



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

### Nazir Daf Yud Aleph

#### MISHNA

- If a cup of wine is poured for a person and he reacts by saying "I am a nazir from this", he is a nazir. It once happened that a woman who was drunk was given a cup of wine. She reacted by saying "I am hereby a nezirah from this". The **Chachomim** said, this woman just meant to make this cup of wine assur to her like a korbon, and she is therefore not a nezirah.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna brings a story to contradict its earlier ruling!? **A:** The Mishna is missing words and should be understood as saying, "if wine is poured for someone and he reacts by saying "I am hereby a nazir", he becomes a nazir. However, if he was drunk when he was offered the wine and made that statement, he is not a nazir". The story then proves the ruling.
  - The reason he does not become a nazir is because he really only meant to make it assur to him like a korbon. The reason he didn't say so outright is because he felt that if he just said "this is assur to me" the people will pester him and bring him other cups of wine to drink. Therefore, he said he is a nazir, to stop them from bringing any more wine at all to him.

#### MISHNA

- If a person says "I am hereby a nazir on the condition that I can drink wine" or "that I can still become tamei to meisim", he becomes a nazir and is subject to all the prohibitions of a nazir.
- If a person accepted nezirus and then said "I am aware of the concept of nezirus, but I did not realize that a nazir may not drink wine", he remains assur to drink wine anyway. **R' Shimon** says he may drink wine (and is not a nazir at all).
- If a person accepted nezirus and then said "I am aware that a nazir is assur to drink wine, however, I thought that the Rabanan would allow me to drink wine because I cannot live without wine" or "I thought the Rabanan would allow me to become tamei to meisim because my job is to bury the meisim", he is mutar (and is not a nazir). **R' Shimon** says he is assur and is a full nazir.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** Why doesn't **R' Shimon** argue in the first case as well? **A:** **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, **R' Shimon** actually did argue in the first case as well. **Ravina** said that **R' Shimon** does not argue in the first case, because in the first case he has made a condition contrary to what is written in the Torah, and such a condition does not take effect.
  - **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, in the first case, we understand his statement to mean "I am hereby a nazir *except* that I will continue to drink wine". It is not a condition, and as such is not void.

#### YODEYA ANI SHEHANAZIR ASSUR B'YAYIN

- Why is it that the views of the **T"K** (the **Rabanan**) and **R' Shimon** seem to be reversed when compared to the previous part of the Mishna!? **A:** We must flip the shitos in the last part of the Mishna to make them consistent with the previous part of the Mishna. **A2:** In the first case, which was a question of whether he has accepted nezirus upon himself, the **Rabanan** say he becomes a nazir as long as he has accepted even one of the aspects of nezirus, whereas **R' Shimon** says he does not become a nazir until he has accepted all aspects of nezirus upon himself. The last part of the Mishna deals with when he is already a full nazir and he is now trying to annul one aspect of the nezirus. The **Rabanan** say that if he annuls one aspect he has

annulled the entire nezirus, and he is therefore mutar. **R' Shimon** says that annulling one aspect alone is ineffective. Therefore, he remains a full nazir for as long as he has not annulled all aspects of the nezirus. **A3:** Our Mishna is discussing a case of "nidrei onsin", regarding which there is a machlokes whether they become automatically void (the view of **Shmuel**) or they need to be annulled by a chochom (the view of **R' Assi**). The **Rabanan** in our Mishna hold like **Shmuel**, and therefore this person is not a nazir. **R' Shimon** holds like **R' Assi**, and therefore the person is a nazir until he has the nezirus annulled by a chochom.

#### MISHNA

- If a person says "I am hereby a nazir, and I am obligated to provide the korbanos for a nazir", and his friend who heard him say this responds "And I, and I am obligated to provide the korbanos for a nazir", if they are smart they can each provide the required korbanos for the other. If they do not do that, they must provide korbanos for another nazir.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** What would happen if the friend only responded with "And I"? Would that be understood as his acceptance of both parts of the first person's statement, or only on one part? If it is only on one part, which part is it that he has accepted? **A:** In our Mishna he says "And I, and I am obligated...". This seems to suggest that "and I" is only an acceptance of part of the statement, because if it was an acceptance of the entire statement, why is there a need for the "and I am obligated..."?
  - **Q:** It seems clear that "and I" is only on part of the statement. The question now becomes, would "and I" be an acceptance of the first part or of the second part? **A:** Since the Mishna says "and I am obligated to provide korbanos...", we see that the "And I" is an acceptance of the first part of the statement.
  - **Q: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** asked **Rava**, maybe "And I" would be an acceptance of the entire statement, and the reason he adds "and I am obligated..." is only to reinforce the obligation he already accepted by saying "And I"! In fact, we can prove this from a Mishna later. The Mishna there says, if someone says "I am hereby obligated to provide for half of the korbanos of a nazir" and a friend who hears that responds "And I, I am obligated to provide for half the korbanos of a nazir", he must do so. Now, in that case there is only one part to the statement, and still the friend says "And I" and then adds "I am obligated...". We see that the "And I" obligates him and the "I am obligated" only reinforces his earlier acceptance. Here too, we can say that the "And I" is an acceptance of the entire statement and the "I obligate myself" is a reinforcement of the acceptance!? **A: Rava** said, this cannot be. If we say that in our Mishna both parts of the friend's statement were necessary, that would be the reason why he makes both these parts of the statement in our Mishna, and the later Mishna says that he makes both these parts of the statement (even though it is not needed, because the first person made a one part statement) just to be consistent with the style of our Mishna. However, if you will say that it is truly unnecessary in our Mishna as well, why would our Mishna and the next Mishna even say that the friend made the two part statement at all!