



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

Nazir Daf Chuf Beis

- The Gemara is trying to determine whether a husband's hafarah dismisses the neder from that point and forward or whether it uproots it retroactively.
 - The Gemara now says, maybe we can bring a proof from a Braisa. The Braisa says, if a woman accepted nezirus and then became tamei, and her husband was then meifer her neder, she must still bring the chatas bird, but does not bring the olah bird. Now, if the hafarah only dismisses the neder at this point in time, she should have to bring the olah as well (since she was a nezirah who became tamei)!
 - **Q:** The alternative is that the hafarah uproots it retroactively. However, if that is true, why does she bring a chatas bird (since she was never a nezirah)!? **A:** In truth the hafarah uproots the neder retroactively. The reason she must bring the chatas is because the Braisa follows **R' Elazar Hakapar**, who says that every nazir is considered a sinner since he deprives himself of permissible wine, and therefore needs a kaparah (which is why she needs the bird chatas as a kaparah).
 - A Braisa clearly says that if a woman accepted nezirus, and another woman then says "And I", and the first woman's husband is then meifer his wife's neder, the first woman is not a nezirah, but the second woman is. We clearly see that the hafarah only dismisses the neder from this point forward.
 - The Braisa continues, and says that **R' Shimon** says, if the second woman said "I am like you", then she is also released from her neder when the first woman becomes released from her own neder.
 - **Mar Zutra the son of R' Mari** said, based on the first part of this Braisa we can answer a question of **Rami bar Chama**, who asked, if someone prohibits something to himself "like the meat of a Shelamim", does he mean to compare it to a Shelamim in its original, assur state, or to a Shelamim when it becomes mutar to eat? From the Braisa we see that he means to compare it to the original status, as the Braisa says that the second woman means to compare herself to the first woman in her nezirus status.
 - The Gemara says this is not a good comparison, because a Shelamim retains kedusha even when it may be eaten, and therefore can be thought of as the subject of a neder. However, a woman after her nezirus was mufar is no longer a nezirah at all, and could therefore not be the basis of another woman's neder.
 - **Q:** If a woman accepts nezirus and another woman responds and says "I am hereby a nezirah in your footsteps", and the first woman's nezirus then becomes mufar, do we say that the second woman is also released, because her acceptance was to mirror the status of the first woman, or do we say that she meant to mirror her status as a nezirah, and she therefore remains a nezirah? **A:** Our Mishna said, that when a woman accepts nezirus and her husband says "And I" he cannot be meifer (because that would dismiss his own nezirus). Now, when a husband says "And I" it is the equivalent of someone else saying "in your footsteps" since he realizes that he has the power to be meifer and in that way may dismiss the nezirus. So, if a person refers to the original status, why can't he be meifer for her, since it would anyway not effect his status!? It must be that the husband refers to the status overall, and similarly, the woman who says "in your footsteps" must refer to the status overall, and therefore, if the first

woman becomes released from her neder, this woman would become released as well.

- The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. It may be that a woman means to refer only to the original status. The reason why the husband in our Mishna cannot be meifer is because his statement of “And I” is considered to be a confirmation of his wife’s neder. That is why he can no longer be meifer unless he were to first annul the confirmation.

HAREINI NAZIR V’AHT V’AMRA AMEIN...

- **Q:** A Braisa says, if a man said to his wife “I am hereby a nazir, and you?”, and she responds “Amen” they both become nezirim. If she doesn’t respond “Amen”, they both are not nezirim, because he made his neder dependent on her acceptance of the neder as well. It seems that in the first case he would not be able to be meifer his wife’s nezirus, which contradicts what our Mishna said!? **A: R’ Yehuda** said, we must change the Braisa to read “he may be meifer her nezirus and must keep his own nezirus”. **A2: Abaye** said, the Braisa is discussing where the husband said “I am hereby a nazir, and you”, as a statement, which we understand him to mean that he is making his neder dependent on hers. In the Mishna he says “I am hereby a nazir, and you?”, as a question. This is why he can be meifer hers, but must keep his.