



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Nazir, Daf כ' – Daf ה'

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'---12-----

- **R' Yitzchok bar Yosef in the name of R' Yochanan** said, if someone tells a shaliach to be mekadesh a woman for him, without specifying which woman he wants him to be mekadesh, and the shaliach then dies, this person becomes assur to marry any other woman in the world. The reason is that we have a chazakah that a shaliach does what he was told to do. Therefore, we must assume that he was mekadesh someone for him. However, since he does not know who, we must be concerned that any other woman he wants to marry is a prohibited relative of the woman that the shaliach was mekadesh for him. Therefore, he cannot marry any woman.
 - **Q: Reish Lakish** asked **R' Yochanan**, a Mishna suggests that if a person brought a pair of birds for obligatory korbanos (one for a chatas and one for an olah), and the birds were specified as to which one was to be used for which korbon, and then one of the birds flew away (it is not recognizable which one flew away and which one remained), the person must bring an entire new pair of birds. Now according to what **R' Yochanan** said, we should be concerned that any new bird that is purchased is the bird that flew away, and as such cannot be part of the new pair of birds!? **A: R' Yochanan** said, a woman does not move around, and as such, each woman is looked at as being “kol kevuah k'mechtza ahl mechtza dami”, and therefore he cannot marry her. Birds move around, and based on the principle of “kol d'parish meiruba parish” we say that the new birds are not the bird that flew away. And, even if you will say that the case of the woman may be where she was moving around (e.g. he was mekadesh her in the marketplace), still, since she ultimately returns to a fixed place (her home) she is not considered to be moving around.
 - **Rava** said, **R' Yochanan** would agree that if a woman did not have close relatives at the time that the shaliach was mekadesh the woman, that the sender of the shaliach can marry such a woman. Even more than that, if a woman had close relatives, but they were married at the time that the shaliach was appointed by the person, the person may marry that woman now as well. Even though it is possible that the close relative was divorced by the time the shaliach gave the kiddushin, he would not have given kiddushin to a woman who was married at the time that he was appointed. This is because a shaliach is only appointed to do something that can be done at the time of appointment (and since she was married at that time, he could not be mekadesh her even if she was later divorced).
 - **Q:** Our Mishna said, if a person obligates himself to become a nazir and to provide korbanos for another nazir, and his friend then accepts the same obligation, they can each pay for the korbanos of the other one. Now, when the first person made his statement the friend did not yet accept nezirus. According to what **Rava** said, a person only has in mind things that are currently available to him, and therefore he should not be able to absolve his obligation by paying for the friend's korbanos!? We must say that he meant that whenever he is ready to provide the korbanos he will do so for anybody who is a nazir at the time he is ready to pay. If so, when the person appointed a shaliach he also meant that the shaliach should be mekadesh any woman who is single at the time that the shaliach is ready to give the kiddushin!? **A:** A person only appoints a shaliach for something that he can currently do himself, and not for something that he cannot currently do himself.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that a person may appoint a shaliach to be meifer the nedarim of his wife while he is away travelling. Now, a Mishna says that the **Chachomim** say a person cannot be meifer his wife's future nedarim. **R' Eliezer** says that a person can. Presumably the Braisa is following the **Chachomim**, and we see that although he cannot do so himself, he can appoint a shaliach to do it for him!? **A:** The Braisa may be

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

following **R' Eliezer**. The reason he appoints a shaliach rather than be meifer in advance on his own is because he is about to travel and is not in the right frame of mind to do so himself.

MISHNA

- If a person says, “I am hereby obligated to provide the korbanos for half a nazir”, and his friend overheard him and said “And I, I hereby obligate myself to provide the korbanos for half a nazir”, **R' Meir** says they must *each* provide for the korbanos of a complete nazir. The **Chachomim** say, each one must only provide for the korbanos of half a nazir.

GEMARA

- **Rava** said, all agree that if he said “half the korbanos of a nazir, I must bring”, he is only obligated to provide for half the korbanos. Also, if he said “the korbanos of half a nazir” he must provide all the korbanos of a nazir, because there is no such thing as a half nazir. The machlokes is where he says “I am hereby obligated to provide the korbanos for half a nazir”. In that case, **R' Meir** says “I am hereby obligated” makes him obligated to a full set of korbanos, and when he then adds “half a nazir” he is trying to minimize his obligation, which he may not do. The **Rabanan** say, we view the statement as a neder immediately followed by an explanation that he only intended to provide for half the korbanos. Therefore, he only needs to provide for half the korbanos.

