

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
לעילוי נשמת צבי בן יחזקאל יוסף גרין, מחסידי דעעש
From the Grin family, Sao Paulo, Brazil

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the author of the Mishnah (cont.)

It is suggested that the Mishnah follows the opinion of R' Tarfon but that suggestion is rejected.

The Gemara identifies the Mishnah as following the opinion of R' Yehudah regarding a pile.

The Baraisa related to the pile is cited that presents a dispute between R' Shimon and R' Yehudah.

The position of R' Shimon is clarified.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah presents a case of a כוי that approaches and different people make vows of nezirus related to whether the כוי is wild or domesticated, and the final result of all the different vows.

3) Parallel Beraisos

Two Beraisos are cited, the first one teaches that the nine people who made vows are nezirim and the second one teaches that one person would have to observe nine periods of nezirus.

The Gemara wonders how one person will be obligated to observe nine periods of nezirus when some of the nine vows are exclusive of one another.

R' Sheishes suggests that it refers to the case where a tenth person declares that he will observe the nezirus periods that the other nine people are obligated to observe.

הדרן עלך בית שמאי

4) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah enumerates the different prohibitions that apply to the nazir and presents details related to the prohibition against grape products.

5) Consuming the grapevine

An inference is made from the first part of the Mishnah that consuming the grapevine is not prohibited for a nazir.

This would be inconsistent with R' Eliezer who maintains that a nazir is prohibited to consume the grapevine.

According to a second version this inference was drawn from the later part of the Mishnah.

The Gemara explains that the dispute between R' Eliezer and Rabanan relates to methodology of exposition.

Their respective positions are explained.

The Gemara clarifies different terms used by Rabanan in their exposition.

The end of the exposition is repeated for the purpose of further clarification. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

How was the vow of Yaakov valid according to Rabbi Tarfon?
רבי יהודה אומר משום ר' טרפון אין אחד מהן נזיר לפי שלא נתנה נזירות אלא להפלאה

In Nedarim (21a), the ר"ן writes that because vows are associated (הוקשו) to nazir, the opinion of Rabbi Tarfon which does not validate nezirus when it is made conditionally would also not recognize any vow made with a condition. At the moment the vow is pronounced the factor of specificity is lacking, so the vow is invalid.

Keren Orah (ibid.) asks that we find many examples of vows which were certainly valid, although they were made contingent upon other factors. For example, Yaakov Avinu promised to give a tithe of his property if Hashem would protect him and return him safely to Eretz Yisroel (see Bererish 28:20-22). Also, the Jewish people issued a vow (Bemidbar 21:2) when they were confronted by Amalek, who had disguised themselves. The verses there imply that the vow was valid, even though it was stated on condition that the Jews prevail. Channa, the mother of Shmuel declared a vow based upon a condition (Shmuel 1, 1:11), and Yiftach also issued his vow with a contingency (Shoftim 11:30). In all these cases, the vow was valid despite its being conditional. How are we to understand these cases according to Rabbi Tarfon?

Keren Orah explains that Rabbi Tarfon agrees that if one vows at a time of crisis or in time of duress, the vow is valid even if there are conditions associated with the commitment. שלמי נדרים writes that if a vow involves a mitzvah or tzedakah, the person has in mind for it to be valid even if it is stated as being conditional. It is only in reference to nazir or vows to prohibit something upon oneself that a conditional vow fails due to its not being pronounced with certainty (מפלאה).

In his Shiurim, הרב דוד פוברסקי explains that the reason for the rule of Rabbi Tarfon, as noted in Sanhedrin (25a) is that one's mindset is not committed when one is relying upon an אסמכתא—a presumed but unreliable outcome. Therefore, when the condition made is unreliable, such as in our Mishnah where a viewer is guessing the identity of a passer-by, the nezirus is faulty. However, when a person sets up a reasonable condition in order for his nezirus to rely upon it, the person may very well know whether the condition will later apply, and the vow is merely set to hinge upon this eventuality. In this case, even Rabbi Tarfon can recognize the vow as being valid. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
לע"נ ר' נתנאל בן ר' שמואל מרדכי ע"ה
By his children
Mr. and Mrs. Robert Hartman

HALACHAH Highlight

The appropriate beracha for bread soaked in wine and schnapps

ר' עקיבא אומר אפי' שרה פיתו ביין וכי

R' Akiva says that even if a person soaks his bread in wine etc.

