



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Mishna

If a person said, “I obligate myself to bring a *korban minchah* from barley” (*and all voluntary meal offerings are made from wheat flour, not barley*), he is required to bring a *minchah* made from wheat. If he said, “from regular flour,” he is required to bring a *minchah* made from fine flour. If he said, “from flour without oil and frankincense,” he is required to bring a *minchah* with oil and frankincense. If he said, “from half an *issaron* of flour,” he is required to bring a *minchah* from a complete *issaron* (*the required measurement*). If he said, “from an *issaron* and a half,” he is required to bring two *issarons*. Rabbi Shimon exempts him from bringing any *minchah*, for he did not donate in the ordinary manner. (103a)

Invalid Stipulation

The *Gemora* asks: Why is this so? Surely this is a vow where its “opening” (*a reason where the Sage can claim that the vow is not effective from the outset*) accompanies it (*for “from barley” is a retraction on his vow*)!?

Chizkiyah answers: The *Mishna* is in accordance with Beis Shammai who maintain that one must always consider the first words of a man’s expression, for it was taught in a *Mishna*: If one said, “I am hereby a *nazir* from dried figs,” or “from pressed figs,” Beis Shammai says: He is a *nazir* (*even though a nazir is not forbidden to eat figs*). Beis Hillel says: He is not a *nazir* (*he cannot be a nazir since he mentioned figs, and he is not forbidden in figs because he said nezirus, not a vow*). [*Beis Shammai considers his first statement as the*

primary one and therefore he is a nazir; Beis Hillel regards this as an immediate retraction.]

Rabbi Yochanan answers: You can say that our *Mishna* is even in accordance with Beis Hillel, and it is referring to a case where he said, “If I would have known that one cannot vow in such a manner, I would not have vowed like this, but rather, like that (*to bring a minchah from wheat*). [*It is therefore not a retraction, and he must fulfill his vow.*]

Chizkiyah said: This was taught only in the case where he said, “a *minchah* offering of barley,” but if he said, “a *minchah* offering of lentils,” he has no obligation at all.

The *Gemora* asks: Let us see; Chizkiyah explained our *Mishna* according to the view of Beis Shammai, and Beis Shammai maintains that one must always consider the first words of a man’s expression; then surely it makes no difference whether he said “of barley” or “of lentils”!?

The *Gemora* answers: He retracted that opinion (*and now holds that it is only valid if it is reasonable that he would have vowed differently if he had known the law, and he claims that that is the case*). And why did he retract it? Rava said: It is because our *Mishna* had the following difficulty: Why does it state a *minchah* offering of barley, and not of lentils? It is obvious that the vow is valid because he can make a mistake. Now in regard to barley, a man may make such a mistake (*for there are some offerings that come from barley*); however, with regard to lentils, there is no room for a mistake.

Rabbi Yochanan, however, said: Even if he said, “a *minchah* offering of lentils” (*the vow is nevertheless valid*).

The *Gemora* asks: Let us see; Rabbi Yochanan explained our *Mishna* according to the view of Beis Hillel, and Beis Hillel maintains that the vow is valid because he can make a mistake; then surely it should make a difference if he said “of barley” or “of lentils”!?

The *Gemora* answers: Rabbi Yochanan was speaking according to Chizkiyah’s initial argument, and he was saying as follows: Why did you retract from your view? It is because our *Mishna* does not state ‘of lentils.’ But perhaps it was omitted for it was so obvious that it was not even necessary to be stated! [*The Mishna was written in an “it’s not necessary to state” format:*] It is not necessary to state the case ‘of lentils’ (*that he must bring a valid minchah*), for it might be said that he, in essence, is retracting his vow, and one must always consider the first words of a man’s expression; but even where he said ‘of barley,’ in which case it might be said that he is making a mistake, we still say that we must consider the first words of a man’s expression.

Zeiri said: This (*that a minchah is valid even when the vow specified the wrong ingredients*) applies only where he said (*I accept upon myself to bring*) ‘a *minchah*’, but where he did not say ‘a *minchah*’ (*but rather, he said, “I accept upon myself to bring barley*), it is not so (*and he would not be obligated to bring a minchah, for he definitely meant barley*).

Rav Nachman was once sitting and related that which Zeiri said. Rava asked Rav Nachman from our *Mishna*: If he said, “from regular flour,” he is required to bring a *minchah* made from fine flour. Is it not the case that he did not say ‘a *minchah*’?

The *Gemora* answers: No, he actually said ‘a *minchah*.’

The *Gemora* asks from the next case of the *Mishna*: If he said, “from flour without oil and frankincense,” he is required to

bring a *minchah* with oil and frankincense. Is it not the case that he did not say ‘a *minchah*’?

The *Gemora* answers: No, he actually said ‘a *minchah*.’

The *Gemora* asks from the next case of the *Mishna*: If he said, “from half an *issaron* of flour,” he is required to bring a *minchah* from a complete *issaron* (*the required measurement*). Is it not the case that he did not say ‘a *minchah*’?

The *Gemora* answers: No, he actually said ‘a *minchah*.’

