



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Nazir, Daf א – Daf א

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 א--5-----

- **Q:** How do we know that a permanent nazir may cut his hair from time to time? **A:** A Braisa says, **Rebbi** says that Avshalom was a permanent nazir, and the pasuk says regarding him that “at the end of 40 years” Avshalom asked Dovid for permission to bring a korbon for his neder (presumably for his nezirus), and we see he would cut his hair every 12 months based on the pasuk that says that he would cut his hair “v’haya mikeitz yamim layamim”, and through a gezeirah shava on the word “yamim” from the parsha of redeeming a house in a walled city we learn that this refers to a period of 12 months. **R’ Nehorai** says Avshalom cut his hair once every 30 days. **R’ Yose** says he cut his hair every Friday, which was the norm for princes to do.
 - **Q:** We find that **Rebbi** himself say that the word “yamim” regarding a house in a walled city refers to 2 days, not 12 months!? **A:** The pasuk says that he cut his hair “when the hair got heavy on him”. That does not happen after 2 days, so it must refer to the time period of 12 months, which is the outer limit time period to redeem such a house.
 - **Q:** A pasuk says “vayehi mikeitz shenasayim yamim”, and yamim there means 2 years!? **A:** We do not learn the word yamim when it is stated alone, from the word yamim when it is stated along with the word “shenasayim” (2 years).
 - **Q:** A pasuk says “chodesh yamim”, which shows that yamim refers to 30 days!? **A:** We do not learn the word yamim when it is stated alone, from the word yamim when it is stated along with the word “chodesh”.
 - **Q:** A pasuk (which discusses how the girls would cry for the daughter of Yiftach Hagiladi 4 times a year) says “yamim yamima”, which presumably refers to 3 months (4 times a year evenly distributed means they did so every 3 months)!? We do not learn the word yamim when it is stated alone, from the word yamim when it is stated along with the word “yamimah”.
 - **Q:** We learn from a Braisa of **R’ Yishmael** that words do not have to be exactly the same in order to serve as a basis of learning one from the other!? **A:** That is true when there are no words that are more similar which can serve as the basis for learning. However, when there is a more similar word, that is the word that must be used.
 - **A:** We can also answer that the 4 times may not have been evenly spread out over the year. Therefore, the words “yamim yamimah” do not necessarily refer to a period of 3 months.
 - **R’ Nehorai** said that Avshalom would cut his hair every 30 days. He learns this from Kohanim, who cut their hair every 30 days. They do so, because beyond that amount of time is considered to be long hair that is “heavy on him”. For that same reason this nazir may cut his hair every 30 days.
 - **R’ Yose** said he cut his hair every Friday. Based on this, the only difference between Avshalom and his brothers (the other princes) was that he would not cut his hair for an Erev Yom Tov that fell during the week, and they would. We can also say another difference was that his brothers could cut their hair Friday morning, whereas he would have to wait for Friday afternoon.
 - **Q:** What is the “40th year” mentioned in the pasuk a reference to? **A:** **R’ Nehorai in the name of R’ Yehoshua** said, it was the 40th year after Klal Yisrael made the request to have a king.
 - A Braisa says, the year they asked for a king was the 10th year of the leadership of **Shmuel Hanavi**.

MISHNA

- Standard nezirus is for a period of 30 days.

GEMARA

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** How do we know this? **A: R' Masna** said, the pasuk regarding a nazir says “kadosh yihyeh”, and “yihyeh” is the gematriya of 30. **A2: Bar Pada** said, we learn this from the fact that the Torah states the word nazir, nizro, or the like, 29 times.
 - **Q:** Why doesn't **R' Masna** learn like **Bar Pada**? **A:** He says that a number of these words are needed for other darshos, and as such cannot be used for this purpose as well.
 - **Bar Pada** says, although some are used for a drasha, since there are some that are not used for other drashos, they must be there to teach that the number of days in a standard nezirus should be learned from the number of times that these words are mentioned in the Torah, and this even includes instances where the word is used for another drasha.
 - **Q:** According to **Bar Pada** a standard nezirus should only be 29 days, and yet our Mishna says it is 30 days!? **A:** In truth it is only 29 days, because on the 30th day he cuts his hair and brings his korbanos. Since he does so on the 30th day, the Mishna refers to it as a 30 day nezirus period.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that the nazir cuts his hair on the 31st day!? **A:** The Mishna ends off that if he cuts his hair on the 30th day he is yotzeh, so we see that the true nezirus period is for 29 days. The first part of the Mishna is saying that the **Rabanan** treated the neder as if the person said he would be a nazir for a complete 30 days, and therefore he should not cut his hair until day 31.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Masna**, how could the end of the Mishna say that he is yotzeh if he cut his hair on the 30th day? **A:** He holds that a partial day is equivalent to the whole day.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says, if a person makes a neder to be a nazir for 30 days and he then cuts his hair on the 30th day he is not yotzeh. According to **R' Masna**, since a partial day is equivalent to a full day he should be yotzeh!? **A:** The case is where the person specifically made the neder to be for 30 *complete* days.

