16.5.2 32a (משנה ד') → 34a (סיום הפרק)

ז. אַל תִּבְטָחוּ לָכֵם אֵל דִּבְרֵי הַשֵּׁקֵר לֵאמֹר **הַיכֵל ה' הִיכֵל ה' הִיכַל ה'** הַמָּה:יִרמִיהוּ פּרק ז פּסוק ד

2. **שַבעים שבעים** נַחָתָּדְ עַל עַפּוּךְ וַעַל עִיר קַדְשָׁךְ לָכָלֶא הַפְּשַׁע וּלְהָתֵם חַטָּאת וּלְכַפֶּר עַוֹן וּלְהָבִיא צֵּדְק עַלְמִים וַלְחָתּם חָזוֹן וְנָבִיא וְלְמִשׁחַ קְדַשׁ קַדְשִׁים: *זניאל טיבד*

- I משנה ד': further on mistaken הקדש
 - a if someone took a vow of מירות and then found that his animals (that he was counting on for the קרבן) were stolen
 - i if: he took the vow before they were stolen, he is a נזיר
 - ii *if*: they were stolen first, he isn't a נזיר
 - iii *misapplication*: נחום המדי (at time of נזירים that had come to ירושלים to bring their קרבנות and found the שקדש desolate and destroyed:
 - 1 he asked them: had you known that the מקדש was destroyed, would you have taken the vow? (A: "no") and he released them
 - 2 מרבון he should have asked whether they took the vow before or after the חרבן
 - iv note: ר"א's silence here indicates that he accepted מתמים position, negating פותחין בנולד
 - 1 further: חכמים agree with ר"א that תנאי נולד works
 - (a) Example: if someone asked these נזירים "had someone told you that the מקדש was destroyed, would you have vowed ינזירות?" and they answer in the negative vow is released.
 - (b) Observation: ר' יוסף and אביי point to vv. 1-2, forecasting the בולד at all
 - (i) Rejection: the verses don't pinpoint the day of destruction exactly
- II משנה ה': vows taken on condition of mutually exclusive realities
 - a example: if 2 people (A and B) approach C; A vows on condition that C is פלוני, B vows on condition that C isn't פלוני, B then vows on condition that one of A or B is a נזיר E vows on condition that neither A nor B is a נזירים, F vows on condition that A and B are both נזירים and then F vows on condition that A through E are all
 - i rulings:
 - 1 ב"ש all are נזירים
 - 2 only the ones whose words were accurate are נזירים
 - 3 ר"ט none of them are נזירים
 - (a) reason: נזירות requires הפלאה (clear unequivocal expression)
- III משנה ו' variation on earlier case:
 - a if C ran away (so that we could never identify if he was indeed פלוני)
 - i ת"ק: none of them is a נזיר
 - ii פלוני: each should stipulate if C was נזיר, I'm a נזיר, if not, I'm a נזיר, if not, I'm a נזיר נדבה
 - 1 implication: if he hadn't run away, (at least) everyone who was right about his identity would be a נזיר
 - 2 authorship: must be ר' יהודה of case of כרי:
 - (a) if: someone takes a vow of נזירות on condition that he has 100 כור in his granary and comes to find it stolen

בהמה and חיה if that's a נזיר

נזיר if one of a-f is a נזיר

h נזיר if none of a-f is a נזיר

נזיר if that's neither a חיה nor a בהמה

(i) ספק נזירות להקל) נויר not a כיי not מייר only if we knew that there were 100 כור would he be a נויר

е

- (ii) ספק נזירות להחמיר) since there may have been 100 ספק נזיר כור
- IV משנה if the object of the condition of the vow(s) was a כי (a type of wild gazelle that has ambiguous חיה/בהמה identity)
 - a מיה if that's a מיר
 - b מיה if that's not a חיה
 - c נזיר if that's a בהמה
 - d נזיר if that's not a בהמה
 - i נזירים if all of *a-h* are נזירים
 - i ruling: all are נזירים
 - ii *note*: tradition records the number 9 here
 - 1 either: 9 נזירים if more people continued this chain
 - 2 or: 9 נזירויות (for one person)
 - (a) *Meaning*: he took all 6 statements (חיה) not חיה, ההמה neither, both) and then all possible combinations (3 המה, חיה, both/neither) (מאירי)
 - (b) Alternatively: he met a group of 9 as above and accepted their entire total of נזירויות)