

16.2.1

9a (משנה א') → 10a (מן החטים)

ז. כל ימי נזרו מפל אשר יעשה מגפן היין מחרצנים ועד זג לא יאכל: במדבר ז, ד.

הרי עלי מנחה מן השעורין יביא מן החטים  
קמח יביא סלת  
בלא שמן ולבונה יביא עמה שמן ולבונה  
חצי עשרון יביא עשרון שלם  
עשרון ומחצה יביא שנים  
רבי שמעון פוטר שלא התנדב כדרך המתנדבים:  
מנחות יבג.

I 'א' נזירות: משנה א' "a ban from other fruits (e.g. dried dates)

a נזירות – ב"ש – valid

i reason:

1 following ר"מ – a person never utters meaningless words –

2 אין שאלה בניירות → אין שאלה בהקדש, they hold

b נזירות – ב"ה – invalid

i reason:

1 following ר' יוסי – a person's final words define his meaning

2 following ר"ש – a נדר is invalid if formulated in a manner not normally done – שלא כדרך הנודרים –

(a) explanation: this explains why (according to some ראשונים), there isn't even a נדר here

c ר' יהודה ב"ש never considered this to be a valid נזירות, and would only consider it a valid נדר against dried fruits etc. if he added קרבן to the formula

i note: the משנה doesn't follow נתן ר' version of the dispute:

1 version 1: ב"ש maintain that there is both a נדר (against dried dates) and נזירות; ב"ה validate only a נדר

(a) explanation: ב"ש follow ר"מ and ר' יהודה, ב"ה as per ר' יוסי (all above)

2 version 2: ב"ש maintain that there is just a נדר, ב"ה maintain that there is nothing

(a) explanation: ב"ש follow ר' יהודה, ב"ה follow ר"ש

ii testing our analysis: (מנחות יבג:ג) – who is the author?

1 חזקה disputed, and that משנה follows ב"ש

(a) argument: [dates → נזירות]: [barley → מנחה]

2 ד' יוחנן consensus (even ב"ה agree)

(a) argument: case where, when told that barley can't be brought, says that he would've said "wheat"

3 חזקה (commenting on משנה) – only valid if he stated "barley", but not "lentils"

(a) challenge: [lentils → מנחה] should be parallel to [dates → נזירות]

(b) answer חזקה changed his mind about the authorship, since, if it followed ב"ש, it would've presented the more unusual declaration – "lentils" – as valid.

(i) Rather: he understands our משנה in accord with ר' יהודה and ב"ש only validate if he used a proper formula (קרבן) → in מנחות, only valid if he mentions an item that could go on the מזבח (e.g. barley)

4 ד' יוחנן even "lentils" is a valid declaration

(a) challenge: ר' יוחנן stated that our משנה is case where he recants based on the new information

(b) answer: he is responding to חזקה; no need to change his mind about the authorship of the משנה. Perhaps "lentils" weren't mentioned because that is a more obviously valid declaration, since it couldn't have been valid; but סד"א that "barley" would mean that either he could bring barley (as in מנחת העמר/מנחת סוטה), otherwise it isn't valid – קמ"ל