-----Daf 7---6-----

- **Q:** A Mishna says, if someone accepts 2 periods of nezirus upon himself, he shaves his head and brings the korbanos for the end of the first nezirus on day 31, and for the second nezirus on day 61. This makes sense according to **R' Masna**, but is difficult according to **Bar Pada**, because according to him it should be on day 30 (according to him the nezirus period is only for 29 days)!? **A: Bar Pada** will say, look at the next part of the Mishna. The Mishna there says that if he shaved his head for the first nezirus on day 30, then he should shave his head for the second nezirus on day 60. We see that a nezirus is truly over after 29 days. The reason the first part of the Mishna said he must wait until day 31 (meaning that a nezirus is 30 days) is because that case was talking about where the person specifically accepted upon himself a nezirus of 30 complete days.
 - **R' Masna** will say that the later part of the Mishna is teaching that Day 30 is counted as a day for the first nezirus *and* as a day for the second nezirus.
 - **Q:** That is essentially teaching that a partial day has the status of a full day. However, this is something that the Mishna has already taught (based on our understanding in the last Daf)!? **A:** We would have thought that this concept only applies to a single period of nezirus, but not to two consecutive periods of nezirus. The Mishna teaches that it applies there as well.
- **Q:** The Mishna (discussed above) says, if one accepted two periods of nezirus upon himself, and he shaves his head for the second nezirus on Day 59 he is yotzeh, because Day 30 counts for the second nezirus as well (if Day 30 is the first day, then Day 59 is the 30th day). According to **Bar Pada**, who says that nezirus is only 29 days, he should be yotzeh even if Day 30 is *not* part of the second nezirus!? **A: Bar Pada** would say, the Mishna means to say that Day 30 is *only counted for the second* period of nezirus. This means that the first period of nezirus is valid even though it was only 29 days. In fact, this Mishna is the source that a period of nezirus need only be 29 days.
- **Q:** A Mishna says, if a nazir becomes tamei on Day 30, he must redo the entire period of nezirus, because he became tamei within the period of nezirus. According to **Bar Pada** this is incorrect, since Day 30 is beyond the period of nezirus!? **A: Bar Pada** will say to look to at the next part of the Mishna, where **R' Eliezer** says that in this case he must only wait 7 days (in which he will become tahor) before bringing his korbanos (and need not

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

repeat the period of nezirus). We see from here that Day 30 is not part of the nezirus, because if it was, the entire nezirus would have to be repeated.

