



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Nazir Daf Tes

PEREK HAREINI NAZIR -- PEREK SHEINI

MISHNA

- If a person says "I am hereby a nazir from dried figs" or "pressed figs", **B"S** say he becomes a full nazir (and does not become assur to have figs), and **B"H** say he does not become a nazir (the statement has no meaning and he remains mutar in everything). **R' Yehuda** says that **B"S** actually said it is only effective when he said that these items should be assur to him like a korbon (in which case he would not become a nazir, but would become assur to eat the figs).

GEMARA

- **Q:** How could **B"S** say he becomes a nazir, when a nazir is about being assur to grape products, not figs!? **A:** **B"S** hold like **R' Meir**, who says that a person does not make a meaningless statement. Therefore, we must impute a meaning to his seemingly nonsensical statement. We do so by saying that he meant to accept nezirus, and the reference to figs was meaningless. **B"H** hold like **R' Yose**, who says that we must take the person's entire statement into account. Therefore, since he said he will be a nazir *from figs*, no neder was made.
 - **Q:** Even according to **B"S** we must say that the second part of his statement has some meaning, and if so it should serve to release him from the acceptance of nezirus he had previously made!? **A:** **B"S** hold that the part of his statement "I am hereby a nazir" makes him a nazir. When he then says "from figs", we view it as an attempt to annul the neder of nezirus. However, **B"S** hold that one cannot annul a neder of hekdesch, and therefore can also not annul a neder of nezirus (the pasuk refers to the nazir as "kadosh"), and therefore this second part of his statement has no meaning. **B"H** hold like **R' Shimon**, who says that when a person promises to bring a korbon that he may not bring (e.g. he promises to bring a mincha of barley flour, which is not something that an individual may bring), he is not obligated to bring any korbon at all (the **T"K** there argues and says that he must bring a regular Korbon Mincha). Here too, **B"H** say that since he promised to be a nazir for figs, he is not obligated in any kind of nezirus.
 - Our Mishna does not follow **R' Nossan** in a Braisa, who said that the machlokes is that **B"S** say the person is either subject to nezirus or to a neder not to eat figs (this would mean that they follow **R' Meir** as explained above, and **R' Yehuda** in the Mishna), and **B"H** hold that that he may be subject to a neder on figs (if that was his intent, and they therefore follow **R' Yose**, who says that we follow a person's later words).
 - Another version of this Braisa says that **R' Nossan** says that **B"S** say he is subject to a neder on the figs, and not to nezirus (they follow **R' Yehuda**), whereas **B"H** say he is subject to neither (they follow **R' Shimon**).
 - **Q:** We mentioned above the machlokes between **R' Shimon** and the **T"K** in a Mishna. Who is the shitah (i.e. the **T"K**) who holds that when one promises to bring a Korbon Mincha of barley flour (or states any other irregularities of a typical Korbon Mincha), we say he must bring one of wheat flour (with all the regular requirements of a Korbon Mincha)? **A:** **Chizkiyah** said, it is the view of **B"S** in our Mishna. They say the person is subject to nezirus even though there is no such thing as nezirus from figs. The same would be that they would require the person to bring a regular Korbon Mincha, even though there is no such thing as a Mincha of barley. **R' Yochanan** said that it may even follow the view of **B"H**, because the Mishna there is discussing a case where the person

later said “had I known that one may not bring a Mincha from barley, I would have promised to bring a Mincha of wheat”.

- **Chizkiyah** said, the **T”K** only requires him to bring a Mincha of wheat when he promised to bring a Mincha of barley. However, had he promised to bring a Mincha of lentils, he would not be required to bring any Mincha at all.
 - **Q: Chizkiyah** said the **T”K** is the view of **B”S**. If so, we should say that lentils is as “foreign” to a Mincha as figs are “foreign” to a nazir, and yet **B”S** say that he becomes a nazir (and he should therefore also be obligated to a Mincha in this case)!? **A: Chizkiyah** retracted his view that the **T”K** is **B”S**. **Rava** explained, he retracted this view, because if the **T”K** was actually **B”S**, the Mishna should have given the example of where the person promised to bring a Mincha of lentils, not barley.
 - **Chizkiyah** held that the **T”K** follows the view of **B”S** according to **R’ Yehuda**. The essence of that understanding is that since “nazir” can mean a simple separation, or promise, we can understand the statement of being a nazir from figs as meaning that he is making a promise not to eat figs. Similarly, since there is a Mincha brought from barley (by the tzibbur), we can understand his statement to mean that he will bring a regular Korbon Mincha. However, if he were to say that he will bring a Mincha of lentils, since that is *never* brought, he would not be obligated to bring any Mincha. This is the reason the Mishna only gave the example of a Mincha of barley, and not of lentils.
 - **R’ Yochanan** said that the **T”K**, who even follows **B”H**, holds that the person would even be chayuv to bring a regular Mincha if he promised to bring a Korbon Mincha of lentils.
 - **Q: R’ Yochanan** holds that we obligate someone for something other than what he promised only if he can claim that he made a mistake in thinking that what he promised is a valid form of neder. However, no one can claim that he thought a Mincha can be brought from lentils, so how could he hold that he would be chayuv to bring a Mincha!? **A: R’ Yochanan** was saying to **Chizkiyah**, you retracted your view based on the fact that the Mishna does not give the case of where the person promised to bring a Mincha of lentils. It may be that the Mishna didn’t give that case because that is the *less* novel case. It is less novel to say that after promising to bring a Mincha, if the person adds that it should be from lentils, we understand him as trying to reverse his Mincha obligation and therefore we don’t take any significance with those words. However, it is more novel to say that after saying he would bring a Mincha, and then adding it should be of barley, it may be that he actually only wants to bring a Mincha if it can be brought of barley, like the Omer and the Sotah, and if not, the obligation should not exist. The Mishna therefore teaches that even in that case we say he is obligated to bring a Mincha of wheat.