-----Daf ל'--13-----

MISHNA

- If someone says “I am hereby a nazir when I have a son”, and he then has a son, he becomes a nazir. If he has a daughter, tumtum, or androginas he does not become a nazir.
- If he says “I am hereby a nazir when I have a child”, then even if he has a daughter, tumtum, or androginas he becomes a nazir.
 - If his wife had a child that immediately died, he is not a nazir. **R' Shimon** says he is a safek nazir and therefore he should say “if this child was a viable child, I am a nazir to fulfil my earlier promise. If it is not a viable child, I am accepting a new nezirus” (in that way he can bring korbanos at the end of the nezirus period in either case).
 - If she then gives birth to a healthy child, he is then a nazir. **R' Shimon** says he is again a safek nazir and should therefore say “If the first child was viable, then my first nezirus was for my earlier promise and I will now keep a new nezirus. And, if the first child was not a viable child, then my earlier nezirus was a new nezirus and I will now keep nezirus for my earlier promise”.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The first case of the Mishna seems obvious!? **A:** The Mishna says that only to lead into the next case, that if he has a daughter, tumtum, or androginas he does not become a nazir.
 - **Q:** This also seems obvious!? **A:** We would think that when he says “ben” he means that when he has any child he will be a nazir. The Mishna teaches that this is not so.

V'IHM AMAR KISHEYIHIYEH LI VLAD...

- **Q:** This seems obvious!? **A:** We would think that when he says “child” he refers to a “prominent” child, meaning a son. The Mishna teaches that this is not so.

HIPILAH ISHTO EINO NAZIR

- The Mishna here follows the view of **R' Yehuda** who says that when a safek arises as to whether a condition has been fulfilled to require a nezirus, we say that there is no nezirus.

R' SHIMON OMER YOMAR IHM HAYA BEN KAYAMAH...

- **Q:** **R' Abba** asked **R' Huna**, what happens if a person says he will be a nazir when he has a son, and his wife then lost a child, he then designated a korbon for his nezirus obligation, and she then gave birth that same day to a healthy child (a twin brother)? According to **R' Shimon** the animals become kadosh out of doubt. However, what

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

would the Halacha be according to **R' Yehuda**? Do we say that the animals do not become kadosh (since one cannot separate a korbos for nezirus before he is actually a nazir), or do we say that since the twin brother is viable it proves that the first brother was a viable child as well? This would mean that he became a nazir for the first child and the designation of the korbos is therefore effective? The practical implication would be whether he can work with this animal or shear its wool. **A: TEIKU.**

- **Q: Ben Rechumi** asked **Abaye**, if a person says “I am hereby a nazir when I have a son”, and his friend overhears this and responds “and it is incumbent on me as well”, how are we to understand the friend’s statement? Is he accepting nezirus when the first person has a son, or does he mean to accept nezirus when he himself has a son?
 - **Q** If we say that he refers to when he himself has a son, what if a person says “I am hereby a nazir when I have a son” and the friend responds “And I”? Do we understand that to mean that he is accepting nezirus when he himself has a son, or does he mean to say that he loves the first person so much that he will accept nezirus when the first person has a son?
 - **Q:** If we say that as long as the friend makes the response in the presence of the first person he would be embarrassed to selfishly be thinking of himself, what about if the response is made not in the presence of the person for whom the nezirus is being accepted (Reuven accepts nezirus when Levi will have a son, and Shimon then says “and I”, but Levi is not there)? Do we say that in that case he still means to accept nezirus when Levi has the son, or maybe he means to accept nezirus when he has the son? **A: TEIKU.**

MISHNA

- If someone says “I am hereby a nazir, and I will again be a nazir when I have a son”, and he began counting days of nezirus for his first acceptance, and in middle of that term of nezirus a son was born to him, he completes his own term of nezirus and then begins a new nezirus for the birth of his son.
- If he says “I am hereby a nazir when I have a son, and I am also hereby a nazir”, and he started counting for his own term of nezirus and has a son born during that term, he must set aside his own nezirus term, keep the nezirus for the birth of his son, and then resume and complete the nezirus of his own.

