



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

Nazir Daf Beis

MESECHTA NAZIR

PEREK KOL KINUYEI NEZIRUS -- PEREK RISHON

MISHNA

- All equivalent terms ("kinuyim") of nezirus are effective to create nezirus.
- If one says "I shall be" or "I shall be handsome" (suggesting he will grow his hair long) he becomes a nazir (these are considered partial statements ("yados") and create the acceptance of nezirus if there is reason to believe that this is what was meant).
- [The Mishna now returns to discuss the kinuyim].
 - If someone says "I shall be a nazir" or a "naziach" or a "paziach", he is a nazir.
 - If he says "I am hereby like this" or "I am hereby *mesalsei*" or "I am hereby *mechalkei*" or "I hereby obligate myself to grow my hair", he becomes a nazir.
 - If someone says "I hereby obligate myself to bring birds", **R' Meir** says he becomes a nazir and the **Chachomim** say he does not become a nazir.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why is Mesechta Nazir included in Seder Nashim? **A:** The Tanna was basing this on the pasuk. The pasuk says that a man may divorce his wife if he discovers that she was involved with adultery. The Tanna is saying, drinking wine is what causes the woman to commit adultery. Therefore, when one sees a woman become a sotah and go through the procedure of a sotah, he will separate himself from drinking wine by accepting nezirus upon himself (this is the connection to Meschtos Gittin and Sotah, which are part of Seder Nashim).
- **Q:** The Mishna begins with a statement of kinuyim and then immediately begins to explain yados, without having even made mention of yados!? **A:** **Rava** said, the Mishna is missing words and should be read as saying "All kinuyim of nezirus are like nezirus, and all yados of nezirus are like nezirus". Having mentioned yados the Mishna then begins to explain yados first.
 - **Q:** Why isn't the explanation for kinuyim given first? **A:** The Mishna first explains the one stated last, which is a method used by Mishnayos elsewhere as well (the Gemara cites examples).
 - **Q:** We find many examples of where the Mishna begins explaining the first item of a list before the last!? **A:** A Mishna will sometimes explain the first thing first and sometimes the last thing first. When the two items consist of a permitted thing and a prohibited thing, the prohibited thing is explained first, because this is something that is taken more seriously by people. In the examples cited, the prohibited thing is always explained first. In the examples where it is not explained first it is because the prohibition applies to the person only indirectly (e.g. he may not let his animal do melacha on Shabbos).
 - **Q:** Why in our Mishna is kinuyim not explained first? **A:** The concept of yados is learned from a drasha and is therefore more beloved to the Tanna. That is why he explained it first.
 - **Q:** If so, why not mention yados first in the Mishna as well? **A:** The Tanna wanted to begin with the basic way of accepting nezirus (a complete acceptance, whether by using the word "nazir" or one of the kinuyim) and then mentioned that an impartial acceptance would be

effective as well. However, when beginning to explain these concepts, the Tanna begins with yados, because they are learned from a drasha.

HA'OMER "AHAH" HAREI ZEH NAZIR

- **Q:** Maybe the statement of "I shall be" was meant to say that the person accepts a day of fasting on himself!? **A: Shmuel** said, the case is that a nazir is passing by as the person made that statement.
 - **Q:** Shall we say that **Shmuel** holds that yados that are inconclusive (not clearly stated, and can be understood in multiple ways) are not valid yados and therefore do not create a neder? **A:** If a nazir is not walking by as he makes the statement it would not even be considered an "inconclusive yad" and therefore would be ineffective to create nezirus. If a nazir is walking by it is still inconclusive, but **Shmuel** holds that this type of inconclusive yad is effective.
 - **Q:** Maybe he only means to obligate himself to give to the nazir the animals that are needed by him for his korbanos, and he did not mean to accept nezirus upon himself!? **A:** The case is that in his heart he completes the thought that he is accepting nezirus upon himself (and he later states that that was his intent).
 - **Q:** That seems obvious!? **A:** We would think that without a more complete statement of his intention at the time of acceptance the statement is ineffective in creating nezirus. The Mishna therefore teaches that this statement with the intent is sufficient to create nezirus.

"AHAH NA'EH" NAZIR

- **Q:** Maybe the person meant to say "I shall be beautiful before Hashem with mitzvos" (and not to make a reference to nezirus) as the Braisa learns from the pasuk of "zeh Keili v'anveihu", that one should beautify the mitzvos (make a beautiful succah, use a beautiful lulav, tzitzis, and Sefer Torah)!? **A: Shmuel** said, the Mishna is discussing where the person was holding onto his hair when he said "I shall be beautiful", so we therefore understand this to be a declaration of nezirus.
 - **Q:** Nezirus is considered to be an aveirah (holding oneself back from enjoying things which are mutar makes it be considered an aveirah), so how can we call it a "beautiful" thing? **A:** Even according to **R' Elazar HaKapar**, who says a nazir is a sinner (for holding back on permissible items), that is only regarding a nazir who became tamei and now must begin his period of nezirus from the beginning again. This extended period leads to a greater possibility of violation and regret for having accepted the nezirus in the first place. However, a nazir who never became tamei would not be considered a sinner, and therefore nezirus can be considered a "beautiful" thing.