance with the shita of the Rabbanan. According to Rava, in a case in which the person changes his words, everyone agrees that the neder is batul. Therefore, since we are now saying that this is a case in which the person is changing his words, this that R' Meir says that the entire neder is batul could even be in accordance with the shita of the Rabbanan.

**Another Example of a Neder that Becomes Partially Mutur  
(superior figs that are mixed into regular figs)**

The Gemara asks another question on Rava.	
Ravina asked Rava	איתיביה רבינא לרבא
(the Baraisa says) R' Nosson says	רבי נתן אומר
there is a neder	יש נדר
that part of it is mutur	שמקצתו מותר
and part of it is assur	ומקצתו אסור
what is the case?	כיצד
one makes a neder	נדר
from a basket (of figs)	מן הכלכלה

---

the Gemara's question is certainly a question on Rabbah as well. Tosefos says that the reason Rav Ada asked this question on Rava and not Rabbah was because Rava was his Rebbi.