



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

Nazir Daf Daled

MISHNA

- If someone says "I am hereby like Shimshon like the son of Manoach like the husband of Delilah" or "like the one who uprooted the doors of Azza" or "like the one who had his eyes torn out by the Plishtim", he becomes a "Nezir Shimshon".

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why does he need to give all these identifying characteristics (Shimshon, the son of Manoach, etc.)? **A:** If he just said "like Shimshon" it would not create such a nezirus, because we may say that he is referring to some other person named Shimshon. The same is true if he only adds "the son of Manoach".

MISHNA

- What is the difference between a "permanent nezirus" and a "nezir Shimshon"? When the hair of a permanent nazir becomes too much to handle, he may cut some off with a razor, and when he does so he brings the 3 korbanos that are normally brought at the end of a nezirus period. If he becomes tamei, he brings the regular korbanos of a nazir who becomes tamei. A nezir Shimshon may never cut his hair at all, and if he becomes tamei he does not bring any korbanos for the tumah.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The concept of a permanent nazir was never even mentioned, so why is the Mishna asking about the details of this concept? **A:** The Mishna is missing words and should be read as saying: If someone says "I am hereby a permanent nazir" he becomes a permanent nazir. The Mishna then continues as we have it written.
- **Q:** The Mishna says that a nezir Shimshon does not bring a korbon if he becomes tamei. This suggests that he is not allowed to become tamei, but he does not bring a korbon if he does become tamei. Based on this our Mishna doesn't follow **R' Yehuda** or **R' Shimon** from a Braisa. In the Braisa **R' Yehuda** says that a nezir Shimshon is *allowed* to become tamei, as we find that Shimshon became tamei, and **R' Shimon** says there is no concept of a nezir Shimshon altogether (Shimshon did not become a nazir based on a neder, he became a nazir based on the Word of Hashem, and therefore there is no way for this to be brought onto someone via a neder). Our Mishna cannot fit according to either view!? **A:** Our Mishna follows **R' Yehuda**, and in truth the Mishna allows him to become tamei. The reason it is said in the sense that he need not bring a korbon is based on the comparison to a permanent nazir, where the Mishna must say that he does bring a korbon.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that **R' Yehuda** and **R' Shimon** argue in the same machlokes as **R' Yaakov** and **R' Yose** in a Braisa. The Braisa says, if someone says that an item should be assur to him "as a bechor", **R' Yaakov** says it becomes assur (one can make an effective neder by comparing an item to something that is assur to him, even if the assur thing is not assur via a neder) and **R' Yose** says it does not become assur (making a neder by comparing to something that itself is not assur through a neder is ineffective). Maybe we can say that **R' Yehuda** holds like **R' Yaakov**, and therefore comparing oneself to Shimshon (who was not himself assur though a neder) is effective, whereas **R' Shimon** holds like **R' Yose** which is why he says there is no concept of a nezir Shimshon!? **A:** It may be that all agree that a neder made by comparing an item to something that is assur but not through a neder, would be an ineffective neder. The reason why it is

effective in the case of comparison to a bechor is based on the seemingly extra word “LaShem” in the pasuk.

- **R’ Yose** would use the extra word to teach that a chatas and an asham can serve as the basis of a neder though comparison. The reason he rather darshen the pasuk in this way (as opposed to bechor) is because a chatas and asham only become kadosh through making a neder on the animals (he must make a statement making them kadosh), whereas a bechor becomes kadosh as it leaves the womb.
 - **R’ Yaakov** says that a bechor also becomes kadosh through the owner’s statement, as we have learned in a Braisa that a pasuk teaches that one should make a statement making his bechor kadosh.
 - **R’ Yose** says, although it is a mitzvah to make this statement, the bechor becomes kadosh without the statement being made as well.
- **Q:** Regarding nazir the pasuk also has a seemingly extra word of “LaShem”, so why doesn’t **R’ Shimon** say that the extra word teaches that a neder saying that one will become a nazir like Shimshon creates a valid neder of nezirus!? **A:** That word “LaShem” teaches that a nezirus is supposed to be accepted upon oneself with pure intentions, as we find in a Braisa that Shimon Hatzadik said he never ate from the asham of a tamei nazir except for once, when he saw that the nazir had absolute pure intention, because he had accepted nezirus so that he could cut his hair off for the sake of Hashem. Such a promise of nezirus, being so pure in intent, will clearly not be violated and would be considered a righteous thing.
- **Q:** The pasuk regarding Shimshon seems to say that Manoach was supposed to make a statement that Shimshon should be a nazir (so it is a nezirus that was made through a neder)!? **A:** That was a statement by the Malach, commanding Manoach to treat Shimshon as a nazir.
- **Q:** How do we know that Shimshon became tamei to meisim? If it is from the pasuk that says that he killed 1,000 men with the jawbone of a donkey, we can say that he threw it at them and therefore did not become tamei!? If it is based on the pasuk that says that he killed 30 men and took their clothing, maybe it means that first he took their clothing and later killed them without becoming tamei! Although the pasuk says “he killed them” and then says “he took the clothing”, maybe he put them in a state of immediate death, but death did not settle in until the clothing was first removed!? **A:** We have been taught by tradition that Shimshon took the clothing after the men were dead, and we therefore see that he became tamei.