- **R' Masna** would say that **R' Eliezer** holds that a partial day is considered to be a full day, and that is why when he becomes tamei on Day 30 it is considered to have happened after the fulfillment of the entire nezirus period.
 - **Q:** The same Mishna says, if someone accepted nezirus for 100 days, and then became tamei on Day 100, **R' Eliezer** says he must repeat nezirus for 30 days. Now, if **R' Eliezer** holds that a partial day is considered to be a full day, then he should only have to wait 7 days to become tahor and then bring the korbanos for his having completed the nezirus!?
 - **Q:** You can't suggest that **R' Eliezer** must hold that a partial day is not considered to be a complete day, because if that were the case the entire 100 days should have to be repeated!? **A:** **R' Eliezer** holds that a partial day is not considered to be a complete day. He learns from a pasuk that if a nazir becomes tamei on the last day of his nezirus period he only needs to repeat 30 days of nezirus, even if he had accepted upon himself a longer period of nezirus.
- **Q:** Maybe their machlokes is really the machlokes between **R' Yoshiya** and **R' Yonason** in a Braisa. The Braisa says, the pasuk says “ahd melos hayamim”, which says “days” in the plural, meaning a minimum of 2 days. We would think that this would suffice for a period of nezirus. **R' Yoshiya** says, the pasuk says “kadosh yihyeh gadel perah” to teach that the period must be long enough for “growing hair”, which must be a period of 30 days. **R' Yonason** says, the words “ahd melos hayamim” teach that we are referring to days that “need to be filled”, which refers to a month, which is sometimes 29 days and sometimes 30 days. Maybe we can say that the machlokes is that **R' Yoshiya** holds nezirus must be 30 days and **R' Yonason** holds it need only be 29 days? **A:** **R' Masna** will say that all agree that nezirus must be 30 days. The machlokes between them is only whether when the pasuk says “ahd melos” it means until and including the 30th day or not. **R' Yoshiya** holds that it does not mean “until and including”, and therefore he needs a different source to teach that a period of nezirus must be for 30 days. **R' Yonason** holds that it means “until and including” and therefore these words can themselves serve as the basis for teaching that a nezirus must be for 30 days.
 - **Q:** Why do we say “ahd melos hayamim” refers to the period of a month, maybe it refers to the period of a week? **A:** A week never has less than 7 days, so there is no need to “fill” a week.
 - **Q:** Maybe it refers to a year, which does differentiate in the number of days from year to year? **A:** A year is calculated by months, not by days. Therefore it can't be said to be “ahd melos hayamim” (the filling of “days”) because it is calculated only based on months.

-----Daf 7-----

MISHNA

- If a person says, “I am hereby a large nazir” (i.e. a nazir for one long period of nezirus), or “a small nazir” (for a short period), or even if he says “I am hereby a nazir from here until the end of the world”, he becomes a nazir for 30 days.

GEMARA

- **Q:** When he says he will be a nazir “until the end of the world”, it seems that he wants to be a nazir for the rest of his life, so why is he only a nazir for 30 days!? **A:** He means to say that keeping the restrictions of a nazir for 30 days is as difficult to me as a lifetime of nezirus.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says, if a person says “I am hereby a nazir from here until a certain place”, we see how long it takes to travel to that place. If it is less than 30 days, he becomes a nazir for 30 days. If it is more, he becomes a nazir for as long as it takes to get to that place. In this Mishna why do we not say like we just explained, that he means to say that a nezirus of 30 days is as difficult to him as the time it takes to travel to that place!? **A:** **Rava** said, the Mishna is discussing where the person made the neder after

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

having begun the travel. That tells us that he meant to accept nezirus for as long as it takes to actually travel.

- **Q:** We will learn that when a neder of nezirus is made with reference to something consisting of many parts, then we assume he has accepted a separate nezirus for each of those parts. If so, in this case we should say that he has accepted a separate nezirus for each and every “parsah” of the trip!? **A: R’ Pappa** said, the Mishna is discussing a place where they do not measure by parsah, and the neder was therefore not meant with regard to parsos.
- **Q:** There should be a separate nezirus period for each night that he had to spend on this journey!? A Mishna says that if one accepts nezirus “as the dust on the earth” or “the hair on my head” or “the sand on the sea”, he has 30 day periods of nezirus for the rest of his life (each piece of dust, hair, or sand creates a 30 day period of nezirus). The same should be with the nights that he spent traveling!? **A:** When the reference point for the nezirus cannot be known (e.g. how many pieces of sand there are, etc.) then we assume he meant that he should be a nazir for 30 day periods forever. However, when the reference point is known (e.g. how many days it takes to travel to that particular place) we assume that he meant that there should be one period of nezirus for that many days. **A2: Rabbah** said, the cases of the Mishna (dust, hair, sand) are each separate and distinct entities (each hair is separate and distinct) and that is why each piece creates a separate nezirus. However, time is not separate, and therefore a number of days do not create separate periods of nezirus.
- **A: Rava** said, the reason why in our Mishna he is a nazir for only 30 days is because the case is that he said “I am a nazir for one standard term, lasting until the end of the world”. He clearly means to say that the nezirus should last 30 days, and he is saying that to him that is as difficult as if it were to last forever.

