

**מתני'** "הריני נזיר מן הגזירות ומן הדבילה". בית שמאי אומרים: נזיר, ובית הלל אומרים: אינו נזיר. אמר רבי יהודה: אף כשאמר בית שמאי – לא אמרו אלא באומר "הריני עלי קרבן".

**גמ'** "הריני נזיר מן הגזירות ומן הדבילה". בית שמאי אומרים: נזיר. ואמאי? "מכל אשר יעשה מגפן היין" אמר רחמנא! בית שמאי סברי לה כרבי מאיר, דאמר: אין אדם מוציא דבריו לבטלה.

ובית הלל סברי לה כרבי יוסי, דאמר: בגמר דבריו אדם נתפס. והאי נדר ופתחו עמו הוא.

ובית שמאי נמי, נדר ופתחו עמו הוא.

**MISHNA** If one says: I am hereby a nazirite and therefore will refrain from dried figs<sup>H</sup> and from cakes of dried figs, Beit Shammai say: His statement renders him a full-fledged nazirite, and his addition: From dried figs, is insignificant, as this fruit is not included in the prohibitions of a nazirite, which include only products of the grapevine. **And Beit Hillel say: He is not a nazirite**, since he did not accept naziriteship upon himself. **Rabbi Yehuda said: Even when Beit Shammai said that this vow takes effect, they said that only in a case where one said that he meant: They are hereby forbidden to me<sup>N</sup> as an offering.** In that case it is as though he took a vow rendering the figs forbidden to him. However, Beit Shammai concede that although the vow takes effect, it is not a vow of naziriteship.

**GEMARA** It is stated in the mishna that if one says: I am hereby a nazirite and therefore will refrain from dried figs and from cakes of dried figs, Beit Shammai say: He is a nazirite. The Gemara asks: **But why? The Merciful One states in the Torah in the passage dealing with naziriteship: "From anything that is made of the grapevine... he shall not eat"** (Numbers 6:4). In naziriteship, only the fruit of the vine is prohibited. The Gemara answers: **Beit Shammai hold in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, who says: A person does not utter a statement for naught.** In other words, if one utters a statement that cannot be fulfilled as stated, his statement is interpreted in a manner that renders it relevant. Here too, Beit Shammai say that he misspoke and actually intended to take a vow of naziriteship.

**And Beit Hillel hold in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, who says: A person is also held accountable for the conclusion of his statement.** If one states two irreconcilable clauses, e.g., this animal is a substitute for a burnt-offering, a substitute for a peace-offering; the second clause is not disregarded, and the animal assumes both statuses. **And this is a vow with its inherent opening, i.e., reason for dissolution.** Although he said: I am hereby a nazirite, by adding the words: From dried figs and from cakes of dried figs, he indicated that his intention was that the naziriteship would not take effect.

The Gemara asks: **And according to Beit Shammai too,<sup>N</sup> it is a vow with its inherent opening,** and since they certainly agree that a vow of this kind does not take effect, why do they hold that this vow takes effect?

HALAKHA

הריני נזיר – I am hereby a nazirite from dried figs, etc. – מן הגזירות וכו': The Rambam writes that if one says: I am hereby a nazirite and therefore will refrain from dried figs, or: From cakes of dried figs, or any statement of this kind, it is prohibited for him to derive benefit from them due to his vow, but he is not rendered a nazirite. This ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel. The Ra'avad disagrees with the Rambam, claiming that the Gemara indicates that according to the opinion of Beit Hillel one is not prohibited from deriving benefit even from dried figs. *Tosefot Yom Tov* and *Likkutei Halakhot* offer additional explanations of this matter (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 1:10).

NOTES

In a case where one said: They are hereby forbidden to me, etc. – באומר הריני עלי וכו' – Many commentaries (Rabbeinu Peretz, citing Rosh; Rid) explain that although the first term he used explicitly referred to naziriteship, he actually intended to state a standard vow of prohibition. The Rid even has a variant reading: Like one who said, instead of: In a case of one who said. *Tosafot* explain that although the word nazirite has a specific meaning, it can refer to separation in general, and therefore it can be used as an expression of a vow. An alternative approach, cited by Rabbeinu Peretz and Rabbeinu Azriel, is that he was actually asked about his intention afterward, and he clarified that he intended to vow that dried figs were forbidden to him. The Commentary on *Nazir*, according to some later authorities, and Rabbi Avraham min HaHar claim that the case under discussion is one in which one explicitly stated: They are hereby forbidden to me like an offering, in addition to his initial statement of: I am hereby a nazirite and therefore will refrain from dried figs.

