



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Nedarim, Daf נד – Daf זצ

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H  
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf נד--88-----

#### MISHNA

- If one makes a neder making it assur for his son in law to benefit from him, and he now wants to give money to his daughter, he must give the money to her as a gift on the condition that her husband has no rights to the money and that the gift be effective when she takes the food bought with this money and puts it in her mouth.

#### GEMARA

- **Rav** said, the Mishna only allows the gift when the father adds the second condition to the gift (use the money for food and eat it). However, if he allows her to do whatever she wants with the money, the gift would not be allowed, because the husband would be koneh this gift, which would be in violation of the neder. **Shmuel** said that even without this second condition the gift would be allowed, because the husband would not be koneh.
  - **Q: R' Zeira** asked, **Rav's** view must be following the shita of **R' Meir** who says that the hand of a wife is like the hand of her husband. However, a Mishna which follows **R' Meir** says that a man can make "shituf" (similar to an eiruv chatzeiros) in a "mavui" (a common area of a number of courtyards) by having his wife be koneh the food on behalf of the others in the mavui. Now, if it is true that when a woman is given something it belongs to her husband, then the food never left the reshus of the husband and cannot act as a shituf for the mavui!? **A: Rava** said, although **R' Meir** holds that the hand of a wife is like the hand of her husband, he would agree that regarding a shituf, since the husband wants the others to be koneh from him through his wife, his wife will be able to be koneh separate and distinct from the husband.
    - **Q: Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, a Braisa clearly says that a wife cannot serve as the intermediary to be koneh the food for the other people of the mavui!? **A: R' Ashi** said, the reason why the wife can be koneh in the case of the Mishna is because the Mishna is discussing a case where the wife herself owns a chatzer in that mavui. Therefore, she herself must be koneh the food to be included in this shituf, and we say that since she can be koneh for herself, she can be koneh for the others as well.

-----Daf זצ--89-----

#### MISHNA

- The pasuk says that the neder of an almanah or a divorcee cannot be revoked. This pasuk is needed for the case where the almanah or divorcee made a neder to be a nezirah after 30 days, and she then got married within those 30 days (before the neder took effect). The pasuk teaches that the new husband cannot be meifer that neder (since it was made before the marriage).
  - If she made this neder while she was married and her husband was then meifer, but he died or divorced her before the 30 days passed, the neder is still revoked (because she was married when she made the neder).
  - If a woman entered nissuin and immediately made a neder, and on that same day was divorced and remarried to the same husband, he cannot be meifer her vow at that point. The general rule is, if a woman goes out into her own reshus for even a moment, her husband can no longer be meifer her nedarim from before the new marriage.

#### GEMARA

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, if an almanah or divorcee says “I shall be a nezirah when I enter into nissuin” and she then enters nissuin, **R’ Yishmael** says the husband may be meifer and **R’ Akiva** says that he cannot be meifer. If a married woman says “I shall be a nezirah when I get divorced”, **R’ Yishmael** says her husband cannot be meifer and **R’ Akiva** says that he can. **R’ Yishmael** explains, the pasuk says that the neder of an almanah or divorcee cannot be revoked – this means that only if the neder was set to take effect while she was an almanah or divorcee is the case that it cannot be revoked. **R’ Akiva** says, the pasuk continues and says “anything that she made assur on herself” cannot be revoked. This suggests that it cannot be revoked when the neder is said while she is an almanah or a divorcee, irrespective of when it is set to take effect.
  - **R’ Chisda** said, our Mishna can only follow **R’ Akiva**. **Abaye** said, our Mishna can even follow **R’ Yishmael**, because in our Mishna the neder is dependent on a set amount of time passing (and therefore we follow the time at which the neder was said), whereas in the Braisa it was dependent on a change in her marital status (and therefore we must follow the time that the neder takes effect).
- The Mishna in “Perek Naarah Hamorasah” gives the general rule that as long as a girl has not yet left her father’s reshus, the father and her husband (during the eirusin) are together meifer her nedarim. This rule teaches that if the father went along with his daughter and the husband’s messengers (who came to take her to the husband’s house) or the father’s messengers went along with the daughter and the husband’s messengers, she is considered not to have left her husband’s reshus. In our Mishna, the general rule teaches the reverse – that if the daughter has been given over to the messengers of the husband, the husband can no longer be meifer nedarim made prior to that time (a husband after nissuin can only be meifer nedarim made after the nissuin).

