

15.2.4

17a (משנה ג) → 18a (בבת אחת)

1. דָּבַר אֶל בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם אִישׁ או אִשָּׁה כִּי יִפְלֵא לְנֹדַר נֹדֵר נְזִיר לְהַזִּיר לֵה': בַּמְדַּבֵּר ג, ב
2. לֹא תִשָּׂא אֶת שֵׁם ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְשׂוּא כִּי לֹא יִנְקָה ה' אֶת אִשְׁרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת שְׁמוֹ לְשׂוּא: שְׁמוֹת כ, ו

- I נדרים ושבועות further distinctions between משנה ג'
- a Nested נדרים are possible; nested שבועות are impossible
- i Example: "הריני נזיר" x 2 – if he eats grapes (e.g.), he is לוקה twice; "שבועה שלא אוכל" x2 and he ate- לוקה once
- II Dispute: הוּנָא vs. שְׂמוּאֵל whether nested נדרים are valid even if they have complete time overlap (היום, היום)
- a דב הוּנָא: only if there is a partial overlap; since the 2nd נדר has an independent time-frame within which to be valid, that gives it validity throughout the entire time-frame
- b שְׂמוּאֵל: even if there is a total overlap
- i challenges to דב הוּנָא:
- 1 our משנה – should state that nested נדרים only work if there is only partial overlap (קשיא)
 - 2 our משנה – equates nested שבועות (invalid) with nested נדרים (valid)
 - (a) circumstance: שבועות – won't eat figs, won't eat figs
 - (b) parallel: total time overlap in the נדרים – valid!
 - (c) Defense: case in our משנה is only partial overlap: "won't eat figs", "won't eat figs and grapes"
 - (i) Block: רבה ruled that such a case of sequential שבועות is valid
 1. explication: if 1st oath is "figs" and 2nd is "figs & grapes" and then he is released from 1st and eats grapes, that's considered עוור חצי (2nd oath is figs **and** grapes) and no חיוב
 2. defense: דב הוּנָא doesn't concur with רבה
 - 3 Ruling: if he took 2 נזירות and designated קרבן for the 1st, then was released from 1st, קרבנות count for 2nd
 - (a) Must be: that the נזירות had total overlap, else how could 2nd count for 1st (there are remaining days)
 - (b) Defense: case was either:
 - (i) With partial overlap, and days count towards the total, but he must complete the new total OR
 - (ii) He took both simultaneously
 - 4 (רב המנונא) – v. 1 teaches that נזירות חלה על הנזירות in spite of it being less severe than שבועות
 - (a) Note: diminished severity – regarding שבועת שוא the text states: לא ינקה (v. 2)
 - (b) Observation: must be total overlap, else no need for a verse
 - (c) Defense: case where the two נזירות were taken simultaneously
- III Comment on last clause – nested שבועות only generate one חיוב
- a Note (רבא): if he was released from the 1st (via חכם), the 2nd takes effect
- i Support: language of משנה – instead of stating "it is only 1", it states "he is only חיוב for one"
- ii Alternative reading: careful read of משנה implies that the 2nd שבועה is potentially active – for רבא's ruling
- 1 Attempted support: ruling about 2 נזירות
 - 2 Rejection: case could be where the 2 were taken simultaneously