MISHNA

- If a person says “I am hereby a nazir and one day” or “and one hour” or “I am hereby a nazir one and a half”, he becomes a nazir for two 30 day periods, which are observed one after the other.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why do we have to give so many examples? **A:** If we would just say that first case we would say that since there is no nezirus of one day, he becomes a nazir for an entire second period. However, when he says he is a nazir and one hour, maybe he just means to make the nezirus a period of 31 days. The Mishna teaches that there too, there is a second period of nezirus. Also, if we would have the second case, we would say since a period of nezirus must be for full days (e.g. 31 days, 45 days, etc., but not for 31 and a half days) that is why when he adds an hour we say it adds a full period of nezirus. However, when he says he will be a nazir for “one and a half”, maybe it means that he wants the nezirus to last for 45 days. The Mishna teaches that there too we say there is a full second period of nezirus.

MISHNA

- If a person says “I am hereby a nazir for 30 days and one hour” he becomes a nazir for 31 days, because there is no such thing as a period of nezirus measured in hours.

GEMARA

- The Mishna seems to say that if someone accepts a nezirus for 31 days, he becomes a nazir for 31 days. **Rav** says, that is only if he accepts nezirus for “31 days”. However, if he accepts nezirus for “30 days and one day” he becomes a nazir for two periods of nezirus.
 - When **Rav** says that his extra words have halachic ramifications, he is following the view of **R’ Akiva**, who says regarding a sale that if the seller uses additional words we assume he meant something more by saying them, and it makes a difference in what we consider to have been sold.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 7--8-----

MISHNA

- If a person says “I am hereby a nazir like the hair on my head” or “like the dust on the earth” or “like the sand of the sea”, he becomes a perpetual nazir whereby his nezirus ends every 30 days (i.e. he shaves his head and brings the korbanos) and he begins a new period of nezirus. **Rebbi** says, such a person does not shave his head every 30 days (he does not have perpetually consecutive periods of nezirus), rather perpetually consecutive nezirus are created when a person says “I obligate myself to *nezirus terms* like the hairs on my head” or “the dust of the earth” or “the sand of the sea”.
- If a person says “I am hereby a nazir a houseful” or “a boxful”, we must investigate to see his true intent. If he says he meant to accept one large nezirus, he is a nazir for 30 days. If he says he was accepting an unspecified nezirus, we view the house or box as if they are full of mustard seeds and he becomes a nazir for the rest of his life.
- If a person says “I am hereby a nazir from here until a particular place”, we figure out how many days it takes to travel to that place: if it takes less than 30 days, the person becomes a nazir for 30 days, and if it takes longer than 30 days he becomes a nazir for as many days as it takes to travel that distance.
- If a person says, “I am hereby a nazir like the number of days in a solar year”, he becomes a nazir for as many periods of nezirus as there are days in the solar year. **R’ Yehuda** said, this scenario once happened and when the person completed these periods of nezirus, he died.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why don’t we view the box as if it is full with melons and in that way save the person from being a nazir forever? **A: Chizkiya** said, the Mishna follows the view of **R’ Shimon**, who says that a person can be understood to mean even a very stringent outcome, as in the case of a questionable nezirus. This argues on **R’ Yehuda** who says that we do not assume a person would do this, and we therefore say that questions regarding nezirus are dealt with leniently. **R’ Yochanan** said, our Mishna can even follow **R’ Yehuda**, because **R’ Yehuda** argued in a case where it was a question whether the nezirus ever took effect. However, in the case of our Mishna the nezirus is certainly effective, and it is only a question of how long. In that case, even he would say that we must deal with this stringently.
 - **Q:** According to **R’ Yehuda**, after finishing each period of nezirus, it is a question whether the next one should begin, so why are we not lenient and say that we view the box as being full of melons and not of mustard seeds? **A: R’ Yehuda** holds like **Rebbi** that in this case there is one, long period of nezirus, not perpetually consecutive ones. Therefore, the nezirus is effective and it is only a question of how long the nezirus will last. In that case we are stringent.
 - **Q:** How can we say that **R’ Yehuda** holds like **Rebbi**? In our Mishna **R’ Yehuda** related an incident that took place to show that the person accepted 365 periods of nezirus on himself, which is in contrast to the view of **Rebbi**! Also, in a Braisa **R’ Yehuda** clearly says that if one says “I am hereby a nazir like the number of piles of figs in the crop” or “the number of paths in the field during shmitta” (both, examples of uncountable numbers) he becomes a nazir of perpetually consecutive periods of nezirus! **A:** In the last case of our Mishna and in this Braisa the person said “like the number”, and that is why we say he has accepted consecutive terms of nezirus. If not for that, he would say that it would be one long period of nezirus.
 - **Q:** There is a Braisa in which **Rebbi** clearly does not make a difference between a case where the person said “like the number” and where he did not!? **A: R’ Yehuda** holds like **Rebbi** that a neder of nezirus that makes reference to a number of items (e.g. the mustard seeds) creates one long period of nezirus, and he disagrees with him regarding whether there is a difference if the person says “like the number”.
- A Braisa says, if a person says “I am hereby a nazir for the rest of my life” or “I am hereby a permanent nazir”, he becomes a permanent nazir. However, if he places a finite limit of even 100 or 1,000 years, he is not a “permanent nazir”, but is instead a nazir forever (he may never cut his hair).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, if one says “I am hereby a nazir and one” he becomes a nazir for 2 periods of nezirus. If he adds “and more” to the previous statement, he must keep 3 periods of nezirus. If he adds “and again”, he must count 4 periods.
 - **Q:** This seems obvious!? **A:** We would have thought that “and again” should make him add periods equal to whatever he was obligated up until that point. The Mishna teaches that he need only add one more period of nezirus.
- A Braisa says, **Sumchos** says, if a person says “I am hereby a nazir” and adds the word “hein”, that means one period of nezirus. Adding the word “digon” means two periods. Adding the word “trigon” means 3 periods. Adding the word “tetragon” means 4 periods. Adding the word “pontigon” means 5 periods of nezirus.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK KOL KINUYEIII