-----Daf 7'---14-----

- **Q: Rava** asked, if someone says “I am hereby a nazir which should take effect after 20 days, and I am hereby a nazir from now for 100 days”, what is the Halacha? Do we say that since the 100 days cannot be completed within the 20 days, the 100 day nezirus does not take effect yet at all, or do we say that since if he counts 20 of the 100 days now, he will be left with 80 days for completion later, and that leaves more than enough time to have “hair growth” (which requires a growth of 30 days), we say that the 100 day nezirus takes effect now and he begins with the 20 days before the other nezirus sets in?
 - **Q:** Why doesn't **Rava** ask the same case except that the second nezirus to be accepted was for only 30 days? **A:** He meant to ask both these questions. He asked, that if we say that when the second nezirus was only 30 days we tell him to observe the entire 30 days after the first period of nezirus, that may be because we don't want him to keep 20 days first and then only have 10 days remaining, since that leaves a very short time, which is not considered significant for purposes of nezirus. However, when the second term is 100 days, and he is left with 80 days later on, maybe we do tell him to observe 20 days now and 80 days later.
 - **Q:** If we say that in this case the nezirus take effect right now for 20 days, what if the second nezirus that he accepts is a status of permanent nezirus? If that take effect immediately, he will not be able to cut his hair at the conclusion of the 30 day nezirus which is set to begin in 20 days!
 - **Q:** If we say that in this case the permanent nezirus takes effect right away, that may be because the nezirus of 30 days can be annulled by a chochom. What about if he accepts a nezir Shimshon to take effect after 20 days and then accepts a regular nezirus? Do we say that since the nezir Shimshon status can never be annulled he will never be able to complete the regular period of

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

nezirus and therefore it does not begin at all, or does it take effect immediately for the next 20 days?

- **Q:** If someone says “Like Moshe on the 7th of Adar”, do we say he is referring to Moshe’s passing and therefore means to accept nezirus as mourning, or do we say he is referring to Moshe’s birthday and has no intent to mean nezirus at all?
- **A:** We can answer the very first question from a Braisa. The Braisa says, if someone declares a 30 day nezirus to begin in 20 days and then declares a 100 day nezirus, he counts 20 days for the 100 day nezirus, then counts the 30 day nezirus, then completes 80 days for the remainder of the 100 day nezirus.
- If he began observing his declared nezirus and his son is then born (requiring another period of nezirus which stops his own nezirus from continuing until this nezirus for his son is completed) and he becomes tamei during the nezirus for his son, **R’ Yochanan** says he has lost whatever has been so far counted for his son’s nezirus and whatever has been counted for his own nezirus, because both of these periods of nezirus are treated as one long period of nezirus. **Reish Lakish** says he only loses what was counted for his son, and he does not lose what was counted for his own nezirus, because he holds that the periods of nezirus are considered to be separate and distinct from each other.
- If a nazir becomes a metzora, he must stop counting his nezirus days until he becomes tahor, but he does not lose the days he already counted before becoming a metzora. If he becomes tamei to a meis while he is already a metzora, **R’ Yochanan** says he loses all the days he had previously counted for the nezirus, because he has become tamei to a meis in middle of his nezirus period. **Reish Lakish** says he does not lose the days previously counted, because the days that he is a metzora are not considered days of his nezirus.
 - We need to state their machlokes in both these cases. If we would only have the first case, we would say that in that case **R’ Yochanan** says as he does, because it is all considered to be a nezirus, and therefore they are considered one period. However, in the case of metzora, he may agree that he is not considered to be in his period of nezirus. If we would only have the second case, we would say that **Reish Lakish** only holds that way there, but in the first case it is all “nezirus” and as such is considered to be one long period. That is why we need both cases.
- If a nazir had his hair cut with less than 30 remaining to the end of his nezirus, he must continue his nezirus even beyond his period until he has allowed his hair to grow for 30 days before shaving it as part of the completion process. If he becomes tamei in the days after the accepted period that he is keeping just to allow for the hair growth, **Rav** says that even **R’ Yochanan** would agree that he does not lose the days counted, because he is now certainly no longer considered to be in his nezirus period. **Shmuel** says that even **Reish Lakish** would say that he loses whatever was counted, because this is literally within his single period of nezirus.
 - **R’ Chisda** said, if a nazir’s korbonos were offered, and he then became tamei before shaving his hair, he is stuck as a nazir and can never conclude the nezirus (the shaving must be done with the korbanos, but he can’t shave now, because he is tamei, and when he is no longer tamei the korbanos were already offered).
 - **Q:** According to **R’ Eliezer** who says that shaving the hair is essential to concluding the nezirus, he should need to wait 7 days to become tahor and should then again have to bring new korbanos to complete his nezirus, and according to the **Rabanan**, the shaving of the hair is itself not essential. If so, who does **R’ Chisda** follow? **A:** He is following the **Rabanan**, and when he says that “he is stuck”, he means that he is stuck in the sense that he cannot perform the mitzvah of shaving the hair along with the korbanos, but not that he is stuck as a nazir forever.
- **R’ Yose the son of R’ Chanina** said, if a nazir has completed his 30 count, but has not yet done his concluding process, and he becomes tamei at that time, he is subject to the malkus penalty. However, he would not get malkus if he cut his hair or drank wine during that time.
 - **Q:** The pasuk regarding tumah says “kol yimei haziro LaShem”, which teaches that he is subject to malkus for tumah even after the count is over. However, the pesukim regarding cutting hair and drinking wine have a similar language which should therefore make him subject to malkus for those actions as well!? **A:** Regarding tumah the pasuk says “v’timei rosh nizro”, which teaches that he is subject to the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

