



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Nazir, Daf ט' – Daf כה

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 ט'---19-----

- A Braisa says, if a woman accepted nezirus, became tamei, separated her korbanos for taharah, and her husband was then meifer the neder of nezirus, she still brings the chatas bird, but not the olah or the ashm.
 - **R' Chisda** said, this Braisa follows the view of **R' Yishmael**, who said that the olah bird is essential and brought as a kaparah. That would be the reason why it is not brought when the husband was meifer the nezirus. According to the others, including the **Rabanan**, the olah is not brought as a kaparah and could therefore be brought even after a hafarah.
 - **Q:** If the Braisa holds that the hafarah removes the nezirus retroactively, then why does she bring the chatas bird? If the Braisa holds that the hafarah removes it from this point on, why shouldn't she bring the olah and ashm? **A:** The Braisa holds that the hafarah removes the nezirus retroactively. The reason she still must bring a chatas is because **R' Yishmael** (the Tanna of the Braisa) holds like **R' Elazar Hakapar**, that every nazir is considered to be a sinner, because they have deprived themselves from things that are mutar (wine). Therefore, since this woman has done so, she must still bring the chatas as a kaparah.

YATZAH V'NICHNAS OLIN LO MIN HAMINYAN

- **Q:** Just because he left the cemetery he may begin counting for his nezirus? **A: Shmuel** explained, the Mishna is discussing where he left and underwent the taharah process.
 - **Q:** The Mishna seems to say he may begin counting *because* he walked back in to the cemetery. If he didn't walk back in he wouldn't begin counting for his nezirus!? **A:** The Gemara means to say, certainly if he became tahor he begins to count. Moreover, if he goes back into the cemetery, he still begins the count, which would therefore require him to bring korbanos when he becomes tamei this time, as a full-fledged nazir.
 - **R' Kahana and R' Assi** asked **Rav**, why didn't you explain this to us as **Shmuel** did? **Rav** answered, I did not think you needed this to be explained.

R' ELIEZER OMER LO BO BAYOM SHENE'EMAR...

- **Ulla** said, **R' Eliezer** only said this Halacha (that there must be at least 2 days of tahara for a period of tumah to remove the days kept as nezirus) regarding a person who accepted nezirus while tamei and then became tahor for one day. However, a tahor nazir who became tamei and then became tahor again, would lose all counted days even if he had only one day of taharah before becoming tamei. **Rava** explained, this is because the pasuk used in **R' Eliezer's** drasha says "ki tamei nizro", which teaches that this drasha (and the Halacha he learns from it) only applies when the nezirus came about in a period of tumah.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says that if a person accepts a 100 day nezirus and becomes tamei on the first day, he does not lose the day already counted, based on the drasha of the pasuk (as explained by **R' Eliezer**). From here we can clearly see that **R' Eliezer** says his Halacha even when it is not a case of a person who accepted the nezirus while he is tamei!? This is a **TEYUFTA** of **Ulla**.
- **Q: R' Pappa** asked **Abaye**, at what point would **R' Eliezer** say that he loses his counted days upon becoming tamei – is it when he becomes tamei anytime after the first day is complete, or only after the second day is complete as well? He didn't know the answer, so he went and asked **Rava**, who said that the pasuk uses the word "yiplu", which suggests a slight amount of time, and teaches that as long as one day has passed when he became tamei, he loses all days counted.
 - We need the pasuk's word of "yiplu" and the word of "yamim". If it would only say "yamim" we would think that at least two days of the nezirus term must pass before his becoming tamei. If it would only say "yiplu", we would think that even if he became tamei on the first day he would lose what was counted, etc.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

MISHNA

- If someone accepted a long period of nezirus when he was outside Eretz Yisrael and observed the full term outside Eretz Yisrael and then entered Eretz Yisrael, **B”S** say he must observe another nezirus of 30 days, and **B”H** say he must observe the full length of the originally accepted nezirus.
 - It once happened that Hilni Hamalka promised 7 years of nezirus if her son were to return safely from war. When he returned, she kept 7 years of nezirus. She then went up to Eretz Yisrael and **B”H** paskened that she must keep another 7 years of nezirus. At the end of those 7 years she became tamei and had to keep another 7 years of nezirus, totaling 21 years of nezirus. **R’ Yehuda** said she only kept 14 years of nezirus.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Maybe we can say that the machlokes is that **B”S** say that the **Rabanan** were only goizer on the land of chutz laaretz as being tamei (which is a more lenient tumah, and they are therefore meikel), whereas **B”H** hold that the **Rabanan** were even goizer that the air of chutz laaretz is tamei (which makes for a more stringent gezeirah, and the reason they are more machmir)? **A:** We can say that all agree that the gezirah of tumah was only on the land of chutz laaretz, and the machlokes is that **B”S** say we penalize a person who accepts nezirus outside Eretz Yisrael and require him to keep an additional 30 days, whereas **B”H** say we penalize him to the full extent of the original nezirus.

