

או כמנחת סוטה – תקדוש, אי לא – לא. קא משמע לן דמייתי מן החיטים.

**מתני' אמר:** "אמרה פרה זו הריני נזירה אם עומדת אני." "אומר הדלת הזה הריני נזירה אם נפתח אני." בית שמאי אומרים: נזיר, ובית הלל אומרים: אינו נזיר. אמר רבי יהודה: אף כשאמרו בית שמאי לא אומרים אלא באומר "הרי פרה זו עלי קרבן אם עומדת היא".

**גמ' פרה מי קא מישתעי?** אמר רמי בר חמא: הכא במאי עסקינן – גזון שהייתה פרה רבוצה לפניו, ואמר: כסבורה פרה זו אינה עומדת – הריני נזיר מבשרה אם עמדה מאליה. ועמדה מאליה. והלכו בית שמאי לשיטתן, ובית הלל לשיטתן.

בית שמאי דאמרי: "מן הגרורות ומן הדבילה" הוי נזיר – הכא נמי, כי אמר "מבשרה" – הוי נזיר. ובית הלל אומרים: לא הוי נזיר.

והא אמרוה בית שמאי תדא זמנא. אמר רבא: תרתמי תלת. וכן תני רבי חייא תרתמי תלת. וכן אמר רבי אושעיא תרתמי תלת.

וצריכי; דאי איתמר בהא, גרורות ודבילה – התם הוא דאמרי בית שמאי הוי נזיר, משום דמיחלפן בענבים. אבל בשר בענבים – לא מיחלף. ואי איתמר בשר – הכא הוא דאמרי בית שמאי הוי נזיר בבשרא ותמרא, אבל גרורות ודבילה – לא, קא משמע לן.

or like the meal-offering of a *sota*,<sup>8</sup> both of which are made of barley, it should become consecrated, and if it is not possible to volunteer a meal-offering from barley, it should not be a meal-offering at all. The mishna therefore teaches us that one nevertheless brings a meal-offering made from wheat. Rabbi Yohanan holds that the difficulty raised by Hizkiyya against his own explanation is inconclusive, and he need not have retracted it.

**MISHNA** If one said: This cow said:<sup>h</sup> I am hereby a nazirite if I stand up; or if he said: This door says: I am hereby a nazirite if I am opened, Beit Shammai say he is a nazirite, and Beit Hillel say he is not a nazirite. Rabbi Yehuda said:<sup>n</sup> Even when Beit Shammai say that the vow is effective, they say so only with regard to one who said: This cow is hereby forbidden to me as an offering if it stands up. In that case it is as if he took a vow that the cow is forbidden. However, Beit Shammai concede that although the vow takes effect, it is not a vow of naziriteship.

**GEMARA** The Gemara asks: Does a cow speak? What is the meaning of the statement: A cow said: I am hereby a nazirite? Rami bar Hama said: With what are we dealing here? We are dealing with a case where there was a prone cow before him, and he tried, without success, to cause it to stand, and he said: This cow thinks it will not stand; I am hereby a nazirite and therefore will refrain from its flesh if it stands of its own accord, and in fact it stood of its own accord. Beit Shammai follow their standard approach and Beit Hillel follow their standard approach.

The Gemara explains: Beit Shammai, who say that one who vows to be a nazirite and therefore will refrain from dried figs and from cakes of dried figs is a nazirite, say that here too, when he says: I am hereby a nazirite and therefore will refrain from its flesh, is a nazirite. Since one does not utter a statement for naught, he is held to the first part of his statement: I am hereby a nazirite, and the words: And therefore will refrain from its flesh, are disregarded. And Beit Hillel say: He is not a nazirite.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: But if Rami bar Hama is correct, didn't Beit Shammai already say this *halakha* one time? According to Rami bar Hama's explanation, this mishna and the previous one differ only with regard to the examples provided, but the principle is identical. Rava said: It is normal for the Sages to cite two or three examples from different cases that offer novel perspectives, although they essentially reflect the same principle. And Rabbi Hiyya also taught two or three examples with regard to this same issue. And Rabbi Oshaya also said two or three examples.

And all these cases are necessary, as, if it were stated only that he is a nazirite in this case of dried figs and cakes of dried figs, it could have been said that it is only there that Beit Shammai say he is a nazirite, since figs are confused with grapes, and it is reasonable to assume that he had grapes in mind. But meat is certainly not confused with grapes, and it could be that in the case of the mishna he is not a nazirite even according to Beit Shammai. And if it were stated only that he is a nazirite where he vowed that meat was forbidden to him, it could have been said that it is here that Beit Shammai say he is a nazirite because he was referring to the often-paired meat and wine, and it is reasonable to assume that he might have had wine in mind. But dried figs and cakes of dried figs are not paired with wine, so he should not be a nazirite. To counter that claim, the mishna teaches us that he is a nazirite in both cases.

