



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

Nazir Daf Samach Beis

- **Q:** The Gemara earlier said that the word "ish" written regarding eirechin teaches that a goy can be the subject of an eirechin vow. The Gemara now asks, why is that necessary to be taught? We learn from a hekesh to nedarim that just as a goy is included in the concept of nedarim, he is also included in the concept of eirechin, and since we have learned that a goy cannot make an eirech vow, it must mean that he can be the subject of an eirech vow!? **A:** The word "ish" written regarding eirechin teaches that a minor close to the age of adulthood (a boy within the 13th year, etc.) may make an eirech vow.
 - **Q:** This answer makes sense according to the view that such a minor may make a neder D'Oraisa. However, according to the view that it is only D'Rabanan, what does the word "ish" come to teach? **A:** It comes to teach that a minor of this age who is a goy can make a neder (and this is D'Oraisa).
 - **Q:** This makes sense according to the view that a goy can make an eirech vow, but cannot be the subject of an eirech vow (the pasuk therefore teaches that this minor can make a vow as well). However, according to the view that a goy cannot make an eirech vow, but can be the subject of an eirech vow, then even a one month old baby can be the subject of an eirech vow, and the pasuk would not teach that only a minor in his 13th year is included!? **A: R' Ada bar Ahava** said, the word "ish" teaches that an adult goy who is not knowledgeable in the halachos of eirechin is not subject to the halachos (if we would only have the words "Bnei Yisrael" we would say that that only comes to exclude a goy who is not knowledgeable in the halachos. By having the word "ish" it teaches that even a knowledgeable goy is not included).
 - **Q:** Since there is a hekesh from nedarim to nezirus, why does the Torah write the words "ki yafli" regarding nezirus, since those words are anyway written regarding nedarim and whatever they are meant to teach can be learned from there!? **A:** It comes to teach that an acceptance that is not a clear acceptance ("yadayim she'einan mochichos") are not considered to be an acceptance.
 - **Q:** This makes sense according to **Rava**, who has this view. However, according to **Abaye** what does the "ki yafli" teach? **A:** It is needed to teach the ruling of **R' Yehuda in the name of R' Tarfon**, who says that a conditional acceptance of nezirus is not an acceptance at all.
 - **Q:** What do the words come to teach according to the **Rabanan** who argue on **R' Tarfon**? **A:** They teach the drasha of **R' Eliezer**, who says that the words are the source for allowing the annulment of nedarim.

MISHNA

- There is a stringency of a slave's nezirus over the nezirus of a woman in that the husband can be meifer the wife's nezirus and cannot cancel the slave's nezirus.
 - If a husband is meifer his wife's nezirus, it becomes permanently revoked. If a master makes the slave violate his nezirus (which the master may do), the slave must observe the nezirus if and when he is ever freed.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, a master may force his slave to violate his nezirus, but not to violate any other neder or eirech vow.
 - **Q:** Why is that so? **A:** The pasuk says “lessor issar ahl nafsho”, which teaches that only one who owns himself can become a nazir. Therefore, if the master disagrees with the nezirus, the slave must violate the nezirus.
 - **Q:** Why don't we say that the same is true regarding other nedarim (which are also referred to in that pasuk)? **A:** **R' Sheishes** said, regarding nedarim, where if he becomes assur to one cluster of grapes he remains mutar to others, the master cannot force him to violate the neder. Regarding nezirus, where he becomes assur for all grapes, the master can force him to violate the nezirus (it affects his ability to work).
 - **Q:** Maybe the case of neder is discussing where there is only one cluster, and his not eating these grapes will therefore affect his ability to work!? **A:** **Rava** said, the case being discussed is where he made a neder not to eat grape seeds, which would not affect his ability to work. Therefore, the master cannot make him violate the neder. However, nezirus prevents him from eating all grape products, which therefore could affect his ability to work, which is why the master may force him to violate the nezirus.
 - **Q:** Maybe the case of nedarim is where there is nothing to eat besides these grape seeds, and not eating them will affect his ability to work!? **A:** **Abaye** said, it is only regarding nezirus that the master must force his slave to violate if he doesn't want him to observe it, because the slave's acceptance is effective. However, regarding nedarim and shavuos, the acceptance by the slave is never effective, and there is therefore no need for the master to force him to violate them.
 - This is based on the pasuk which teaches that a person can only make a neder if he has the ability to make a neder regarding good things and bad things (self-deprivation). Since a slave cannot make a neder of self-deprivation (because it effects his work), he cannot make a neder at all.

MISHNA

- If a slave accepted nezirus and then ran away from his master, **R' Meir** says he must observe the nezirus while away from his master and **R' Yose** says he need not do so and may drink wine.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Maybe we can say that they argue in the statement of **Shmuel**, who said that a slave who is made hefker by his master becomes automatically a free man, without the need for a document of emancipation. The Mishna presumably is discussing a slave who ran away and who the master has lost all hope of returning. Therefore, **R' Meir** holds like **Shmuel**, and says he is a free man and therefore must now observe his nezirus, whereas **R' Yose** says he does not become a free man and therefore need not observe the nezirus? **A:** It may be that all agree with **Shmuel**. **R' Meir** holds that the master does not object to the nezirus while the slave is away, because he feels that the deprivation of wine will cause the slave to come back to him. **R' Yose** holds that the master wants the slave to drink wine while away so that he remains strong, and therefore the master opposes the nezirus even while the slave has run away.