-----Daf 20-----

MAASEH B’HILNI HAMALKA...

- **Q:** Does **R’ Yehuda** agree that she became tamei, but says she only observed 14 years because he follows **B”S**, who say that she only needed to observe 30 days after observing the nezirus outside Eretz Yisrael, or does he follow **B”H** and says she only kept 14 years because she never became tamei? **A:** It must be that he felt that she never became tamei, because if he holds that she did and he follows **B”S**, he should have said that she was a nezirah for 14 years and 30 days.
 - In fact, it must be that he holds this way, because **R’ Yehuda** holds like **R’ Eliezer** who says that a nazir who becomes tamei on his last day must only keep an additional 30 days. If so, she would have had to been a nezirah for 7 years, plus 30 days (for her becoming tamei), plus an additional 30 days (per **B”S**).

MISHNA

- If there are two sets of witnesses who are testifying about a person: one set says the person accepted 2 terms of nezirus and the other set says the person accepted 5 terms of nezirus, and the person himself denies having done either, **B”S** say the sets of witnesses contradict each other and therefore neither set is believed. **B”H** say that both sets agree that there were at least 2 periods of nezirus accepted, so he must keep 2 periods of nezirus.

GEMARA

- Our Mishna does not follow the following Braisa. The Braisa says, **R’ Yishmael the son of R’ Yochanan ben Broka** says that **B”S and B”H** agree that when there are 2 sets of witnesses, like in our Mishna, the person would be required to observe 2 periods of nezirus. The machlokes is when there is one set of witnesses, and one of the witnesses says the person accepted 5 periods of nezirus and the other says he accepted 2 periods. In that case **B”S** say we don’t accept the testimony at all, and **B”H** say the testimony of 5 includes the testimony of 2, so we accept the testimony of 2 periods of nezirus.
 - **Rav** said, all agree that we would not accept the testimony, and there would be no nezirus, in a case where the witnesses counted.
 - **R’ Chama** asked **R’ Chisda**, what does **Rav** mean? If he is referring to a case where one said “5 periods and not 2” and the other said “2 periods and not 5”, it is certain that they contradict each other and the testimony would not be accepted. Rather, the case must be where one witness said the person accepted “one and two periods” and the other witness said the person

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

accepted “three, four, and five periods”. **R’ Chama** said that he would not agree with **Rav** in this case. It may be that we understand the one who says “3, 4, and 5” as not contradicting the one who said “1 and 2”. Instead, since he was mentioning the larger numbers he didn’t bother to mention the smaller numbers.

- In Eretz Yisrael they said like **R’ Chama**, and said that there is no contradiction when the witnesses counted.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK MI SHE’AMAR!!!

PEREK MI SHE’AMAR II -- PEREK REVI’I

MISHNA

- If someone says “I am hereby a nazir”, and a friend who hears this says “And I”, and another friend who heard this says “And I”, they all become nezirim. If the first person is somehow released from his neder to become a nazir, the other people become released as well. If the last person becomes released from his neder to become a nazir, the other two remain obligated to their neder.
- If someone says “I am hereby a nazir”, and a friend who hears this says “My mouth is like his mouth and my hair is like his hair”, he also becomes a nazir.
- If someone says “I am hereby a nazir”, and his wife heard and said “And I”, the person can be meifer the neder of his wife and can confirm his own neder. If a woman says “I am hereby a nazira” and her husband says “And I”, he can no longer be meifer her neder.
- If someone says to his wife “I am hereby a nazir, and you?”, and she responds by saying “Amen”, he can be meifer her neder and can confirm his own neder. If a woman says to her husband “I am hereby a nazira, and you?”, and he responds by saying “Amen”, he can no longer be meifer her neder.