-----Daf 9-----

PEREK HAREINI NAZIR -- PEREK SHEINI

MISHNA

- If a person says “I am hereby a nazir from dried figs” or “pressed figs”, **B”S** say he becomes a full nazir (and does not become assur to have figs), and **B”H** say he does not become a nazir (the statement has no meaning and he remains mutar in everything). **R’ Yehuda** says that **B”S** actually said it is only effective when he said that these items should be assur to him like a korbon (in which case he would not become a nazir, but would become assur to eat the figs).

GEMARA

- **Q:** How could **B”S** say he becomes a nazir, when a nazir is about being assur to grape products, not figs!? **A:** **B”S** hold like **R’ Meir**, who says that a person does not make a meaningless statement. Therefore, we must impute a meaning to his seemingly nonsensical statement. We do so by saying that he meant to accept nezirus, and the reference to figs was meaningless. **B”H** hold like **R’ Yose**, who says that we must take the person’s entire statement into account. Therefore, since he said he will be a nazir *from figs*, no neder was made.
 - **Q:** Even according to **B”S** we must say that the second part of his statement has some meaning, and if so it should serve to release him from the acceptance of nezirus he had previously made!? **A:** **B”S** hold that the part of his statement “I am hereby a nazir” makes him a nazir. When he then says “from figs”, we view it as an attempt to annul the neder of nezirus. However, **B”S** hold that one cannot annul a neder of hekdes, and therefore can also not annul a neder of nezirus (the pasuk refers to the nazir as “kadosh”), and therefore this second part of his statement has no meaning. **B”H** hold like **R’ Shimon**, who says that when a person promises to bring a korbon that he may not bring (e.g. he promises to bring a mincha of barley flour, which is not something that an individual may bring), he is not obligated to bring any korbon at all (the **T”K** there argues and says that he must bring a regular Korbon Mincha). Here too, **B”H** say that since he promised to be a nazir for figs, he is not obligated in any kind of nezirus.
 - Our Mishna does not follow **R’ Nossan** in a Braisa, who said that the machlokes is that **B”S** say the person is either subject to nezirus or to a neder not to eat figs (this would mean that they follow **R’ Meir** as explained above, and **R’ Yehuda** in the Mishna), and **B”H** hold that that he may be subject to a neder on figs (if that was his intent, and they therefore follow **R’ Yose**, who says that we follow a person’s later words).
 - Another version of this Braisa says that **R’ Nossan** says that **B”S** say he is subject to a neder on the figs, and not to nezirus (they follow **R’ Yehuda**), whereas **B”H** say he is subject to neither (they follow **R’ Shimon**).
 - **Q:** We mentioned above the machlokes between **R’ Shimon** and the **T”K** in a Mishna. Who is the shitah (i.e. the **T”K**) who holds that when one promises to bring a Korbon Mincha of barley flour (or states any other irregularities of a typical Korbon Mincha), we say he must bring one of wheat flour (with all the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