### MISHNA

- There are 9 girls whose nedarim stand and cannot be revoked: 1) a bogeres whose father had married her off as a minor and is now divorced or widowed, 2) a naarah who became a bogeres and whose father had married her off as a minor and is now divorced or widowed, 3) a naarah who is not yet a bogeres and whose father had married her off as a minor and is now divorced or widowed, 4) a bogeres whose father has died, 5) a naarah who became a bogeres and whose father has died, 6) a naarah who has not become a bogeres and whose father has died, 7) a naarah whose father died and who became a bogeres after his death, 8) a bogeres whose father is still alive, and 9) a naarah who became a bogeres and whose father is alive. **R’ Yehuda** says, also if one married off his daughter with nissuin as a minor and she became widowed or divorced and returned to her father’s house while still a naarah, her nedarim cannot be revoked.

### GEMARA

- **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, the grouping of the Mishna follows **R’ Yehuda** (who would group what is essentially 3 cases and make them into 9). However, the **Chachomim** would say that there are 3 girls (they would keep it simple without expanding the cases) whose nedarim cannot be revoked – a bogeres, an orphan, and “an orphan in her father’s lifetime” (her father had married her off as a minor and is now divorced or widowed).

### MISHNA

- If a woman makes a neder that she will not have benefit from her father or her father in law *if* she does something for her husband; or if she makes a neder that she will not have benefit from her husband if she does something for her father or father in law, the husband may be meifer these nedarim even though they have not yet taken effect (because the condition has not yet been fulfilled).

### GEMARA

- A Braisa brings this case of a conditional neder and says that **R’ Nosson** says a husband cannot be meifer the neder at that point, and the **Chachomim** say that he can. The Braisa then says, if she says “I will be forbidden to have tashmish with any Yid if I have tashmish with you (her husband)”, again **R’ Nosson** says that the husband cannot be meifer this neder and the **Chachomim** say the he can.

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 90-----

- There was a man who made a neder prohibiting benefit from anyone in the world if he would get married before learning Halacha (all of Shas). He then tried to learn, but could not. He would not marry so as not to trigger the neder. **R' Acha bar R' Huna** tricked him into thinking that he could marry without triggering the neder, so he went ahead and got married. In fact, the neder did take effect. **R' Acha bar Huna** immediately made him dirty so that he should need to come onto other people, and then brought him to **R' Chisda** to have the neder annulled.
  - **Rava** said, **R' Acha bar R' Huna** is so great by making sure the neder took effect before having it annulled, because he holds that just as **R' Nosson** argues with the **Rabanan** regarding hafarah and requires the neder to take effect before the husband can be meifer, so too he would require the neder to take effect before it could be annulled.
    - **R' Pappi** said, although **R' Nosson** and the **Rabanan** argue with regard to hafarah, they would agree that a neder *must* take effect before it could be annulled.
      - Maybe we can say that a Braisa is a proof to **R' Pappi**. The Braisa says, if a person makes a neder not to benefit from a particular person, and he then adds that if he has this neder annulled, he should become assur to benefit from the chochom who annulled the neder for him, the Halacha is that if he wants to have it annulled he should first annul the first neder and then the second neder. Presumably it must be done in this order, because the second neder does not take effect until the first neder is annulled. We see that the Braisa holds that a neder cannot be annulled until it has taken effect!
        - The Gemara says this Braisa is no proof, because it is unclear from the Braisa which neder is called the “first” and which is called the “second”.
      - There is another Braisa that can act as a proof for **R' Pappi**. The Braisa says, if a person makes a neder not to benefit from a particular person, and he then adds that if he has this neder annulled, he should become a nazir, the Halacha is that if he wants to have it annulled he should first annul the neder and then the nezirus. We see that the Braisa holds that a neder (i.e. the nezirus) cannot be annulled until it has taken effect!
        - The Gemara says, it may be that this Braisa only follows the view of **R' Nosson**, but the **Rabanan** would argue and say that either one can be annulled first.
    - **Mareimar** told **Ravina**, your father said that **R' Pappi** said that the machlokes between **R' Nosson** and the **Rabanan** is only in regard to hafarah. However, with regard to annulment, all would agree that a neder can be annulled even if the neder did not take effect.
      - **Q:** The Gemara asks from the first Braisa that was brought as a proof above, which shows that the first neder must be annulled before the second neder. We see that the second neder cannot be annulled until it becomes effective!? **A:** It is unclear from the Braisa which neder is called the “first” and which is called the “second”, and therefore there is no way to know that this is what the Braisa means.
      - **Q:** The Gemara asks from the second Braisa that was brought as a proof above, which shows that the neder must be annulled before the nezirus. We see that the second neder cannot be annulled until it becomes effective!? **A:** **TEYUFTA** of this version of **R' Pappi**.