issur of tumah even if he is just waiting for his head to be shaved, and the count has already been completed.

- **Q:** A Braisa clearly says that he is subject to malkus at that time for any one of these 3 actions!? **A:** **TEYUFTA.**

-----Daf 10---15-----

MISHNA

- If someone says “I am hereby a nazir when I have a son, and I am hereby a nazir for 100 days”, and he begins observing the 100 day nezirus immediately, if a son is born to him at any time up to 70 days into the 100 day nezirus, then “he loses nothing” (meaning, he counts the 30 day nezirus for his son concurrently with the 100 day nezirus, and therefore only keeps a total of 100 days of nezirus). However, if the son is born after 70 days, he must stop his count toward the 100 days, observe the 30 days nezirus for his son, and then complete the 100 day nezirus after that is done. This is so, because a period of nezirus cannot last for less than 30 days (and in this second case, the nezirus for his son therefore must extend beyond his 100 day count, and therefore cannot be counted concurrently with the 100 day nezirus).

GEMARA

- **Rav** said, Day 70 counts as a day for the 100 day nezirus and as a day for the nezirus for his son. Therefore, since it counts as 2 days, it also counts as two days for the 100 day nezirus and he saves a day of counting (he can bring his korbanos on Day 100 instead of Day 101).
 - **Q:** Our Mishna said, if the son is born anytime up to Day 70 “he loses nothing”, since the 30 day nezirus can be totally enveloped in the 100 days. If **Rav** is correct, the person actually *gains* a day, and does not simply “lose nothing”!? **A:** That is what the Mishna should have said. The reason it says “he loses nothing” is to keep the style of the end of the Mishna which says that if the son is born after Day 70 “he loses”, so the beginning of the Mishna says that if he is born by Day 70 “he loses nothing”.
 - **Q:** The Mishna says that if a son is born after Day 70 he loses. According to **Rav**, if the son is born on Day 71, since Day 71 counts as a day for the son as well, the nezirus for the son ends on Day 100, and therefore the person should “lose nothing” even when a son is born on Day 71!? **A:** The Mishna means that if a son is born “after, after” Day 70 – which means on Day 72 and forward – that is when he will lose and have to count the 30 days of nezirus in addition to the 100 days.
 - **Q:** If so, why does the Mishna say that if the son is born until Day 70 he doesn’t lose anything? The Mishna should say until Day 71!? Therefore, it must be that the Mishna holds that if the son is born at Day 71 he does lose. It must be that the Mishna cannot share the view of **Rav**.
 - **Q:** According to who did **Rav** say his Halacha? **A:** Maybe it is based on **Abba Shaul**, who says that regarding aveilus the 7th day counts as a day towards the shiva and as a day towards the shloshim. He would therefore similarly hold over here that the day the son is born can count for both periods of nezirus.
 - **Q:** It may be that **Abba Shaul** only holds that way there, because aveilus is D’Rabanan, but would not hold this way regarding nezirus, which is D’Oraisa!? **A:** Maybe **Rav** holds like **R’ Yose**, who says regarding a Korban Pesach, that a woman who is a “zavah ketanah”, and must observe a clean day before eating a korban, and that clean day is Erev Pesach, and at the time that the Korban Pesach is offered on her behalf she has been observing a clean day, but later on that day she sees blood, thus making that she cannot partake in the korban, **R’ Yose** says that she need not bring a Korban Pesach on Pesach Sheini. It must be that he says so, because he holds that the first part of the day when she was clean is counted as a day on which she is not considered to be tamei at all, and when she later sees blood, it is considered a separate day of seeing blood. Therefore, at the time the Pesach was brought she was clean and was counted as having brought the korban. We can say that this is just like **Rav** said, that the one day can be counted for two separate purposes.