regular requirements of a Korbon Mincha)? **A: Chizkiyah** said, it is the view of **B”S** in our Mishna. They say the person is subject to nezirus even though there is no such thing as nezirus from figs. The same would be that they would require the person to bring a regular Korbon Mincha, even though there is no such thing as a Mincha of barley. **R’ Yochanan** said that it may even follow the view of **B”H**, because the Mishna there is discussing a case where the person later said “had I known that one may not bring a Mincha from barley, I would have promised to bring a Mincha of wheat”.

- **Chizkiyah** said, the **T”K** only requires him to bring a Mincha of wheat when he promised to bring a Mincha of barley. However, had he promised to bring a Mincha of lentils, he would not be required to bring any Mincha at all.
 - **Q: Chizkiyah** said the **T”K** is the view of **B”S**. If so, we should say that lentils is as “foreign” to a Mincha as figs are “foreign” to a nazir, and yet **B”S** say that he becomes a nazir (and he should therefore also be obligated to a Mincha in this case)!? **A: Chizkiyah** retracted his view that the **T”K** is **B”S**. **Rava** explained, he retracted this view, because if the **T”K** was actually **B”S**, the Mishna should have given the example of where the person promised to bring a Mincha of lentils, not barley.
 - **Chizkiyah** held that the **T”K** follows the view of **B”S** according to **R’ Yehuda**. The essence of that understanding is that since “nazir” can mean a simple separation, or promise, we can understand the statement of being a nazir from figs as meaning that he is making a promise not to eat figs. Similarly, since there is a Mincha brought from barley (by the tzibbur), we can understand his statement to mean that he will bring a regular Korbon Mincha. However, if he were to say that he will bring a Mincha of lentils, since that is *never* brought, he would not be obligated to bring any Mincha. This is the reason the Mishna only gave the example of a Mincha of barley, and not of lentils.
 - **R’ Yochanan** said that the **T”K**, who even follows **B”H**, holds that the person would even be chayuv to bring a regular Mincha if he promised to bring a Korbon Mincha of lentils.
 - **Q: R’ Yochanan** holds that we obligate someone for something other than what he promised only if he can claim that he made a mistake in thinking that what he promised is a valid form of neder. However, no one can claim that he thought a Mincha can be brought from lentils, so how could he hold that he would be chayuv to bring a Mincha!? **A: R’ Yochanan** was saying to **Chizkiyah**, you retracted your view based on the fact that Mishna does not give the case of where the person promised to bring a Mincha of lentils. It may be that the Mishna didn’t give that case because that is the *less* novel case. It is less novel to say that after promising to bring a Mincha, if the person adds that it should be from lentils, we understand him as trying to reverse his Mincha obligation and therefore we don’t take any significance with those words. However, it is more novel to say that after saying he would bring a Mincha, and then adding it should be of barley, it may be that he actually only wants to bring a Mincha if it can be brought of barley, like the Omer and the Sotah, and if not, the obligation should not exist. The Mishna therefore teaches that even in that case we say he is obligated to bring a Mincha of wheat.

-----Daf 10-----

MISHNA

- If a person says, “This cow said I am hereby a nazir if I stand up” or “This door said I am hereby a nazir if I open up”, **B”S** say he becomes a nazir and **B”H** say that he does not become a nazir. **R’ Yehuda** said, **B”S** only said that