## MISHNA

- Originally they said that there are 3 women who must be divorced and who collect their kesubah when they are divorced: the wife of a Kohen who says that she was raped by another man and therefore assur to be with her husband ever again, a woman who says that her husband is incapable of having children, and a woman who makes a neder not to have tashmish with any Yid ever again.
  - They later retracted this and said, that to prevent a woman from making these claims as a front to force a divorce and allow her to marry another man that she may desire, a woman is only believed to say that

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

she was raped and thereby become assur to her husband who is a Kohen if she brings proof; a woman who claims her husband cannot have children may not demand and force a divorce, rather she must ask for a divorce; regarding the woman who makes that Neder, the husband should be meifer the Neder with regard to himself, leaving her assur to have tashmish with any other Yid.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** After the original ruling was revised, what is the Halacha with the wife of the Kohen who claims she was raped, with regard to her eating terumah? Do we say that they required her to bring proof only to make her assur to her husband or is it even to make her assur to eat terumah? **A: R' Sheishes** said, she may eat terumah until she brings proof, because if she remains married and does not eat terumah people will say she is remaining married illegally and any children they then have would be thought of as chalalim. **Rava** said that she may not eat terumah, and we are not concerned that people will think she is married illegally, because they will assume that the reason she eats only chullin is because it is easier and more readily available for her.
  - **Rava** said, **R' Sheishes** would agree that if this woman then became widowed from the Kohen (normally, the widow of a Kohen who has children from him may continue to eat terumah), she must stop eating terumah. The reason **R' Sheishes** allowed it was to protect the children. At this point, if she would stop eating terumah, people will say she was raped as a widow and will therefore not have any doubts regarding the children.
- **R' Pappa** said that **Rava** would test his talmidim with the following question. If the wife of a Kohen is raped, does she collect her kesubah or not? Do we say that the case of rape by a Kohen's wife is like the case of willing zenus by anyone else's wife (both these women become assur to remain married to their husbands) and therefore just as a woman who was willingly mezaneh does not get her kesubah, the same is with the wife of a Kohen who was raped, or do we say that the wife of the Kohen could tell him, I am fit to remain married to a husband (rape doesn't make a woman assur to her husband) and it is only because you are a Kohen that I am assur, and therefore it is "your fault" and "your bad mazal" and therefore you must pay me my kesubah? The talmidim answered that from our Mishna we see that he must pay her kesubah. The case of our Mishna can't be referring to a woman who was willingly mezaneh, because then she wouldn't get her kesubah. It can't be referring to a woman married to a non-Kohen who was raped, because then she wouldn't become assur to remain with her husband. It must be referring to a woman who is the wife of a Kohen, and the Mishna says that although she becomes assur to him and must be divorced, she still collects her kesubah.

