

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, כז

- I נדר of variations of מנחות and the consequences of inexact fulfillment
- a If: he said **עלי** **הרי** 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 **הרי** **זו** **במחבת** 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** **הרי** 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 **ברייתא** disagrees in all “עלי” cases and maintains that he has fulfilled his נדר (קובע כלי is not קובע)
 i Challenge (**אביי**): **ברייתא** 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 **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 **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"ג**, 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. 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's approach to נדרים – נדרים – we take into account all of words - even דבריו סוף