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

if the person said “This cow should be like a korbon to me if she stands up” that the cow would then become assur to the person.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Does a cow talk? **A: Rami bar Chama** said, the case here is that the person’s cow was lying down in front of him, and the person thinks to himself that the cow must be thinking that she cannot stand up and would agree to become a nazir if she could stand up. The person in his mind thinks to agree to this imaginary conversation of the cow and thinks that if the cow stands up on her own he will be a nazir from the cow’s meat. Based on this, **B”S** is following their shitah that this creates nezirus just like in the last Mishna where the person declared to become a nazir from figs. Here too, declaring nezirus from meat also creates a full nezirus. **B”H** follow their earlier shitah, that just like in the last Mishna there is no nezirus, here too there is no nezirus.
 - **Q:** If this is basically a repeat of the logic of the last Mishna, why the need to give two more cases of the same thing here in our Mishna? **A: Rava and R’ Chiya and R’ Oshaya** all said that we need these different illustrations of the concept. If we would only have the case of the figs we would say that only in that case **B”S** say that it creates nezirus, because figs are similar to and are confused with grapes, but meat which is not, will not create a nezirus. If we would only have the example with the meat, we would say that only in that case **B”S** say that it creates nezirus, because meat and wine are often eaten together and a statement of meat may be thought of as a statement of wine, but when he says figs no nezirus would be created. If we would say these 2 cases, we would think that certainly in the case of the door **B”S** would agree with **B”H** that no nezirus is created. Finally, if we would only say the case of the door, we would think that it is only there that **B”H** say no nezirus is created, but in the other two cases we would say that they agree with **B”S** that a nezirus is created.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, the Mishna makes no mention of the cow getting up “on her own”!? **A: Rava** therefore said, the Mishna is discussing where the person imagines the cow as saying “If I get up on my own or with someone’s help I will be brought as a korbon for a nazir”. The person agrees with this imaginary conversation and it is as if he says that if the cow gets up he will bring the korbanos of a nazir. According to **B”S**, he thereby becomes a nazir.
 - **Q:** This can explain the case of the cow, which can be brought as a korbon. How will this explain the case of the door? **A: Rava** therefore said, the case must be where the cow is laying on the ground refusing to get up (and thereby the person imagines it saying “I will become a nazir if I get up”, meaning that it is refusing to get up). To counter the cow’s “promise” not to stand up, the person thinks of his own promise and decides that he will become a nazir if he does not get the cow to stand up (to show how adamant he is about getting the cow to stand up). The cow then stands up on her own. **B”S** hold that since he did not himself lift her to stand up, he becomes a nazir. **B”H** say, since the cow is no longer lying down, he does not become a nazir.
 - **Q:** Based on this, how would we explain **R’ Yehuda** in the Mishna that the case is where the person made the cow assur as a korbon? We just explained that the case is a regular case of having accepted nezirus on himself!? **A:** The case is as stated above, except that his “declaration” was “I am a nazir from her meat if she does not stand up” and she then stood up on her own. **B”S** hold that since he did not himself lift her to stand up, he becomes a nazir. **B”H** say, since the cow is no longer lying down, he does not become a nazir.
 - **Q:** This would suggest that if the cow does not get up even **B”H** would agree that the person would become a nazir. However, this is not true, because the person used the verbiage of becoming “a nazir from her meat”, which according to **B”H** would not create nezirus!? **A: B”H** are saying to **B”S**, according to us even if the animal does not get up the person would not become a nazir. However, even according to you that he would become a nazir, at least agree to us that if the animal stands up on her own, the person will not become a nazir! **B”S** respond and say that even in that case he would become a nazir, because

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

his promise was made with the understanding that he alone would get the cow to stand up, and he did not get the cow to stand up. Therefore, he becomes a nazir.

-----Daf נ"ו-----11-----

MISHNA

- If a cup of wine is poured for a person and he reacts by saying “I am a nazir from this”, he is a nazir. It once happened that a woman who was drunk was given a cup of wine. She reacted by saying “I am hereby a nezirah from this”. The **Chachomim** said, this woman just meant to make this cup of wine assur to her like a korbon, and she is therefore not a nezirah.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna brings a story to contradict its earlier ruling!? **A:** The Mishna is missing words and should be understood as saying, “if wine is poured for someone and he reacts by saying “I am hereby a nazir”, he becomes a nazir. However, if he was drunk when he was offered the wine and made that statement, he is not a nazir”. The story then proves the ruling.
 - The reason he does not become a nazir is because he really only meant to make it assur to him like a korbon. The reason he didn't say so outright is because he felt that if he just said “this is assur to me” the people will pester him and bring him other cups of wine to drink. Therefore, he said he is a nazir, to stop them from bringing any more wine at all to him.