BACKGROUND

Meal-offering of a *sota* – מנחת סוטה: This is the meal-offering brought by a suspected adulteress [*sota*] (Numbers 5:11–31). A suspected adulteress, whose husband brings her to the Temple to undergo the biblical procedure to test her faithfulness to him, is required to bring a meal-offering of barley flour, unlike most meal-offerings, which are brought from wheat flour. No oil or incense is added to it (Numbers 5:15). A handful of flour is removed from this offering, and the remainder of it is eaten by the priests (Numbers 5:25–26).

HALAKHA

This cow said, etc. – אמרה פרה זו וכו' – Some authorities cite this mishna as proof that if one makes his vow dependent on an event that he does not expect to occur, as is the case here, it still is a vow, despite the fact that this is considered a stipulation of surety (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 562:13 and *Hoshen Mishpat* 207:19; see *Beur HaGra* there).

NOTES

Rabbi Yehuda said, etc. – אמר רבי יהודה וכו' – The Commentary on *Nazir* writes on the next page that Rabbi Yehuda certainly agrees with regard to the case of: The door said, that it cannot be comparing a door to an offering, since a door cannot be described in terms of an offering. However, Rabeinu Todros writes that in that case one might render the wood of a door forbidden to himself by a vow, in the manner of a standard vow of prohibition, where an item is rendered forbidden by one comparing the item to an offering.



לְטַעַמֵיהוּ דְבֵית שְׁמַאי קְאָמְרִי: לְדִידָן – אֲפִילוּ לֹא קָמַת נְמִי לֹא הָיָה נָזִיר, לְדִידְכוּ דְאָמְרֵיתוּ הָיָה נָזִיר – אֹדְדוּ לָן מִיֵּהָת דְתוֹרָפִיהּ דְהָדִין גְּבָרָא מְשׁוּם דְרַבֵּינָא, וְהָא קָמַת. וְבֵית שְׁמַאי: לֹא תוֹרָפִיהּ דְהָאִי גְּבָרָא מְשׁוּם אֹקְמָה בִידֵיהּ הוּא – וְהָא לֹא אֹקְמָה.

The Gemara answers: They stated their opinion in accordance with the reasoning of Beit Shammai: According to our opinion, even if the cow does not stand he is also not a nazirite, since naziriteship takes effect only if he vowed that products of the vine are forbidden to him. However, according to your reasoning that you say he is a nazirite, in any event concede to us that this man's intention is based upon the fact that the cow was prone, and it has stood, so the naziriteship should not take effect. And Beit Shammai hold: Isn't this man's intention based upon him having it stand by his own hand, and he did not have it stand? Since his condition was not fulfilled, the naziriteship does not take effect.

Perek II  
Daf 11 Amud a

**מתני'** מִזְגוּ לוֹ אֶת הַכּוֹס, וְאָמַר "הֲרִינִי נָזִיר מִמֶּנּוּ" – הֲרִי זֶה נָזִיר. מַעֲשֵׂה בְאִשָּׁה אַחַת שֶׁהִיְתָה שׁוֹבְרָה, וּמִזְגוּ לָהּ אֶת הַכּוֹס, וְאָמְרָה "הֲרִינִי נָזִירָה מִמֶּנּוּ". אָמְרוּ חֲכָמִים: לֹא נִתְבַּוְּנָה זֶה אֶלָּא לומר "הֲרִי הוּא עָלַי קִרְבָּן".

**MISHNA** If they poured one a cup<sup>H</sup> of wine and he said: I am hereby a nazirite and therefore will refrain from it, he is a full-fledged nazirite who must observe all the *halakhot* of naziriteship. An incident occurred with regard to a certain woman who was intoxicated<sup>N</sup> from wine, and they poured a cup for her and she said: I am hereby a nazirite and therefore will refrain from it. The Sages said: This woman did not intend to accept naziriteship but rather, meant to say: It is hereby forbidden to me as an offering. She vowed against deriving benefit from that cup alone, since she did not want to drink any more.

**גמ'** מַעֲשֵׂה לְסִתּוֹרָ? אִמְרַת רִישָׁא "הֲרִי זֶה נָזִיר". וְהָדָר תִּנִּי "מַעֲשֵׂה בְאִשָּׁה אַחַת". אֲלֵמָא בְהָאִי הוּא דְאָסוּר, הָא יִינָא אַחֲרִינָא – שְׂרִי!

**GEMARA** The Gemara asks: Was an incident cited to contradict the previous ruling? You said in the first clause of the mishna that if one said that he is hereby a nazirite and therefore will refrain from a cup that was poured for him, then he is a nazirite. And the *tanna* then teaches: An incident occurred with regard to a certain woman who said: I am hereby a nazirite and therefore will refrain from it, which the Sages interpreted as a vow rendering the cup forbidden to her like an offering. Apparently it is only with regard to this cup of wine that is forbidden to her; consequently, any other wine is permitted, and she is not a nazirite.