An entirely different approach is presented in the Rambam's Commentary on the Mishna. He contends that even according to Rabbi Yehuda, Beit Shammai hold that the individual becomes a nazirite, since the usage of the word: Offering, indicates that he wishes to be a nazirite, as offerings are an integral part of naziriteship. If he does not mention an offering, his words are meaningless even according to Beit Shammai.

**ובית שמאי נמי –** The Rid points out that the logic of this claim is in fact the opposite of that which was previously attributed to Beit Shammai, as earlier the Gemara explained that the second statement is not to be understood as a clarification of the first. He therefore explains that the Gemara is suggesting an alternative formulation, whose initial assumption is that this is a vow with its inherent opening to broach dissolution, and then explains that Beit Shammai holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir. See *Tosafot* for a different explanation.

אָלֵא, בֵּית שְׁמַאי סְבְרֵי לֵה כְּרַבֵּי מְאִיר, דְּאָמַר: אֵין אָדָם מוֹצִיא דְבָרָיו לְבִטּוּלָה. וְכִינּוּ דְאָמַר "הֲרִינִי נָזִיר" – הָוָה לִיֵּה נָזִיר, כִּי קָאָמַר "מִן הַגְּרוּגָרוֹת וּמִן הַדְּבִילָה" – לְאִיתְשׁוּלֵי הוּא דְקָאָתִי. וּבֵית שְׁמַאי לְטַעֲמֵיהוּ, דְאָמְרִי: אֵין שְׂאֵלָה בְּהַקְדָּשׁ. וְכִינּוּ דְאֵין שְׂאֵלָה בְּהַקְדָּשׁ – אֵין שְׂאֵלָה בְּנִזְרוּת.

וּבֵית הִלֵּל סְבְרֵי כְּרַבֵּי שְׁמַעוֹן, דְּתַנּוּ: וְרַבֵּי שְׁמַעוֹן פּוֹטֵר, שְׂלֵא הִתְנַדֵּב כְּדֹרְךְ הַמִּתְנַדְּבִים.

The Gemara explains the dispute: **Rather, Beit Shammai hold in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, who said: A person does not utter a statement for naught, and once he said: I am hereby a nazirite, he is immediately rendered a nazirite. When he then says: And therefore I will refrain from dried figs and from cakes of dried figs, he is coming to request<sup>N</sup>** that a halakhic authority dissolve his vow, as he regrets having taken the vow and is now seeking to dissolve it. **And Beit Shammai follow their standard line of reasoning, as they say: One cannot request that a halakhic authority dissolve a vow of consecrated property,<sup>H</sup>** which one can do for vows of prohibition. **And since one cannot request that a halakhic authority dissolve a vow of consecrated property, likewise one cannot request that a halakhic authority dissolve a vow of naziriteship,<sup>NH</sup>** as the legal status of a vow of naziriteship is like that of a vow of consecrated property in this regard.

**And Beit Hillel hold in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon,<sup>N</sup> as we learned in a mishna (Menahot 103a):** If one vows to bring a meal-offering from barley, since voluntary meal-offerings are brought only from wheat, the Rabbis say: He must bring a meal-offering from wheat, **and Rabbi Shimon exempts him entirely, as he did not donate in the manner typical of donors.** Since he donated an offering that cannot be sacrificed, his vow is meaningless. Here too, since he took a vow of naziriteship stating that he therefore will refrain from dried figs rather than from wine, his statement is meaningless.

**NOTES**

He is coming to request – לְאִיתְשׁוּלֵי הוּא דְקָאָתִי: The early commentaries point out that the wording here is imprecise, as he has not actually appeared before a halakhic authority to request the dissolution of his vow. Rather, it means that he regrets taking the vow, and this is comparable to one who goes to request dissolution (*Tosafot*).

One cannot request of a halakhic authority to dissolve a vow of naziriteship – אֵין שְׂאֵלָה בְּנִזְרוּת – The Commentary on *Nazir* explains that naziriteship is compared to consecration in the verse: "He shall be holy" (Numbers 6:5), as the same Hebrew word, *kadosh*, is used for both consecration and the holiness of a nazirite. *Tosafot* and other early commentaries offer similar explanations. Maharit Algazi and the Netziv suggest that a vow of naziriteship is considered like consecration because it includes the offerings brought by the nazirite upon the completion of his term. One who seeks to have his naziriteship dissolved is effectively asking for the dissolution of the requirement to bring these offerings. The language of the Gemara offers some support for this interpretation.