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A Braisa clearly says that **R' Yose** holds that the woman in this case would be considered as having been tamei the entire day regarding the halachos of tumah!? **A:** He holds the tumah is retroactive only D'Rabanan. It must be that way, because if not, why does he hold that the woman does not need to bring a Korbon Pesach on Pesach Sheini?
 - The Gemara says, it may be that he holds that the tumah is even retroactive D'Oraisa. The reason she does not need to bring another korbon is because we consider this to be a "hidden tumah", for which a person does not need to bring a korbon on Pesach Sheini.
 - We find, based on a statement of **R' Oshaya**, that he held like the first explanation, that **R' Yose** held the tumah is retroactive only D'Rabanan.
- **Q:** According to **R' Yose**, how can a woman ever be held as having 3 days of seeing blood, since he says that a morning when she does not see blood is considered as a "complete clean day"? **A:** Either the case would be where she had a flow of blood for 3 days straight, or the case would be where she saw blood from right before sunset and into the beginning of the night for 2 nights in a row. That would make it so that she never had a partial clean day.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HAREINI NAZIR!!!

-----Daf 10-----16-----

PEREK MI SHE'AMAR -- PEREK SHLISHI

MISHNA

- If someone says "I am hereby a nazir", he shaves his head (and brings the korbanos, etc.) on the 31st day. If he did so on the 30th day, he is yotzeh. If he said "I am hereby a nazir for 30 days", and he then shaves his head on Day 30, he is *not* yotzeh.
- If someone accepted 2 periods of nezirus on himself, he shaves his head for the conclusion of the first nezirus on Day 31, and for the second nezirus on Day 61. If he shaved for the first nezirus on Day 30, then he can shave for the second nezirus on Day 60. If, in this case he shaved for the second nezirus on Day 59, he is yotzeh.
 - This is the testimony that was given by **R' Papayus** – that if one accepted two periods of nezirus, and he shaved on Day 30, the second shaving should be done on Day 60, but if it was done on Day 59, he is yotzeh. This is because Day 30 is considered Day 1 for the second nezirus period (thereby making Day 59 the 30th day).
- If someone says "I am hereby a nazir" and then became tamei on Day 30, he loses all the days he has already counted and must observe another 30 days of nezirus. **R' Eliezer** says he need only wait 7 days to become tahor and can then continue with the concluding process for the nezirus (he holds that once even part of Day 30 has passed, he is no longer within the nezirus period).
 - If he said "I am hereby a nazir for 30 days" and then becomes tamei on Day 30, all would agree that he loses all the days he has already counted and must observe another 30 days of nezirus.
 - If he said "I am hereby a nazir for 100 days and became tamei on Day 100, he loses all the days he has already counted and must observe another 100 days of nezirus. **R' Eliezer** says he need only observe another 30 days of nezirus.
 - If he became tamei on Day 101, he need only observe another 30 days of nezirus. **R' Eliezer** says he need only wait 7 days to become tahor, and may then continue with the concluding process for the nezirus.