The *Gemora* asks: If so, consider the end case of the *Mishna*: If he said, “from an *issaron* and a half,” he is required to bring two *issarons*. But as soon as he said (*I accept upon myself to bring*) a *minchah* offering, he immediately is obligated to bring an *issaron*, and when he added ‘and a half’ it is of no consequence at all!?

The *Gemora* answers: The case must be that he said, “I accept upon myself to bring a *minchah* offering of half an *issaron*,” for as soon as he said ‘a *minchah* offering,’ he immediately is obligated to bring an *issaron*, and when he added ‘half an *issaron*,’ it was of no consequence, and when he concluded and said, ‘an *issaron*,’ he became obligated to bring another *issaron*.

The *Gemora* asks: If so, what can be the reason for that which Rabbi Shimon stated: He is exempt from bringing any *minchah*, for he did not donate in the ordinary manner. [*If we are following Beis Shammai, he did donate in an ordinary manner, for we consider his first expression, and he has vowed to bring a minchah!?*]

Rava answered: Rabbi Shimon stated this according to the opinion of Rabbi Yosi, who maintained that a person is bound by his last words as well (*and since he vowed to bring a minchah of an issaron and a half, it is not a vow in the ordinary manner*). (103a – 103b)

Mishna

A man may donate a *minchah* offering consisting of sixty *issarons* and bring them in one vessel. If he said, "I accept upon myself to offer sixty-one *issarons*," he must bring sixty in one vessel and one in another vessel; for since the congregation brings on the first day of *Sukkos* when it falls on a *Shabbos* sixty-one *issarons* (in total; for thirteen bulls were offered - each requiring three *issarons* of flour as a *minchah* offering; two rams, each requiring two *issarons*, and fourteen lambs, each requiring one *issaron*; in addition, there were two further *issarons* for the two lambs of the daily offering, and two more for the two lambs of the *Shabbos Mussaf* offering; thus $39 + 4 + 14 + 4$ *issarons* = 61); it is enough for an individual that his *minchah* offering be less by one *issaron* than that of the congregation. Rabbi Shimon said: But some of those *issarons* are for the bulls and some for the lambs, and they may not be mixed with each other (for the quantity of oil for the *issarons* varied; each *issaron* that accompanied the bull or the ram required two logs of oil, hence the mixture was thick, whereas the *issaron* that was brought with each lamb required three logs of oil, thus making a thin mixture; accordingly the sixty-one *issarons* were not all put in one vessel)! Rather, the reason is that up to sixty *issarons* can be mixed (the oil and the flour) in one vessel. They said to him: Can sixty be mixed in one vessel, and not sixty-one? He answered: So it is with all the measures prescribed by the Sages: a man may immerse himself in forty *se'ah* of water, but he cannot immerse himself in forty *se'ah* less one *kortov* (an extremely small measurement equal to $1/64$ of a log). (103b)

Sixty-one Issarons

This question was asked before Rabbi Yehudah bar Ila'i: How do we know that if a man said, "I accept upon myself to offer sixty-one *issarons*," he must bring sixty in one vessel and one in another vessel? Rabbi Yehudah bar Ila'i, the opening speaker on all occasions, opened the discussion and said: Since we find that the congregation brings on the first day of

Sukkos when it falls on a *Shabbos* sixty-one *issarons* (in total), it is enough for an individual that his *minchah* offering be less by one *issaron* than that of the congregation. Rabbi Shimon said to him: But some of those *issarons* are for the bulls and some for the lambs, and some have a thick mixture while some have a thin one; some are mixed in the morning and some in the afternoon, and they are not all mixed with each other. Rabbi Yehudah said to him: You explain it. He replied: It is written: *And any minchah that is mixed with oil or dry.* Thus, the Torah is saying: Bring a *minchah* offering that can be mixed in one vessel. Rabbi Yehudah responded: an sixty be mixed in one vessel, and not sixty-one? He answered: So it is with all the measures prescribed by the Sages: a man may immerse himself in forty *se'ah* of water, but he cannot immerse himself in forty *se'ah* less one *kortov*; food the size of an egg is capable of transmitting *tumah*, but if the food is a drop less than an egg - even in the size of a sesame seed, it cannot transmit *tumah*; a cloth that is three *tefachim* by three *tefachim* is susceptible to *midras tumah* (if a *zav* or a *niddah* rest their weight on something, it contracts *tumah*), but that which is three *tefachim* by three *tefachim* less one thread is not susceptible to *midras tumah*.

The *Gemora* asks: But what of it if they cannot be mixed? Have we not learned in a *Mishna* that If he did not mix it, it is nevertheless valid?

Rabbi Zeira answered: A *minchah* offering that is fit for mixing (of the flour and the oil of the offering; with one log of oil for sixty *issarons* of flour, and a maximum of sixty *issarons* in one pan, perfect mixing is possible), the mixing is not critical to it (and the offering will be valid even without mixing); whereas, a *minchah* offering that is not fit for mixing (where, the proportions of the mixture were less than a log for sixty *issarons* or where more than sixty *issarons* were placed in one pan), the mixing is critical (and the offering will not be valid). (103b)