חֲסוּרֵי מִיַּחֲסָרָא וְהָכִי קָתַנּוּ: מִזְגוּ לוֹ אֶת הַכּוֹס וְאָמַר "הֲרִינִי נָזִיר מִמֶּנּוּ" – הֲרִי זֶה נָזִיר. וְאִם שׁוֹבֵר הוּא, וְאָמַר "הֲרִינִי נָזִיר מִמֶּנּוּ" – אֵינּוּ נָזִיר; מֵאִי טַעַמָּא – כִּמְאֵן דְאָמַר "הֲרִי עָלַי קִרְבָּן" הוּא. וְכִי תַעֲמָא: לִימָא הָכִי – סָבַר: מִיִּיתֵין לִי אַחֲרִינָא וּמַצְעֵרֵן לִי, אִימָא לְהוּ הָא מִיִּלְתָּא דְפְסִיקָא לְהוּ; וּמַעֲשֵׂה נְמִי בְאִשָּׁה אַחַת.

The Gemara answers: The mishna is incomplete and is teaching the following: If they poured a cup of wine for one and he said: I am hereby a nazirite and therefore will refrain from it, he is a nazirite. And if he is intoxicated and they pour a cup of wine for him and he said: I am hereby a nazirite and therefore will refrain from it, he is not a nazirite. What is the reason for this? He is considered to be like one who said: This cup is forbidden to me like an offering. The Gemara asks: And if you would say that this was his meaning, let him say so explicitly; why would he say: I am hereby a nazirite and therefore will refrain from it? The reason is because he maintains: If I specify this cup, they will bring me another<sup>N</sup> cup and aggravate me with it. It is better that I say to them this statement, which is definitive to them, and they will understand that I do not want to drink any more wine. The mishna continues: And an incident also occurred with regard to a certain woman who was intoxicated<sup>H</sup> and took this vow, and the Sages explained her statement accordingly.

**מתני'** "הֲרִינִי נָזִיר עַל מְנַת שְׂאֵהָ שׁוֹתָה" וְיִינִי וּמִיַּשְׂמָא לְמַתִּים" – הֲרִי זֶה נָזִיר, וְאָסוּר בְּכֹלָן.

**MISHNA** If one says: I am hereby a nazirite on the condition that I will be allowed to drink<sup>H</sup> wine and may become ritually impure from corpses, i.e., he wishes to be a nazirite only with respect to the growth of his hair, he is a full-fledged nazirite and is prohibited from engaging in all of the behaviors forbidden to a nazirite, including consuming products of the vine and contracting impurity from a corpse.

HALAKHA

מִזְגוּ לוֹ אֶת הַכּוֹס – If they poured one a cup, etc. – ר"כ: If a cup of wine was poured for an individual and he said: I am hereby a nazirite and therefore will abstain from it, he is a nazirite (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 1:11).

And an incident also occurred with regard to a certain woman – ר"מ: מעשה נמי באשה אחת: If one was depressed or a mourner, and when his friends attempted to persuade him to drink to relieve his misery he said: I am hereby a nazirite and therefore will abstain from it, only that cup is forbidden to him, and he is not a nazirite. Similarly, if one was intoxicated and, when a cup of wine was poured for him, said: I am hereby a nazirite and therefore will abstain from it, only that cup is forbidden to him. If he was completely intoxicated, like Lot, his statement is entirely disregarded (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 1:11–12).

I am hereby a nazirite on the condition that I will drink, etc. – ר"י: הרני נזיר על מנת שאהא שותה וכו': If one said: I am hereby a nazirite on the condition that I may drink wine, or: That I may become impure from corpses, he is a nazirite, and all of the prohibitions of naziriteship apply to him, since he cannot stipulate counter to what is written in the Torah (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 1:13).

NOTES

Who was intoxicated [*shikkora*] – שְׁהִיְתָה שׁוֹבְרָה: A variant version of the text reads: *Shikolet*, instead of: *Shikkora*, meaning that she did not want to drink wine because she was bereaved [*shekula*]. This reading is followed in the Rambam's Commentary on the Mishna (see Rav Kapah's version), and the Rambam similarly rules in the *Mishne Torah* that if one was in mourning or otherwise in despair, and upon being offered wine to assuage his pain said: I am hereby a nazirite and therefore will abstain from it, he meant to render only this cup forbidden to himself, and he is not a nazirite.

They will bring me another – מִיִּיתֵין לִי אַחֲרִינָא: The Rosh and other commentaries explain that it is common for people to pressure an intoxicated person to drink more. This person therefore forces them to stop offering him more to drink. Conversely, a sober person who is not being pressured by anyone to drink would state that he is a nazirite only if he actually wanted to be a nazirite. If he wanted to vow that only the cup before him is forbidden to him, he would word his statement in the following manner: It is forbidden to me like an offering.