GEMARA

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Eliezer** says that when he becomes tamei on Day 30 (after accepting a regular period of nezirus) he need only wait 7 days, because he holds that whenever he becomes tamei after the completion of the nezirus term he need only wait the time it takes to become tahor.
 - **R' Eliezer** did not argue in the case where the person accepted a 30 day period of nezirus, and said that if this person became tamei on Day 30 he would have to observe another 30 days of nezirus. He holds this way in this case, because the person accepted 30 *complete* days of nezirus. Therefore, he remains in the term of nezirus for the entire 30 days.
 - Regarding the case of where the person accepted a nezirus of 100 days, and then became tamei on Day 100, and the machlokes between the **T"K and R' Eliezer**, this has all been explained in the Gemara earlier on Daf Hey and Vuv.

MISHNA

- If someone declared a nezirus while he was in a cemetery, even if he remains there for 30 days, his nezirus is not considered to have begun, and he therefore does not go through the process of bringing the korbos of a nazir who has become tamei.
 - If he left the cemetery, became tahor, and then reentered the cemetery, his nezirus is considered to have begun and he is therefore subject to the process of a nazir who has become tamei, and loses any days of nezirus that he has already counted before reentering the cemetery. **R' Eliezer** says, the pasuk says "v'hayamim harishonim yiplu". This teaches that upon becoming tamei he only loses the days of nezirus observed if there are at least 2 days that have been observed. If it is less than that, then as soon as he becomes tahor he picks up counting where he left off before becoming tamei.

GEMARA

- **R' Yochanan** said that if one accepts nezirus while in a cemetery, the nezirus takes effect (he would get malkus if he drinks wine, cuts his hair, or does not leave the cemetery). He holds that the nezirus is "floating" and takes effect as soon as he becomes tahor, without any further acceptance. **Reish Lakish** said that the nezirus does not take effect until he leaves the cemetery. He holds that a second declaration would have to be made when he becomes tahor, and if one is not made the nezirus will not take effect.
 - **Q: R' Yochanan** asked **Reish Lakish**, our Mishna says that one who accepted nezirus while in a cemetery need not bring the korbos of a nazir who became tamei. This suggests that otherwise the nezirus does take effect!? **A: Reish Lakish** answered, the Mishna means that this person is not subject at all to the halachos of tumah or korbos, because he is not a nazir at all.
 - **Q: A Braisa** says, if someone accepted nezirus while he is tamei, he may not cut his hair, drink wine, or become tamei to a meis, and if he does, he would get malkus. We see that the declaration makes the nezirus take effect!? **A: The Braisa** is referring to where the person became tahor and restated his acceptance of nezirus. If he doesn't do that, the nezirus does not take effect.
 - **Q: A Braisa** says, the only difference between a tamei person who accepts nezirus and a nazir who becomes tamei is that the first person has his 7th day counted towards his nezirus, whereas the latter person does not. Now, if **Reish Lakish** is correct, the nezirus has not taken effect, so why would the 7th day count towards the nezirus!?
 - Based on this, the Gemara will suggest a revised understanding of **Reish Lakish**.