Maharil¹ writes that if a piece of bread falls into wine in the middle of a meal one must recite a בורא פרי הגפן before eating the bread. He cites our Gemara as support for this conclusion because our Gemara refers to eating something soaked in wine as drinking. Shayarei Knesses Hagedolah² also addressed the question of bread soaked in wine and the question of which is the primary ingredient and which is the secondary ingredient. He makes reference to the Maharil and concludes that his practice is to avoid the question so he makes a beracha on wine before he eats the bread soaked in wine.

Shulchan Aruch Harav³ analyzes the case of a person who dips bread into his schnapps before the meal begins and questions what is the appropriate beracha. On the one hand one could argue that his intent is for the schnapps and he is eating the bread simply to dull the sharp taste of the schnapps. On the other hand, since this is taking place before the meal it is hard to accept that he does not intend for the bread to fill him up and thus the bread cannot be considered secondary. It is the second approach that Shulchan Aruch Harav finds compelling and therefore even if a person was in the middle of a meal and wanted to eat bread soaked in wine he would not be required to make a beracha on the absorbed wine. Even

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is a כוי?

2. What are the three nazir prohibitions?

3. Which exposition is more encompassing—פרטי or כללי ריבוי ומיטוטי?

4. What is derived from the words ומחצנים ועד זג?

though if he was going to drink wine he would be required to make a beracha in the middle of a meal, nonetheless, since the bread is considered primary, due to its capacity to fill a person, the wine is considered secondary and a beracha is not required.

Mishnah Berurah⁴ rules that a person who soaks his bread in schnapps after the meal in order to assist digestion is required to make a beracha on the schnapps. The reason is that once the meal is completed it is clear that the function of the bread is to make it easier to consume the schnapps, thus the bread is secondary to schnapps. He adds that Elyah Rabbah advises to drink some schnapps before eating the bread soaked in the schnapps and by doing so one avoids questions related to the correct beracha to recite. ■

1. מהרי"ל ח"ב נט"י סעודה וברכות סי' ז'.
2. שכנה"ג סי' קס"ח הגהב"י ס"ק י"א.
3. שו"ע הרב או"ח סי' ר"יב סעי' ב' - ד'.
4. מ"ב שם סק"ה. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Avoiding Pitfalls

"...מחצנים ועד זג..."

Our Gemara discusses the exact parameters of the nazir's prohibition against eating grapes.

בין הזמנים is a very difficult time for a ben Torah, since it is all too easy to hardly learn one word the entire time. The Shela Hakadosh, זת"ל, actually wished to abolish it entirely saying, "בין הזמנים is a plague not recorded in the Torah." Rav Chaim Shmuelevitz, זת"ל, would keep to the exact same seder during בין הזמנים as he did during the

zeman. Those close with him would say, "The only difference is the carpet slippers!"

Once, before בין הזמנים, Rav Shach, זת"ל, said to his talmidim, "Let us examine what Rabeinu Yonah says in Sha'arei Teshuvah, 'If you ask where we find Scripture making a fence to protect? The answer is: we find this regarding the mitzvah of Nazir who is only prohibited from drinking wine...he is prohibited from everything that can be made into wine even if it's not alcoholic. This is only a protective measure to ensure he doesn't drink wine...' He uses this concept to explain why even kirvah to arayos is יהרג ואל יעבור.

"The Gemara itself compares staying

away from arayos to a nazir refraining from grapes and the like. Chazal go even further and prohibit him from even entering a vineyard. The Rambam explains, 'It is Rabinically prohibited for a Nazir to be in the presence of people drinking wine. He should be very careful to distance himself from such debauchery since Chachamim said he shouldn't even go near a vineyard.'

Rav Shach concluded with a warning about staying in a good environment during בין הזמנים. "Think about it. Is there a bigger gathering of drunkards, of people with lax moral standards, than the street?" ■