And Beit Hillel hold in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon – וּבֵית הִלֵּל סְבְרֵי כְּרַבֵּי שְׁמַעוֹן – Beit Hillel do not even address the issue of whether one can rescind consecrated property because they hold that one who does not formulate his statement properly has not consecrated the item at all (*Tosafot*). The following question is posed by some early commentaries: Why doesn't the Gemara simply say that according to Beit Hillel, rescinding is possible in the case of consecrated property, as they do in fact hold? On the following page, *Tosafot* answer that this explanation would not account for the fact that in this situation Beit Hillel do not even prohibit one from benefiting from dried figs. Others suggest that the Gemara preferred an explanation that applies even according to the opinion that there is no rescinding of consecrated items (*Shita Mekubbetzet*), or that it wanted to suggest an answer that also suits Rabbi Yehuda's explanation of the opinion of Beit Shammai (Rabbeinu Todros).

**HALAKHA**

Request dissolution of a vow of consecrated property – שְׂאֵלָה בְּהַקְדָּשׁ: The *halakha* is not in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai; rather, one may rescind a donation of consecrated property and dissolve vows of consecration, just as one may dissolve standard vows. However, it is a mitzva to fulfill one's dedications to the Temple, and one should seek to dissolve those vows only in cases of extreme necessity (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nedarim* 4:7, 13:25; *Shulhan Arukh*, *Yoreh De'a* 203:3, 258:1).

Request dissolution of a vow of naziriteship – שְׂאֵלָה בְּנִזְרוּת – One who takes a vow of naziriteship and regrets his vow may request that a halakhic authority dissolve his naziriteship in the same manner as standard vows are dissolved (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 2:1).

מתנתין דלא בי האי תנא. דתנא,  
רבי נתן אומר: בית שמאי אומרים:  
נדור ונויר, ובית הלל אומרים: נדור  
ואין נויר. בית שמאי סברי לה כרבי  
מאיר וכרבי יהודה, ובית הלל סברי  
לה כרבי יוסי.

לישנא אחרנא אמרי לה: רבי נתן  
אומר, בית שמאי אומרים: נדור ואינו  
נויר, ובית הלל אומרים: לא נדור ולא  
נויר. בית שמאי – כרבי יהודה, ובית  
הלל – כרבי שמעון.

תנן התם: האומר "הרי עלי מנחה  
להביא מן השעורים" – יביא מן  
החיתים: "קמח" – יביא סולת:  
"שלא בשמן ולבונה" – יביאנה בשמן  
ולבונה: "חצי עשרון" – יביא עשרון  
שלם: "עשרון ומחצה" – יביא שנים.  
רבי שמעון פוטר, שלא התנדב בדרך  
המתנדבים.

מאן תנא. דכי אמר "הרי עלי מנחה  
מן השעורים" – מביא מן החיתים?  
אמר חזקיה: במחלוקת שנויה, ובית  
שמאי היא. לאו אמרי בית שמאי  
כי אמר "מן הגרוגרות ומן הדבילה"  
הוי נויר – הכי נמי, כי אמר "מן  
השעורים" – מביא מן החיתים.

ורבי יוחנן אמר: אפילו תימא דברי  
הכל, באומר "אילו הייתי יודע שאין  
נודרין כך – לא נדרתי כך אלא כך".

§ The Gemara comments: **The mishna is not in accordance with the opinion of this tanna. As it is taught in a baraita: Rabbi Natan says that if one says: I am hereby a nazirite and therefore will refrain from dried figs, Beit Shammai say: He has rendered dried figs forbidden to himself by a vow, and he is also a nazirite; and Beit Hillel say: He has rendered dried figs forbidden to himself by a vow, but he is not a nazirite.**<sup>h</sup> According to Rabbi Natan, **Beit Shammai hold in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir that a person does not utter statements for naught and that he becomes a nazirite as soon as he says: I am hereby a nazirite; and he explains the opinion of Beit Shammai as Rabbi Yehuda does, i.e., that one in this situation has vowed that dried figs are forbidden to him, since the rest of his statement also has significance. And Beit Hillel hold in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei<sup>n</sup> that one is held to the conclusion of his statement, and he has therefore vowed that dried figs are forbidden to him.**