-----Daf 7⁷---17-----

- **Mar bar R' Ashi** has a new understanding of the machlokes between **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish** in the case of where a tamei person (e.g. he is in standing in the cemetery) accepts nezirus upon himself. He says that all agree that the nezirus takes effect immediately and if the person drinks wine or cuts his hair he will get malkus. The machlokes is only regarding whether he would get malkus for ignoring a warning to leave the cemetery after accepting the nezirus. **R' Yochanan** says he would get malkus and **Reish Lakish** says that he would not.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Yochanan** asked **Reish Lakish**, our Mishna says that even if this person remains in the cemetery for 30 days his nezirus count does not begin and he therefore does not bring a korbon as a tamei nazir. This suggests that although he doesn't bring a korbon, he would get malkus!? **A: Reish Lakish** answered, since the next case of the Mishna says that if he left the cemetery and became tahor and then went back in he would have to bring a korbon, the first case of the Mishna also uses the concept of korbon and says he would not have to bring a korbon. However, the first part of the Mishna could have also said that he is not subject to malkus.
- **Q:** A Braisa says, the only difference between a tamei person who accepts nezirus and a nazir who becomes tamei is that the first person has his 7th day counted towards his nezirus, whereas the latter person does not. This suggests that regarding malkus they are the same (they would both be subject to malkus, which is what **R' Yochanan** said)!? **A:** The inference from the Braisa is that regarding the issur of cutting hair the two are alike. However regarding the issur of tumah they would be different.
 - **Q:** If they are different regarding malkus for tumah the Braisa should list that as a difference!?
A: The Braisa is dealing with creating the terms of the nezirus, not regarding violating the terms of the nezirus.
- **Q:** A Braisa says, if someone accepted nezirus while he is tamei, he may not cut his hair, drink wine, or become tamei to a meis, and if he does, he gets malkus. This is a clear **TEYUFTA** of **Reish Lakish**.
- **Q: Rava** asked, if a nazir is in a cemetery, does he need to remain there for a minimum amount of time before being subject to malkus?
 - **Q:** What is the case in this question? If the case is where he is being warned not to accept nezirus while he is in the cemetery, and he ignored the warning and accepted it anyway, why would he need to be there for a minimum period of time? He has ignored the warning!? **A:** The case must be where a nazir entered a cemetery while in a box, which prevents him from becoming tamei. Someone else then went and made a hole in the floor of the box, thereby allowing tumah to enter the box. **Rava's** question is, do we only require a minimum time for tumah when dealing with a person becoming tamei in the Beis Hamikdash, or does this concept even apply regarding nezirus as well?
 - The Gemara answers the question by saying **TEIKU**.
- **Q: R' Ashi** asked, if a person accepted nezirus while in a cemetery, is he required to shave his head as part of his taharah process? Do we say that a tahor nazir who became tamei must do so, but this person was never yet a tahor nazir, or do we say that there is no difference and he must shave his hair in this case as well? **A:** Our Mishna said that a person who accepts nezirus while in a cemetery does not bring the korbanos of a tamei nazir. This seems to suggest that he would have to shave his head.
 - The Gemara says this is no proof, because it may be that the Mishna is saying that the reason he does not bring the korbon is because he does not shave his head.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, the only difference between a tamei person who accepts nezirus and a nazir who becomes tamei is that the first person has his 7th day counted towards his nezirus, whereas the latter person does not. This suggests that regarding shaving their hair they are the same (they would both be required to shave their heads)!? **A:** The inference is that regarding *malkus* they are the same, not regarding shaving.
 - **Q:** If they are not the same regarding shaving their heads then the Braisa should list that as a difference between them!? **A:** When the Braisa says the only difference between them is regarding the seventh day, it means to refer to all matters of the 7th day, which includes the difference in regard to shaving of their heads.
 - **Q:** A Braisa uses a kal v'chomer to teach that the days that a nazir is a metzora do not count towards his days of nezirus. The Braisa says that if a person became a nazir in a cemetery, which is a situation in which his hair is fit to be shaved for nezirus, yet his days of tumah don't count towards his nezirus, then surely a nazir who is a metzora, whose hair is not fit to be cut for nezirus (it will be cut for the metzora taharah process) will not have his metzora days count for his nezirus. Now, presumably the Braisa means that the nazir who became a nazir in the cemetery will have his hair shaved when he becomes tahor from this tumah. This can answer the question of **R' Ashi**!? **A:** The Braisa means that his hair is

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

shaved for nezirus at the end of his term of nezirus, not for the tumah. This must be what the Braisa is referring to, because if it is referring to shaving for tumah, then how is the metzorah different, since he must also shave his hair as well!

- The Gemara says this is no proof, because the Braisa may be referring to shaving for the tumah, which would still be considered as shaving for nezirus purposes, whereas the metzorah shaves his hair for non-nezirus purposes.
- A Braisa clearly says that we learn from a pasuk that a tahor nazir who became tamei must shave his head when he becomes tahor again. However, a nazir that became a nazir while tamei would not have to shave his head for his taharah process. We clearly see from this Braisa the answer to **R' Ashi's** question, **SHEMA MINAH**.