### -----Daf נ"ט-----91-----

- **Q:** They asked, if a woman tells her husband "you divorced me, but I lost the get", is she believed? **A: R' Hamnuna** said, our Mishna said that the **Rabanan** later enacted that we don't believe a wife of a Kohen who says she was raped unless she has proof. Now, it is only in that case that we require proof, because the husband has no way of knowing whether she is lying. However, in this case, where the husband knows whether or not he divorced her, unless she was saying the truth she would not have the chutzpah to say so to his face. Therefore, she must be saying the truth, and would be believed. **Rava** said, our Mishna is no proof. The reason why she is believed to say she was raped (in the beginning of the Mishna) is only because she wouldn't embarrass herself by saying she was raped unless it was true. However, when she says she was divorced there is no such embarrassment, and the perceived chutzpah is no indication, because if their relationship is very contentious she would have the chutzpah to lie and say she was divorced. Therefore, it may be that she is not believed to say so.
  - **Q: R' Mesharshiya** asked, the second case of the first part of the Mishna (where she is believed to say that her husband's zerah does not come out with force and he is therefore incapable of having children) refutes **Rava**, because in that case there is no degree of embarrassment, and yet she is believed!? **A: Rava** holds, since she must explicitly tell Beis Din that his zerah does not come out strongly, it is embarrassing for her to say, and she would therefore not say so unless she was saying the truth.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The case of her claim of impotence at the end of the Mishna (she is not believed to say that his zerah does not come out strongly) seems to refute **R' Hamnuna**, because this is something that the wife and husband both know about, and she is not believed to say even though it would be a tremendous chutzpah for her to lie about it in the face of her husband!? **A: R' Hamnuna** holds that the woman believes that her husband cannot tell about himself whether his zerah comes out strongly. Therefore she is not afraid to lie about it to his face.
- There was a woman who would always bring her husband (who was a Kohen) water in the morning after having had tashmish (for him to wash his hands). One morning she did so, and the husband said we did not have tashmish last night, so why are you bringing water? The woman said, someone had tashmish with me, so if it wasn't you, it must have been one of the non-Jewish merchants who posed as you! **R' Nachman** said, she is not believed to say that this happened, because we assume that she has a desire to get divorced and marry someone else.
  - There was a similar story with a woman who complained that the tashmish of the previous night was painful. The husband (who was a Kohen) said they did not have tashmish the previous night. She answered as in the incident above, and **R' Nachman** paskened the same way in this case as well.
- A man was secluded with another man's wife in her house. When the husband came home, the adulterer broke through a wall of bushes and ran away. **Rava** said, we say that no zenus actually took place, because if it did, the man would have hid rather than be seen running away.
  - A man was secluded with another man's wife in her house. When the husband came home, the adulterer hid from view. When he saw the husband about to eat from something that a poisonous snake had eaten from, he jumped out to stop the husband from eating from it. **Rava** said, we say that no zenus took place, because if it did, the adulterer would have been happy to allow the husband to die.
    - **Q:** This seems obvious!? **A:** We would think that he was mezaneh, and the reason he saved the husband is because he has a stronger desire to be with a woman who is assur to him (and he therefore would rather that the husband remain alive).

**HADRAN ALACH PEREK V'EILU NEDARIM!!!**

**HADRAN ALACH MESECHTA NEDARIM!!!**

**MAZAL TOV!!!**



# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## Maseches Nazir, Daf כ – Daf ט