Some say a different version<sup>n</sup> of the baraita: **Rabbi Natan says that Beit Shammai say: He has rendered dried figs forbidden to himself by a vow and he is not a nazirite; and Beit Hillel say: He has not rendered dried figs forbidden to himself by a vow, and he is not a nazirite.** According to this version, the opinion of **Beit Shammai is as Rabbi Yehuda explained in the mishna, and Beit Hillel hold in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, who maintains that a donation not performed in the manner typical of donors is not a donation.**

§ The Gemara discusses a case mentioned earlier. **We learned in a mishna there (Menahot 103a): With regard to one who says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a meal-offering<sup>b</sup> from barley,<sup>h</sup> since voluntary meal-offerings are made only with wheat he must bring a meal-offering from wheat.** If one vows to bring a meal-offering from flour, since a standard meal-offering is made from fine flour **he must bring one from fine flour.** If one vows to bring a meal-offering without oil and frankincense, **he must bring it with oil and frankincense, in accordance with the halakha.** If one vows to bring a meal-offering with half of a tenth of an ephah of fine flour, **he must bring a meal-offering with a full tenth, since a meal-offering cannot have less than one-tenth of an ephah of flour.** If one vows to bring a meal-offering with a tenth and a half, **he brings two units of a tenth of an ephah in his meal-offering.** Since half of one-tenth of an ephah is the minimum, his vow is increased to two full tenths. **Rabbi Shimon exempts him entirely in all these cases, as he did not donate in the manner typical of donors.**

The Gemara asks: **Who is the tanna who taught that when one said: It is incumbent upon me to bring a meal-offering from barley, he brings a meal-offering from wheat? Hizkiyya said that this halakha is taught as a dispute between tanna'im, and it is the opinion of Beit Shammai.** He explains: **Didn't Beit Shammai say that when one said: I am hereby a nazirite and therefore will refrain from dried figs and from cakes of dried figs, he is a nazirite, indicating that he is held to only the first part of his statement, and the conflicting details are ignored? So too, when he said that he will bring a meal-offering from barley, he brings it from wheat, and the same analysis applies to the other cases listed in this mishna.**

**And Rabbi Yohanan said: You can even say that all, including Beit Hillel, agree with the opinion of the Rabbis of the mishna, as the mishna may be stated with regard to one who later says, to clarify his earlier statement: Had I known that one cannot vow in this manner, that one cannot bring a voluntary meal-offering from barley, I would not have vowed that way, only this way, to bring a meal-offering from wheat.** Mentioning barley was an error on his part rather than a condition, and he actually meant to bring a standard meal-offering. In this case even Beit Hillel, who maintain in the mishna here that there is no vow at all, deem him liable to bring a proper meal-offering.

HALAKHA

Forbidden by a vow, but he is not a nazirite, etc. – נדור ואין נויר וכי: The Rambam rules that if one says: I am hereby a nazirite and therefore will refrain from dried figs, or any similar statement, then dried figs are forbidden to him due to his vow, however naziriteship does not take effect. The Ra'avad objects to the Rambam's ruling, as the Gemara indicates that the mishna is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Natan, and therefore one should not even be bound by a vow. The *Kesef Mishne* states that the Rambam's version of the text probably read: The mishna is in accordance with Rabbi Natan. Other commentaries reconcile Rambam's ruling without emending the text, since they maintain that this is the opinion of Beit Hillel as presented in the mishna (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 1:10).

It is incumbent upon me to bring a meal-offering from barley, etc. – הרי עלי מנחה להביא מן השעורים – וכי: If one says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a meal-offering of barley, or: A meal-offering of half a tenth, or: A meal-offering of no oil or frankincense, he is exempt, since he has not donated in the manner typical of donors. If he says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a meal-offering from barley, or: From lentils, and the like, he is questioned about his intentions. If he thought that there was such a meal-offering, and had he known that meal-offerings must comprise a full tenth of fine wheat flour with oil and frankincense he would not have vowed as he did, he is exempt. If he says that had he known, he would have vowed in the proper manner, he is obligated to bring a standard meal-offering. The *Kesef Mishne* explains that the ruling of the Rambam is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yohanan, as well as in accordance with the opinion of Ze'iri in tractate *Menahot*, who differentiate between one who says: A meal-offering of, and one who says: A meal-offering from (Rambam *Sefer Avodat, Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 17:9).