-----Daf נב--21-----

GEMARA

- **Reish Lakish** said to **R’ Yehuda Nesiah**, the Halacha of the Mishna is only in a case where the “And I” were all said “toch kidei dibur” of the original nezirus declaration. “Toch kidei dibur” is the amount of time that it takes to say “shalom alecha rebbi”. **R’ Yehuda Nesiah** said, that doesn’t give time to the talmid who must greet his rebbi and still wants to say “And I”. Therefore, the Halacha of the Mishna applies for the length of time of “toch kidei dibur” plus the time it takes to say “And I” (according to **Reish Lakish** the Mishna would allow up to 3 people to say “And I”, since that is what can be said in the time of “toch kidei dibur”, and according to **R’ Yehuda**, it seems that even a fourth person would be able to join as well).
 - A Braisa says like **Reish Lakish**.
 - **Q:** Maybe our Mishna can be brought as a proof to **Reish Lakish** as well. The Mishna gives the example of 2 people saying “And I”. According to **R’ Yehuda** there can be up to 4 people, so the Mishna which limits it must follow **Reish Lakish**!? **A:** It may be that the Mishna would agree that there can be up to 4, but it is not usual for a Mishna to list more cases than necessary, so it only gives the case of 2 people.
 - **Q:** Why not only give the case of one person? **A:** Since the end of the Mishna discusses where either the first person had his neder annulled, or where the last person had his neder annulled, in that case there must be three people. Therefore, the first part of the Mishna gives the case of 3 people (the original acceptance and 2 responders) as well.
- **Q:** When a person says “And I”, does he mean to connect his statement with the person immediately prior to him in the chain, or does he mean to connect with the original declaration of nezirus? The difference would be whether the statement “And I” must be made “toch kidei dibur” of the original declaration or “toch kidei dibur” of the immediately prior statement of “And I”. **A:** We can answer from our Mishna. The Mishna gives the example of 2 people saying “And I”. If each person means to connect to the immediately prior statement, the Mishna could have given an example with many more statements than just two!

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The Gemara says, this is no proof, because it is not usual for a Mishna to list more cases than necessary, so it only gives the case of 2 people.
 - Why not give the case of only one person? **A:** Since the end of the Mishna discusses where either the first person had his neder annulled, or where the last person had his neder annulled, in that case there must be three people. Therefore, the first part of the Mishna gives the case of 3 people (the original acceptance and 2 responders) as well.
- **Q:** Maybe we can answer the question from our Mishna. The Mishna says, if the first person's neder (the original declaration) is annulled, all the other people are released from their nedarim as well. This seems to suggest that if the second person's neder was annulled there would be no effect on anyone else. We see that everyone must mean to connect only to the original declaration!? **A:** It may be that each person connects with the person immediately prior. The reason the Mishna gave the example of where the first person's neder was annulled is because it wanted to be able to make the statement of "they are *all* released", which can only be said when the first person's neder was annulled.
- **Q:** The Mishna says, if the neder of the last person was annulled, no one is released from their neder. Now, this suggests that if the middle person's neder would be annulled, those following him would become released. We see that everyone must mean to connect to the person prior to himself!? **A:** It may be that everyone means to connect to the original declaration. When the Mishna says "acharon" it means a later person, not the last person, and is actually referring to the middle person. The Mishna is therefore saying that if the middle person is released from his neder, it does not release anyone else from their neder.
- **A:** A Braisa clearly says, if a middle person is released from his neder, anyone that follows him is also released, and anyone prior in the chain is not released. From here we clearly see that a person means to connect to the person immediately prior to him in the chain. **SHEMA MINAH.**

HAREINI NAZIR V'SHAMA CHAVEIRO V'AMAR PI K'PIV USE'ARI KISARO...

- **Q:** A Braisa says that a statement of accepting nezirus onto a body part is only effective when the body part is something which the person can't live without (his head, his liver, etc.), so why does this statement regarding his mouth and his hair create nezirus!? **A:** **R' Yehuda** said, the case is where he says "Let my mouth be like his mouth regarding not drinking wine", or "My hair like his hair regarding not cutting it".

HAREINI NEZIRAH V'SHAMA BAALAH V'AMAR V'ANI EINI YACHOL L'HAFEIR

- **Q:** Does a husband's hafarah retroactively uproot the neder, or does it dismiss it from the point in time of the hafarah and on? The difference would be where a woman accepts nezirus, her friend overheard that and said "And I", and the first woman's husband was then meifer. If it retroactively uproots it, then even the second woman is not a nezirah. If it dismisses it at the time of the hafarah, the second woman would remain a nezirah. **A:** Our Mishna says, if a woman accepts nezirus and her husband says "And I", he can no longer be meifer (because that would take away his own nezirus as well, and a person cannot release himself from a vow). Now, if the hafarah only dismisses going forward, why can't he be meifer to release his wife, since his nezirus would anyway remain in place!? It must be that the hafarah uproots retroactively.
 - The Gemara says, this is no proof. It may be that the hafarah only dismisses going forward. The reason he can't be meifer is that by saying "And I" it is as if he confirmed her neder, and the Halacha is that once a husband confirms his wife's neder, he can no longer be meifer without first annulling his confirmation.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says, if a woman accepts nezirus and designates korbanos for the nezirus, and her husband is then meifer, if they were his animals, they lose their kedusha and are considered fully chullin. If they were her animals, the chatas must be left to die. Now, if the hafarah uproots the nezirus retroactively, then even when the animals belonged to her they should lose their kedusha and become chullin!? It must be that hafarah dismisses the neder from the time of the hafarah and on!? **A:** It may be that the hafarah uproots retroactively. The reason why the chatas must be left to die is because it is given the status of a chatas whose owner has died, in which case the Halacha is that the chatas must be left to die.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says, if a woman accepts nezirus and then drinks wine or becomes tamei, she is subject to malkus. Now, if the case is where the husband was not meifer, the Mishna would be obvious!? It must

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

be that the case is where the husband was meifer, and we see that the hafarah only dismisses from now and on!? **A:** It may be that a hafarah uproots retroactively, and the Mishna is giving a case where the husband was not meifer. The reason the Mishna brings the obvious case is to contrast with the next part of the Mishna which says that if the husband was meifer without the wife's knowledge and she drank wine or became tamei, she does not get malkus.

