



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

### Nazir Daf Yud Beis

- **R' Yitzchok bar Yosef in the name of R' Yochanan** said, if someone tells a shaliach to be mekadesh a woman for him, without specifying which woman he wants him to be mekadesh, and the shaliach then dies, this person becomes assur to marry any other woman in the world. The reason is that we have a chazakah that a shaliach does what he was told to do. Therefore, we must assume that he was mekadesh someone for him. However, since he does not know who, we must be concerned that any other woman he wants to marry is a prohibited relative of the woman that the shaliach was mekadesh for him. Therefore, he cannot marry any woman.
  - **Q: Reish Lakish** asked **R' Yochanan**, a Mishna suggests that if a person brought a pair of birds for obligatory korbanos (one for a chatas and one for an olah), and the birds were specified as to which one was to be used for which korbon, and then one of the birds flew away (it is not recognizable which one flew away and which one remained), the person must bring an entire new pair of birds. Now according to what **R' Yochanan** said, we should be concerned that any new bird that is purchased is the bird that flew away, and as such cannot be part of the new pair of birds!? **A: R' Yochanan** said, a woman does not move around, and as such, each woman is looked at as being "kol kevuah k'mechtza ahl mechtza dami", and therefore he cannot marry her. Birds move around, and based on the principle of "kol d'parish meiruba parish" we say that the new birds are not the bird that flew away. And, even if you will say that the case of the woman may be where she was moving around (e.g. he was mekadesh her in the marketplace), still, since she ultimately returns to a fixed place (her home) she is not considered to be moving around.
  - **Rava** said, **R' Yochanan** would agree that if a woman did not have close relatives at the time that the shaliach was mekadesh the woman, that the sender of the shaliach can marry such a woman. Even more than that, if a woman had close relatives, but they were married at the time that the shaliach was appointed by the person, the person may marry that woman now as well. Even though it is possible that the close relative was divorced by the time the shaliach gave the kiddushin, he would not have given kiddushin to a woman who was married at the time that he was appointed. This is because a shaliach is only appointed to do something that can be done at the time of appointment (and since she was married at that time, he could not be mekadesh her even if she was later divorced).
    - **Q:** Our Mishna said, if a person obligates himself to become a nazir and to provide korbanos for another nazir, and his friend then accepts the same obligation, they can each pay for the korbanos of the other one. Now, when the first person made his statement the friend did not yet accept nezirus. According to what **Rava** said, a person only has in mind things that are currently available to him, and therefore he should not be able to absolve his obligation by paying for the friend's korbanos!? We must say that he meant that whenever he is ready to provide the korbanos he will do so for anybody who is a nazir at the time he is ready to pay. If so, when the person appointed a shaliach he also meant that the shaliach should be mekadesh any woman who is single at the time that the shaliach is ready to give the kiddushin!? **A:** A person only appoints a shaliach for something that he can currently do himself, and not for something that he cannot currently do himself.
      - **Q:** A Braisa says that a person may appoint a shaliach to be meifer the nedarim of his wife while he is away travelling. Now, a Mishna says that

the **Chachomim** say a person cannot be meifer his wife's future nedarim. **R' Eliezer** says that a person can. Presumably the Braisa is following the **Chachomim**, and we see that although he cannot do so himself, he can appoint a shaliach to do it for him!? **A:** The Braisa may be following **R' Eliezer**. The reason he appoints a shaliach rather than be meifer in advance on his own is because he is about to travel and is not in the right frame of mind to do so himself.

#### MISHNA

- If a person says, "I am hereby obligated to provide the korbanos for half a nazir", and his friend overheard him and said "And I, I hereby obligate myself to provide the korbanos for half a nazir", **R' Meir** says they must *each* provide for the korbanos of a complete nazir. The **Chachomim** say, each one must only provide for the korbanos of half a nazir.

#### GEMARA

- **Rava** said, all agree that if he said "half the korbanos of a nazir, I must bring", he is only obligated to provide for half the korbanos. Also, if he said "the korbanos of half a nazir" he must provide all the korbanos of a nazir, because there is no such thing as a half nazir. The machlokes is where he says "I am hereby obligated to provide the korbanos for half a nazir". In that case, **R' Meir** says "I am hereby obligated" makes him obligated to a full set of korbanos, and when he then adds "half a nazir" he is trying to minimize his obligation, which he may not do. The **Rabanan** say, we view the statement as a neder immediately followed by an explanation that he only intended to provide for half the korbanos. Therefore, he only needs to provide for half the korbanos.