NOTES

And Beit Hillel hold in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei – בבית הלל סברי לה כרבי יוסי – *Tosafot* and other early commentaries have a variant reading of the text: Hold in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. In other words, the opinion of Beit Hillel in the baraita is the same as Rabbi Yehuda's explanation of Beit Shammai in the mishna, i.e., that there is only a vow and no naziriteship.

A different version – לישנא אחרנא: This version is exactly the same as that of Rabbi Yehuda in the mishna. The only difference is the Gemara's addition that Beit Hillel hold in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon that if one did not express his donation in the typical manner it does not take effect.

BACKGROUND

Meal-offering – מנחה: There are a variety of offerings of flour or bread that were brought in the Temple. The Gemara here is discussing a vow to bring a voluntary meal-offering, which may be brought in one of four ways: Mixed with oil, baked in an oven, fried on a griddle, or in a pan (see *Leviticus* 2:1–13). All of these offerings were made of fine wheat flour.



BACKGROUND

Lentils – עֲדָשִׁים: Lentils, *Lens culinaris*, are a type of legume that grows on a bushy plant with purple flowers. The plant is about 40 cm tall, and the seeds grow in pods. The color of the seeds can be orange, green, yellow, brown, or black. There is evidence that lentils were consumed by people throughout the world since antiquity.



Lentil bush and flowers



Lentils of different colors

The omer meal-offering – מִנְחַת הָעוֹמֵר: The omer is a measure of grain, one-tenth of an ephah. This term is used to refer to the measure of barley offered in the Temple on the sixteenth of Nisan, the second day of Passover. The offering was brought irrespective of whether the sixteenth of Nisan was a Shabbat or a weekday. The omer was harvested on the night following the first day of Passover from the newly ripe barley and was prepared as roasted flour. A handful was burned on the altar; the rest was eaten by the priests. In addition to the omer, a male sheep was sacrificed as a burnt-offering, together with a wine libation and two-tenths of an ephah of wheat flour as a meal-offering. Once the omer had been offered, grain from the new harvest could be eaten.

NOTES

Hizkiyya retracted – הִדָּר בִּיה חֻזְקָה: Tosafot explain that Hizkiyya retracted his opinion that the mishna in tractate Menahot is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai. Instead, he now agrees with Rabbi Yoḥanan that it is referring to one who says he vowed in error. Accordingly, Tosafot omit the following sentence from the Gemara: Rather, Hizkiyya holds that when Beit Shammai stated their opinion there, their intention was as explained by Rabbi Yehuda. This sentence likewise does not appear in the parallel discussion in Menahot. Others claim that Hizkiyya did not retract his statement about the mishna in Menahot. They contend that Hizkiyya in fact retracted his understanding of the opinion of Beit Shammai in the mishna here. He is no longer of the opinion that Beit Shammai's opinion is as stated by the unattributed mishna, and he agrees with Rabbi Yehuda that according to Beit Shammai one is bound by a vow but is not a nazirite (Commentary on Nazir; Meiri).

אָמַר חֻזְקָה: לֹא שָׁנוּ אֶלָּא שְׁאָמַר "מִן הַשְּׁעוּרִים". אָבָל אָמַר "מִן הָעֲדָשִׁים" – לֹא מֵיָתִי וְלֹא כְּלוּם.

מִכְדֵּי חֻזְקָה כִּמְאֵן מוֹקִים לָהּ לְמַתְנִיתִין – בְּבֵית שְׁמַאי, וְהָא עֲדָשִׁים לְגַבֵּי מִנְחָה כְּגִרְוֹגְרוֹת לְגַבֵּי נוּר דְּמוּ, וְקִאָמְרִי בֵּית שְׁמַאי הוּי נוּר! הִדָּר בִּיה חֻזְקָה.

וְאִמַּאי הִדָּר בִּיה? אָמַר רַבָּא: מַתְנִיתִין קִשְׁיָתִיה, מַאי אִירִיא דְּתַנִּי "מִן הַשְּׁעוּרִים"? לִיתַנִּי "מִן הָעֲדָשִׁים". אֶלָּא סִבַּר חֻזְקָה: כִּי קִאָמְרִי בֵּית שְׁמַאי הָתָם – כְּרַבֵּי יְהוּדָה.

וְרַבֵּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר: אֶפִּילוּ מִן הָעֲדָשִׁים. וְהָא רַבֵּי יוֹחָנָן הוּא דְּאָמַר: בְּאוּמַר "אֵילוּ הֵייתִי יוֹדֵעַ שְׂאִין נוֹדְרִין כֵּן – לֹא נִדְרַתִּי כֵּן אֶלָּא כֵּן!" לְדַבְּרֵי דְּחֻזְקָה הוּא דְּקִאָמַר:

אֵת מַאי טַעְמָא קָא הִדָּרַת כֵּן – מִשּׁוּם דְּלֹא קִתְּנִי "מִן הָעֲדָשִׁים". דְּלִמָּא לֹא מִיבְעִיא קִאָמַר; לֹא מִיבְעִיא כִּי אָמַר "מִן הָעֲדָשִׁים" – דְּמֵייתִי מִנְחָה מִעֲלֵייתָא, דְּאִיבָא לְמִימַר מִיְהִדָּר הוּא דְּהִדָּר בִּיה, וְתַפּוּס לְשׁוֹן רֵאשׁוֹן. אֶלָּא כִּי אָמַר "מִן הַשְּׁעוּרִין" וְדַאי דְּהִכֵּי קִאָמַר: אִי קִדְּשָׁה כְּמִנְחַת הָעוֹמֵר.

With regard to this ruling Hizkiyya says: They taught that he must bring a meal-offering from wheat only if he said that he will bring a meal-offering from barley. But if he said he will bring a meal-offering from lentils,<sup>b</sup> he does not bring anything. The difference is that the meal-offerings of the omer and of a sota are made from barley, so if he said: From barley, he may have mistakenly believed that a voluntary meal-offering can be prepared from barley as well. As everyone knows that no meal-offering is made from lentils, his statement demonstrates that he never intended to bring a meal-offering.

The Gemara asks: Now consider, in accordance with whose opinion does Hizkiyya establish the mishna in Menahot? It is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai. But lentils relative to a meal-offering are comparable to dried figs relative to a nazirite, as everyone is likewise aware that one cannot be a nazirite and therefore refrain from figs, and yet Beit Shammai say he is a nazirite. Why not say that one who vows to bring a meal-offering from lentils is obligated to bring a standard meal-offering? The Gemara answers: Hizkiyya retracted<sup>n</sup> from it and no longer holds that the mishna in Menahot is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai.

The Gemara asks: And why did he in fact retract from it? Rava said: The mishna caused him difficulty and demonstrated his error. If the mishna is in accordance with Beit Shammai's opinion with regard to a nazirite, why does the tanna specifically teach the case of one who says that he will bring a meal-offering from barley? Let him teach a greater novelty, i.e., that even one who vowed to bring a meal-offering from lentils is obligated to bring a meal-offering made from wheat. Rather, Hizkiyya holds that when Beit Shammai stated their opinion there, i.e., in the mishna with regard to a nazirite, their intention was as explained by Rabbi Yehuda, that one's statement is interpreted to be meaningful and it can have the meaning of creating a vow that dried figs are forbidden to him. In the case of the meal-offering, even they agree that since one's vow has no meaning, as there cannot be a meal-offering made of lentils, no vow takes effect.

And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Even one who vowed to bring a meal-offering from lentils must bring a meal-offering from wheat. The Gemara asks: But Rabbi Yoḥanan is he who said that the mishna is referring to a case of one who says: Had I known that one cannot vow in this manner, I would not have vowed that way, only this way? In the case of the lentils, it is not reasonable to say that he erred in thinking that one may vow to bring a meal-offering from lentils. The Gemara answers: He stated this ruling in accordance with the statement of Hizkiyya. Rabbi Yoḥanan was not stating his own opinion; he was challenging the ruling of Hizkiyya.

The Gemara explains his challenge: What is the reason you retracted your earlier opinion that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai? You did so because it does not teach: From lentils. That is not conclusive, as perhaps it is speaking utilizing the style of: It is not necessary, as follows: It is not necessary to say that when one says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a meal-offering from lentils, that he brings a proper meal-offering of wheat. In that situation it can be said that by saying: From lentils, he is retracting his first statement and now wants to rescind his vow. And yet Beit Shammai hold that he is held to the first part of his statement, and they do not allow the rescinding of a vow of consecration. But if he said: It is incumbent upon me to bring a meal-offering from barley, since it is possible to explain that certainly this is what he said: If this meal-offering that I have vowed to bring from barley is consecrated like the omer meal-offering,<sup>b</sup>