



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

### Nazir Daf Gimmel

#### HAREINI KAZEH

- **Q:** Even if he is holding his hair when he makes the statement of "I am hereby like this", how does that suggest anything related to nezirus? **A: Shmuel** said, the case is where there was a nazir walking in front of him when he made this statement.

#### HAREINI MESALSEL

- The word "mesalsel" refers to curling of the hair, and therefore to nezirus, as we find it used in a statement by **Rebbi's** maidservant as referring to curling of the hair.
  - **Q:** Maybe it refers to Torah, and not to hair, as used in the pasuk of "salsileha usiromimeka", which refers to Torah!? **A: Shmuel** said, the case is where he is holding onto his hair as he makes this statement.

#### HAREINI MECHALKEL

- The word "mechalkeil" refers to hair, as we find it used in this way regarding the carrying out of lime on Shabbos (for which one is chayuv if he carries out enough to apply to a "kilkul", which is the hair on the temples).
  - **Q:** Maybe the word refers to supporting poor people, as we see in the pasuk where Yosef supported ("vayichalkeil") his father and brothers!? **A: Shmuel** said, the case is where he was holding onto his hair as he made this statement.

#### HAREI ALAI L'SHALEI'ACH PERAH HAREI ZEH NAZIR

- We find the word "shalei'ach" refers to growth of hair, as the pasuk says "shilachayich pardeis rimonim", and the statement is therefore a promise to let his hair grow (as a nazir).
  - **Q:** Maybe it refers to a promise to remove hair, as the pasuk says "v'sholei'ach mayim ahl pnei chutzos", which refers to removal of water from Heaven!? **A:** We learn from a gezeirah shava that the words "shiluach perah" refers to allowing hair to grow long. **A2:** We can also say that the pasuk of "v'sholei'ach mayim ahl pnei chutzos" also refers to growth, specifically the growth of the produce after the rain is sent down.

#### HAREI ALAI TZIPARIN R' MEIR OMER NAZIR

- **Reish Lakish** explains that **R' Meir** holds that since there is a pasuk (in Daniel) in which birds are mentioned right next to "hair", a person will make a neder using a word that is written right next to the word that he has in mind (he has in mind "hair" and he says "birds"). Therefore, the person has made a neder to become a nazir. The **Rabanan** hold that a person would not do this, and therefore no neder was created.
- **R' Yochanan** said, all hold that a person would not do this to create a neder. Rather, the reason that **R' Meir** holds this is a neder of nezirus is because he says that we assume the person meant to obligate himself to the bird korbanos of a tamei nazir (i.e., he obligates himself to a state of nezirus, which may ultimately require him to bring bird korbanos).
  - **Q:** Maybe he meant to obligate himself in a regular nedavah of bird korbanos!? **A:** Then he would have said that he is obligating himself to bring a "kan" (the typical word used to refer to voluntary bird korbanos).
    - **Q:** Maybe he meant to obligate himself to the bird korbanos of a metzora!? **A:** The case is that a nazir was walking by him as he made the statement.
      - **Q:** Maybe it was a tamei nazir, and he meant to obligate himself to pay for the birds that this nazir would need!? **A:** The case is that a tahor nazir was walking by in front of him as he made the statement.
  - **Q:** What is the practical difference between the approach of **Reish Lakish** and the approach of **R' Yochanan**? **A:** The case would be where a person said "I obligate myself to birds that are mentioned close to hair". According to **R' Yochanan**, if a nazir is walking by when he makes the statement he will be a nazir, and if not, not. According to **Reish Lakish**, even if there is no nazir walking by he will become a nazir.

- **Q:** How can we say that anyone holds that mentioning a word used next to the intended word of the neder is not considered to be a valid neder? A Braisa says that the words “right hand” are considered words of making a shevuah. Presumably this is because “right hand” is written in a pasuk near the word “vayishava”. We see that the Braisa holds this is a valid form of neder!? **A:** A Braisa says that the words “right hand” create a shevuah on their own right, based on a pasuk, and not because it is mentioned near language of shevuah in a pasuk.

#### MISHNA

- If someone says “I am hereby a nazir from chatzarnim” or “for zagim” (grape seeds and grape peels) or “for cutting my hair” or “for tumah” (he accepts nezirus on himself for one aspect of nezirus), he becomes a full-fledged nazir in all respects, with all the halachos of nezirus.

#### GEMARA

- Our Mishna does not follow **R’ Shimon** from a Braisa. The Braisa says, **R’ Shimon** says a person does not become obligated in nezirus until he accepts a neder regarding all halachos of nezirus. The **Rabanan** say that even making a neder regarding one of the issurim makes him a full-fledged nazir.
  - **R’ Shimon** bases his view on the pasuk that says that a nazir is assur “from anything made of the grapevine” and then says “from the seeds to the skin”. This teaches that if a person specifies the issurim he is accepting upon himself, he must specify each and every issur in order to get full nazir status. The **Rabanan** say, the pasuk says “he is to separate himself from new wine and old wine”, which teaches that simply accepting that on oneself creates a full-fledged nezirus.
    - **R’ Shimon** says that the pasuk used by the **Rabanan** teaches that drinking wine for a mitzvah, like for Kiddush or Havdalah, is also assur for a nazir.
      - **Q:** Drinking this wine is not a mitzvah D’Oraisa, so how can we say that a pasuk comes to make it assur!? **A:** The case is like **Rava** said, that if a person made a neder to drink wine and then accepted nezirus, he is not allowed to drink wine (although he is obligated to do so under his previous neder).
      - The **Rabanan** say that the pasuk says “yayin” and “sheichar”. We can therefore make 2 drashos. One would teach that a partial acceptance creates full nezirus and the other would teach that he may not drink wine that he is obligated to drink based on a neder.
      - **R’ Shimon** says the word “sheichar” is not available for a drasha, because it is needed for a gezeirah shavah to teach that just as a nazir is only assur to drink wine (but may drink other intoxicating liquids), so too a Kohen is not chayuv for walking into the Beis Hamikdash after drinking any other intoxicating drink. He is only chayuv if he drank wine. This is in contrast to **R’ Yehuda** who says that a Kohen would be chayuv for walking in after eating or drinking any substance that is intoxicating.
        - We can also say that **R’ Shimon** normally holds that one issur cannot take effect on top of an existing issur. The pasuk therefore writes the word “sheichar” to teach that nazir is an exception to that rule, and an issur will take effect on another issur (e.g. if it was Yom Kippur and he then became a nazir and drank wine, he would be chayuv for drinking wine on Yom Kippur and for drinking wine as a nazir).
    - The **Rabanan** say that the pasuk used by **R’ Shimon** teaches that the different parts of the grape combine to reach the minimum amount required to make the nazir chayuv for eating it.
      - **R’ Shimon** does not need this drasha, because he says that a nazir gets malkus for eating any minimal amount. Therefore, no combining of items is needed, because no minimum amount is required.