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf כ---2-----

### MESECHTA NAZIR

#### PEREK KOL KINUYEI NEZIRUS -- PEREK RISHON

#### MISHNA

- All equivalent terms (“kinuyim”) of nezirus are effective to create nezirus.
- If one says “I shall be” or “I shall be handsome” (suggesting he will grow his hair long) he becomes a nazir (these are considered partial statements (“yados”) and create the acceptance of nezirus if there is reason to believe that this is what was meant).
- [The Mishna now returns to discuss the kinuyim].
  - If someone says “I shall be a nazik” or a “naziach” or a “paziach”, he is a nazir.
  - If he says “I am hereby like this” or “I am hereby *mesalsei*” or “I am hereby *mechalkei*” or “I hereby obligate myself to grow my hair”, he becomes a nazir.
  - If someone says “I hereby obligate myself to bring birds”, **R' Meir** says he becomes a nazir and the **Chachomim** say he does not become a nazir.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** Why is Mesechta Nazir included in Seder Nashim? **A:** The Tanna was basing this on the pasuk. The pasuk says that a man may divorce his wife if he discovers that she was involved with adultery. The Tanna is saying, drinking wine is what causes the woman to commit adultery. Therefore, when one sees a woman become a sotah and go through the procedure of a sotah, he will separate himself from drinking wine by accepting nezirus upon himself (this is the connection to Meschtos Gittin and Sotah, which are part of Seder Nashim).
- **Q:** The Mishna begins with a statement of kinuyim and then immediately begins to explain yados, without having even made mention of yados!? **A: Rava** said, the Mishna is missing words and should be read as saying “All kinuyim of nezirus are like nezirus, and all yados of nezirus are like nezirus”. Having mentioned yados the Mishna then begins to explain yados first.
  - **Q:** Why isn't the explanation for kinuyim given first? **A:** The Mishna first explains the one stated last, which is a method used by Mishnayos elsewhere as well (the Gemara cites examples).
    - **Q:** We find many examples of where the Mishna begins explaining the first item of a list before the last!? **A:** A Mishna will sometimes explain the first thing first and sometimes the last thing first. When the two items consist of a permitted thing and a prohibited thing, the prohibited thing is explained first, because this is something that is taken more seriously by people. In the examples cited, the prohibited thing is always explained first. In the examples where it is not explained first it is because the prohibition applies to the person only indirectly (e.g. he may not let his animal do melacha on Shabbos).
    - **Q:** Why in our Mishna is kinuyim not explained first? **A:** The concept of yados is learned from a drasha and is therefore more beloved to the Tanna. That is why he explained it first.
      - **Q:** If so, why not mention yados first in the Mishna as well? **A:** The Tanna wanted to begin with the basic way of accepting nezirus (a complete acceptance, whether by using the word “nazir” or one of the kinuyim) and then mentioned that an impartial acceptance would be effective as well. However, when beginning to explain these concepts, the Tanna begins with yados, because they are learned from a drasha.

HA'OMER “AHAH” HAREI ZEH NAZIR

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Maybe the statement of “I shall be” was meant to say that the person accepts a day of fasting on himself!? **A:** **Shmuel** said, the case is that a nazir is passing by as the person made that statement.
  - **Q:** Shall we say that **Shmuel** holds that yados that are inconclusive (not clearly stated, and can be understood in multiple ways) are not valid yados and therefore do not create a neder? **A:** If a nazir is not walking by as he makes the statement it would not even be considered an “inconclusive yad” and therefore would be ineffective to create nezirus. If a nazir is walking by it is still inconclusive, but **Shmuel** holds that this type of inconclusive yad is effective.
  - **Q:** Maybe he only means to obligate himself to give to the nazir the animals that are needed by him for his korbanos, and he did not mean to accept nezirus upon himself!? **A:** The case is that in his heart he completes the thought that he is accepting nezirus upon himself (and he later states that that was his intent).
    - **Q:** That seems obvious!? **A:** We would think that without a more complete statement of his intention at the time of acceptance the statement is ineffective in creating nezirus. The Mishna therefore teaches that this statement with the intent is sufficient to create nezirus.

### “AHAH NA’EH” NAZIR

- **Q:** Maybe the person meant to say “I shall be beautiful before Hashem with mitzvos” (and not to make a reference to nezirus) as the Braisa learns from the pasuk of “zeh Keili v’anveihu”, that one should beautify the mitzvos (make a beautiful succah, use a beautiful lulav, tzitzis, and Sefer Torah)!? **A:** **Shmuel** said, the Mishna is discussing where the person was holding onto his hair when he said “I shall be beautiful”, so we therefore understand this to be a declaration of nezirus.
  - **Q:** Nezirus is considered to be an aveirah (holding oneself back from enjoying things which are mutar makes it be considered an aveirah), so how can we call it a “beautiful” thing? **A:** Even according to **R’ Elazar HaKapar**, who says a nazir is a sinner (for holding back on permissible items), that is only regarding a nazir who became tamei and now must begin his period of nezirus from the beginning again. This extended period leads to a greater possibility of violation and regret for having accepted the nezirus in the first place. However, a nazir who never became tamei would not be considered a sinner, and therefore nezirus can be considered a “beautiful” thing.

## -----Daf 3-----

### 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

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

“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



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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.

### -----Daf 7--4-----

#### 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

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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.