



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

Nazir Daf Chuf Aleph

GEMARA

- **Reish Lakish** said to **R' Yehuda Nesiah**, the Halacha of the Mishna is only in a case where the "And I" were all said "toch kidei dibur" of the original nezirus declaration. "Toch kidei dibur" is the amount of time that it takes to say "shalom alecha rebbi". **R' Yehuda Nesiah** said, that doesn't give time to the talmid who must greet his rebbi and still wants to say "And I". Therefore, the Halacha of the Mishna applies for the length of time of "toch kidei dibur" plus the time it takes to say "And I" (according to **Reish Lakish** the Mishna would allow up to 3 people to say "And I", since that is what can be said in the time of "toch kidei dibur", and according to **R' Yehuda**, it seems that even a fourth person would be able to join as well).
 - A Braisa says like **Reish Lakish**.
 - **Q:** Maybe our Mishna can be brought as a proof to **Reish Lakish** as well. The Mishna gives the example of 2 people saying "And I". According to **R' Yehuda** there can be up to 4 people, so the Mishna which limits it must follow **Reish Lakish**!? **A:** It may be that the Mishna would agree that there can be up to 4, but it is not usual for a Mishna to list more cases than necessary, so it only gives the case of 2 people.
 - **Q:** Why not only give the case of one person? **A:** Since the end of the Mishna discusses where either the first person had his neder annulled, or where the last person had his neder annulled, in that case there must be three people. Therefore, the first part of the Mishna gives the case of 3 people (the original acceptance and 2 responders) as well.
- **Q:** When a person says "And I", does he mean to connect his statement with the person immediately prior to him in the chain, or does he mean to connect with the original declaration of nezirus? The difference would be whether the statement "And I" must be made "toch kidei dibur" of the original declaration or "toch kidei dibur" of the immediately prior statement of "And I". **A:** We can answer from our Mishna. The Mishna gives the example of 2 people saying "And I". If each person means to connect to the immediately prior statement, the Mishna could have given an example with many more statements than just two!
 - The Gemara says, this is no proof, because it is not usual for a Mishna to list more cases than necessary, so it only gives the case of 2 people.
 - Why not give the case of only one person? **A:** Since the end of the Mishna discusses where either the first person had his neder annulled, or where the last person had his neder annulled, in that case there must be three people. Therefore, the first part of the Mishna gives the case of 3 people (the original acceptance and 2 responders) as well.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can answer the question from our Mishna. The Mishna says, if the first person's neder (the original declaration) is annulled, all the other people are released from their nedarim as well. This seems to suggest that if the second person's neder was annulled there would be no effect on anyone else. We see that everyone must mean to connect only to the original declaration!? **A:** It may be that each person connects with the person immediately prior. The reason the Mishna gave the example of where the first person's neder was annulled is because it wanted to be able to make the statement of "they are *all* released", which can only be said when the first person's neder was annulled.
 - **Q:** The Mishna says, if the neder of the last person was annulled, no one is released from their neder. Now, this suggests that if the middle person's neder would be annulled, those following him would become released. We see that everyone must

mean to connect to the person prior to himself!? **A:** It may be that everyone means to connect to the original declaration. When the Mishna says “acharon” it means a later person, not the last person, and is actually referring to the middle person. The Mishna is therefore saying that if the middle person is released from his neder, it does not release anyone else from their neder.

- **A:** A Braisa clearly says, if a middle person is released from his neder, anyone that follows him is also released, and anyone prior in the chain is not released. From here we clearly see that a person means to connect to the person immediately prior to him in the chain. **SHEMA MINAH.**

HAREINI NAZIR V'SHAMA CHAVEIRO V'AMAR PI K'PIV USE'ARI KISARO...

- **Q:** A Braisa says that a statement of accepting nezirus onto a body part is only effective when the body part is something which the person can't live without (his head, his liver, etc.), so why does this statement regarding his mouth and his hair create nezirus!? **A: R' Yehuda** said, the case is where he says “Let my mouth be like his mouth regarding not drinking wine”, or “My hair like his hair regarding not cutting it”.

HAREINI NEZIRAH V'SHAMA BAALAH V'AMAR V'ANI EINI YACHOL L'HAFEIR

- **Q:** Does a husband's hafarah retroactively uproot the neder, or does it dismiss it from the point in time of the hafarah and on? The difference would be where a woman accepts nezirus, her friend overheard that and said “And I”, and the first woman's husband was then meifer. If it retroactively uproots it, then even the second woman is not a nezirah. If it dismisses it at the time of the hafarah, the second woman would remain a nezirah. **A:** Our Mishna says, if a woman accepts nezirus and her husband says “And I”, he can no longer be meifer (because that would take away his own nezirus as well, and a person cannot release himself from a vow). Now, if the hafarah only dismisses going forward, why can't he be meifer to release his wife, since his nezirus would anyway remain in place!? It must be that the hafarah uproots retroactively.
 - The Gemara says, this is no proof. It may be that the hafarah only dismisses going forward. The reason he can't be meifer is that by saying “And I” it is as if he confirmed her neder, and the Halacha is that once a husband confirms his wife's neder, he can no longer be meifer without first annulling his confirmation.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says, if a woman accepts nezirus and designates korbanos for the nezirus, and her husband is then meifer, if they were his animals, they lose their kedusha and are considered fully chullin. If they were her animals, the chatas must be left to die. Now, if the hafarah uproots the nezirus retroactively, then even when the animals belonged to her they should lose their kedusha and become chullin!? It must be that hafarah dismisses the neder from the time of the hafarah and on!? **A:** It may be that the hafarah uproots retroactively. The reason why the chatas must be left to die is because it is given the status of a chatas whose owner has died, in which case the Halacha is that the chatas must be left to die.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says, if a woman accepts nezirus and then drinks wine or becomes tamei, she is subject to malkus. Now, if the case is where the husband was not meifer, the Mishna would be obvious!? It must be that the case is where the husband was meifer, and we see that the hafarah only dismisses from now and on!? **A:** It may be that a hafarah uproots retroactively, and the Mishna is giving a case where the husband was not meifer. The reason the Mishna brings the obvious case is to contrast with the next part of the Mishna which says that if the husband was meifer without the wife's knowledge and she drank wine or became tamei, she does not get malkus.