

29.12.3

102b (משנה ב) → 103b (אף בגמר דבריו אדם מתמים)

1. מוצא שפתיך תשמר ועשית כאשר נדרת לה' אלהיך נדבה אשר דברת בפיו: דברים כג, כד

- I נדר of variations of מנחות and the consequences of inexact fulfillment
- a If: he said **עלי** **מחבת** and brought in a deep-pan or vice-versa – קרבן is valid (as נדבה) and he still owes his נדר
- i But if: he said **מחבת** **הרי זו** and brought in a deep-pan (or vice-versa) – it is invalid
- b If: he said **עלי** to bring 2 עשרונות in 1 vessel and he brought in 2 (or vice-versa) – valid and he still owes his נדר
- i But if: he said **אלו** to bring in 1 vessel and he brought in 2 (or vice-versa) – it is invalid
- c However: if he said **עלי** to bring in 1 and he brought in 2 and they reminded him of his נדר
- i If: he offered it in 1 – valid; if he offered it in 2 – invalid
- d And: if he said **עלי** to bring in 2 and he brought in 1 and they reminded him of his נדר
- i If: he offered it in 2 – valid; if he offered it in 1, it is akin to 2 מנחות which became mixed up
- 1 Application: if he can take קומץ from each one separately, valid (per ג:ג)
- 2 Note: same applies to 2nd case in [b [i]] above
- e **א** disagrees in all “עלי” cases and maintains that he has fulfilled his נדר (קובע כלי is not retrieved)
- i Challenge (**אביי**): **אביי** teaches that כלי שרת are not מקדש (can be retrieved)
- 1 Answer: they are not מקדש for קרבן, but enough for פסול
- ii Note (**אביי** - also **יוחנן**): only invalid if he determined כלי at point of נדר, not at designation – per v. 1 – כאשר נדרת
- II Justification of clauses:
- a If: we only learned about מחבת/מרחשבת, wouldn't think to invalidate 1/2, as either way it was מחבת (e.g.)
- b And if: we only learned about commitment to bring in 1 and he divided into 2 – because he made a smaller קרבן
- c But: where he made it larger (2 to 1) – we would think that he has fulfilled his נדר – קמ"ל
- III auto-correction for insufficient נדרים
- a If: he committed to bring מנחה of barley – he is obligated to bring from wheat
- b If: he committed to bring from coarse flour (קמח), he is obligated to bring fine flour (סלת)
- c If: he committed to bring without oil/לבונה, he is obligated to bring a מנחה with both of them
- d If: he committed to bring ½ עשרון, he is obligated to bring full עשרון
- e If: he committed to bring 1.5 עשרון, he is obligated to bring 2 full עשרונות
- i Dissent: **ר"ש** exempts (in all these cases) as his נדר didn't follow the usual form of נדרים
- IV Attribution and parameters:
- a חזקיה: our משנה follows ב"ש (נזיר ב:א) – always committed by first utterance (said “מנחה” – obligated properly)
- b **ד' יוחנן**: our משנה could even follow ב"ה (ibid) – case where he indicated that he wanted to bring properly
- c חזקיה: only applies if he said “barley”, not “lentils”
- i Challenge: חזקיה attributed our משנה to ב"ש – if we are ignoring anything after “מנחה”, what difference?
- ii Answer: חזקיה recanted, since משנה only listed שעורים; had it been per ב"ש, would have listed עדשים
- d **ד' יוחנן**: even if he said “lentils”
- i Challenge: **ר"י** set משנה per ב"ה, who assume an error – but no one mistakes lentils for wheat
- ii Answer: he was responding to חזקיה, telling him not to recant his position
- 1 Explanation: reason the משנה didn't list “lentils” is that is a more obvious obligation,
(a) But even: “barley”, which might have been interpreted as a mistake, we still apply לשון ראשון תפוס
- e זעירי: rulings only apply if he said the word “מנחה”, but if he attached them and said “מנחת שעורים” – no obligation
- i Challenge (**רבא לר"נ**, who repeated it): קמח, w/o oil and לבונה, ½ עשרון – aren't these stated without “מנחה”?
- 1 Answer: in all cases, he stated “מנחה” (e.g. **הרי עלי מנחה מן הקמח**)
- 2 Challenge: in case of 1.5 עשרון, when he said מנחה עשרון – that's his obligation; the חצי עשרון should be ignored
(a) Answer: he said מנחה עשרון ועשרון חצי (i.e. he stated the ½ first, then the full עשרון)
(b) Explanation: once he stated מנחה, he is obligated to bring an עשרון, the latter “עשרון” raises it to 2 עשרונות
- ii Question: why does **ר"ש** exempt “since he didn't use the usual formula”?
- 1 Clairification: he said “מנחה” – if we heed his first word(s), he followed the usual formula
- 2 Answer: **ר"ש** follows יוסי **ר' יוסי** approach to נדרים – we take into account all of words - even דברייו