-----Daf 17-----18-----

- **Q:** The Gemara earlier quoted a Braisa that said, the only difference between a tamei person who accepts nezirus and a nazir who becomes tamei is that the first person has his 7th day counted towards his nezirus, whereas the latter person does not. Who is the Tanna of that Braisa? **A: R' Chisda** said, the Braisa follows **Rebbi**, who says that a nazir who became tamei begins counting on the 8th day after beginning his taharah process, However, **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** says he begins counting on the 7th day. We find their views stated in a Braisa.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that a nazir who became tamei multiple times need only bring one korbon for the tumah. Who is the Tanna of this Mishna? **A: R' Chisda** said, this Mishna follows **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda**, who says that the nazir begins to count on the 7th day of the taharah process. The Mishna is saying that if he becomes tamei on the 7th day again, since he cannot bring a korbon until the 8th day, a new korbon obligation does not set in. However, according to **Rebbi**, since he does not begin counting until the 8th day, if he would become tamei again on the 7th day it would not be referred to as becoming tamei “again”, since he is still in the old period of tumah. It also can't be talking about where he became tamei on the 8th day, because since he is able to bring a korbon on the 8th day, if he were to become tamei on the 8th day he *would* be obligated to bring an additional set of korbanos.
 - **Rebbi's** view is based on the pasuk that says “v'chiper alav” (referring to the bringing of the korbon) and *then* says “v'kidash es rosho” (which refers to his being a nazir again). **R' Yose** says, the pasuk ends off and says “bayom hahu”, which is extra, and teaches that he begins counting his nezirus on the 7th day. **Rebbi** says the words “bayom hahu” teach that he begins counting on the 8th day even if he did not bring his korbon on that day.
 - **Q:** Why does **R' Chisda** have to say that the Mishna cannot follow **Rebbi**? Since **Rebbi** holds that he begins counting on the 8th day, presumably this means he begins counting the night leading into the 8th day. If so, the case of the Mishna could be where he became tamei again the night leading into the 8th day, which is a new period of nezirus, but since it is not yet considered time to bring the korbon (which can't be brought until the morning) becoming tamei then would not bring about an additional korbon obligation!? Since this explanation was not given, does that mean that **R' Chisda** must hold that even the night before a korbon can be brought is already considered to be the time for the korbon, which is why becoming tamei even then would require an additional set of korbanos to be brought? **A: R' Ada bar Ahava** said, if we say **Rebbi** holds that the time for the korbon is not considered to come until the morning, he would also hold that the count for the nezirus cannot begin until the morning. And, if he holds that the nezirus count begins at night, it is because he holds that the time for the korbon is considered to begin at night.
- A Braisa says: **R' Eliezer** holds that if a nazir becomes tamei again on the 7th day of his taharah process, he is not obligated to bring an additional korbon. However, if he becomes tamei on the 8th day (when he may already bring the korbon) he would be obligated to bring an additional set of korbanos. The **Chachomim** say, he is only required to bring additional korbanos if he became tamei after having actually offered his Korbon Chatas. Before that time, becoming tamei again does not require him to bring additional korbanos, because only the bringing of

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

the chatas prevents him from beginning his count, whereas the bringing of his asham does not prevent him from doing so. **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yochanan ben Broka** holds that just as the chatas prevents him from beginning his count, the asham prevents him from doing so as well (therefore, if he becomes tamei before both these korbanos are brought, he would not be obligated to bring additional korbanos).

- **R' Eliezer** says the extra words in the pasuk “*bayom hahu*” teach that his nezirus begins on Day 7. The **Rabanan** say “*bayom hahu*” teaches that it begins even though the asham was not yet brought. **R' Yishmael** says “*bayom hahu*” teaches that the nezirus begins even though the olah was not brought.
 - The **Rabanan** hold that the olah would not prevent the nezirus from beginning, because an olah is a gift, and does not bring kaparah.
 - **Q:** The pasuk mentions the bringing of the chatas and the olah, it then mentions beginning the nezirus, and then mentions the bringing of the asham. This alone should be enough of a reason to decide that the asham does not prevent the count from beginning, so why do the **Rabanan** require the extra word of “*bayom hahu*”? **A:** A Braisa says that the order of the pasuk alone would not be enough to teach that, because we would say that just like everywhere else we find that the asham is essential to the process, we would say that the same should be here. Therefore, we need another way of learning that the asham is not essential for this purpose.