MISHNA

- If a person says “I am hereby a nazir on the condition that I can drink wine” or “that I can still become tamei to meisim”, he becomes a nazir and is subject to all the prohibitions of a nazir.
- If a person accepted nezirus and then said “I am aware of the concept of nezirus, but I did not realize that a nazir may not drink wine”, he remains assur to drink wine anyway. **R' Shimon** says he may drink wine (and is not a nazir at all).
- If a person accepted nezirus and then said “I am aware that a nazir is assur to drink wine, however, I thought that the Rabanan would allow me to drink wine because I cannot live without wine” or “I thought the Rabanan would allow me to become tamei to meisim because my job is to bury the meisim”, he is mutar (and is not a nazir). **R' Shimon** says he is assur and is a full nazir.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why doesn't **R' Shimon** argue in the first case as well? **A:** **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, **R' Shimon** actually did argue in the first case as well. **Ravina** said that **R' Shimon** does not argue in the first case, because in the first case he has made a condition contrary to what is written in the Torah, and such a condition does not take effect.
 - **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, in the first case, we understand his statement to mean “I am hereby a nazir *except* that I will continue to drink wine”. It is not a condition, and as such is not void.

YODEYA ANI SHEHANAZIR ASSUR B'YAYIN

- Why is it that the views of the **T"K** (the **Rabanan**) and **R' Shimon** seem to be reversed when compared to the previous part of the Mishna!? **A:** We must flip the shitos in the last part of the Mishna to make them consistent with the previous part of the Mishna. **A2:** In the first case, which was a question of whether he has accepted nezirus upon himself, the **Rabanan** say he becomes a nazir as long as he has accepted even one of the aspects of nezirus, whereas **R' Shimon** says he does not become a nazir until he has accepted all aspects of nezirus upon himself. The last part of the Mishna deals with when he is already a full nazir and he is now trying to annul one aspect of the nezirus. The **Rabanan** say that if he annuls one aspect he has annulled the entire nezirus, and he is therefore mutar. **R' Shimon** says that annulling one aspect alone is ineffective. Therefore, he remains a full nazir for as long as he has not annulled all aspects of the nezirus. **A3:** Our Mishna is discussing a case of “nidrei onsin”, regarding which there is a machlokes whether they become automatically void (the view of **Shmuel**) or they

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

need to be annulled by a chochom (the view of **R' Assi**). The **Rabanan** in our Mishna hold like **Shmuel**, and therefore this person is not a nazir. **R' Shimon** holds like **R' Assi**, and therefore the person is a nazir until he has the nezirus annulled by a chochom.

MISHNA

- If a person says “I am hereby a nazir, and I am obligated to provide the korbanos for a nazir”, and his friend who heard him say this responds “And I, and I am obligated to provide the korbanos for a nazir”, if they are smart they can each provide the required korbanos for the other. If they do not do that, they must provide korbanos for another nazir.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What would happen if the friend only responded with “And I”? Would that be understood as his acceptance of both parts of the first person’s statement, or only on one part? If it is only on one part, which part is it that he has accepted? **A:** In our Mishna he says “And I, and I am obligated...”. This seems to suggest that “and I” is only an acceptance of part of the statement, because if it was an acceptance of the entire statement, why is there a need for the “and I am obligated...”?
 - **Q:** It seems clear that “and I” is only on part of the statement. The question now becomes, would “and I” be an acceptance of the first part or of the second part? **A:** Since the Mishna says “and I am obligated to provide korbanos...”, we see that the “And I” is an acceptance of the first part of the statement.
 - **Q: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** asked **Rava**, maybe “And I” would be an acceptance of the entire statement, and the reason he adds “and I am obligated...” is only to reinforce the obligation he already accepted by saying “And I”? In fact, we can prove this from a Mishna later. The Mishna there says, if someone says “I am hereby obligated to provide for half of the korbanos of a nazir” and a friend who hears that responds “And I, I am obligated to provide for half the korbanos of a nazir”, he must do so. Now, in that case there is only one part to the statement, and still the friend says “And I” and then adds “I am obligated...”. We see that the “And I” obligates him and the “I am obligated” only reinforces his earlier acceptance. Here too, we can say that the “And I” is an acceptance of the entire statement and the “I obligate myself” is a reinforcement of the acceptance!? **A: Rava** said, this cannot be. If we say that in our Mishna both parts of the friend’s statement were necessary, that would be the reason why he makes both these parts of the statement in our Mishna, and the later Mishna says that he makes both these parts of the statement (even though it is not needed, because the first person made a one part statement) just to be consistent with the style of our Misha. However, if you will say that it is truly unnecessary in our Mishna as well, why would our Mishna and the next Mishna even say that the friend made the two part statement at all!