-----Daf כב--22-----

- The Gemara is trying to determine whether a husband's hafarah dismisses the neder from that point and forward or whether it uproots it retroactively.
 - The Gemara now says, maybe we can bring a proof from a Braisa. The Braisa says, if a woman accepted nezirus and then became tamei, and her husband was then meifer her neder, she must still bring the chatas bird, but does not bring the olah bird. Now, if the hafarah only dismisses the neder at this point in time, she should have to bring the olah as well (since she was a nezirah who became tamei)!
 - **Q:** The alternative is that the hafarah uproots it retroactively. However, if that is true, why does she bring a chatas bird (since she was never a nezirah)!? **A:** In truth the hafarah uproots the neder retroactively. The reason she must bring the chatas is because the Braisa follows **R' Elazar Hakapar**, who says that every nazir is considered a sinner since he deprives himself of permissible wine, and therefore needs a kaparah (which is why she needs the bird chatas as a kaparah).
 - A Braisa clearly says that if a woman accepted nezirus, and another woman then says "And I", and the first woman's husband is then meifer his wife's neder, the first woman is not a nezirah, but the second woman is. We clearly see that the hafarah only dismisses the neder from this point forward.
 - The Braisa continues, and says that **R' Shimon** says, if the second woman said "I am like you", then she is also released from her neder when the first woman becomes released from her own neder.
 - **Mar Zutra the son of R' Mari** said, based on the first part of this Braisa we can answer a question of **Rami bar Chama**, who asked, if someone prohibits something to himself "like the meat of a Shelamim", does he mean to compare it to a Shelamim in its original, assur state, or to a Shelamim when it becomes mutar to eat? From the Braisa we see that he means to compare it to the original status, as the Braisa says that the second woman means to compare herself to the first woman in her nezirus status.
 - The Gemara says this is not a good comparison, because a Shelamim retains kedusha even when it may be eaten, and therefore can be thought of as the subject of a neder. However, a woman after her nezirus was mufar is no longer a nezirah at all, and could therefore not be the basis of another woman's neder.
 - **Q:** If a woman accepts nezirus and another woman responds and says "I am hereby a nezirah in your footsteps", and the first woman's nezirus then becomes mufar, do we say that the second woman is also released because her acceptance was to mirror the status of the first woman, or do we say that she meant to mirror her status as a nezirah, and she therefore remains a nezirah? **A:** Our Mishna said, that when a woman accepts nezirus and her husband says "And I" he cannot be meifer (because that would dismiss his own nezirus). Now, when a husband says "And I" it is the equivalent of someone else saying "in your footsteps" since he realizes that he has the power to be meifer and in that way may dismiss the nezirus. So, if a person refers to the original status, why can't he be meifer for her, since it would anyway not effect his status!? It must be that the husband refers to the status overall, and similarly, the woman who says "in your footsteps" must refer to the status overall, and therefore, if the first woman becomes released from her neder, this woman would become released as well.
 - The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. It may be that a woman means to refer only to the original status. The reason why the husband in our Mishna cannot be meifer is

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

because his statement of “And I” is considered to be a confirmation of his wife’s neder. That is why he can no longer be meifer unless he were to first annul the confirmation.

HAREINI NAZIR V’AHT V’AMRA AMEIN...

- **Q:** A Braisa says, if a man said to his wife “I am hereby a nazir, and you?” , and she responds “Amen” they both become nezirim. If she doesn’t respond “Amen”, they both are not nezirim, because he made his neder dependent on her acceptance of the neder as well. It seems that in the first case he would not be able to be meifer his wife’s nezirus, which contradicts what our Mishna said!? **A: R’ Yehuda** said, we must change the Braisa to read “he may be meifer her nezirus and must keep his own nezirus”. **A2: Abaye** said, the Braisa is discussing where the husband said “I am hereby a nazir, and you”, as a statement, which we understand him to mean that he is making his neder dependent on hers. In the Mishna he says “I am hereby a nazir, and you?”, as a question. This is why he can be meifer hers, but must keep his.

-----Daf לז-----23-----

MISHNA

- If a woman accepts nezirus and then drinks wine or becomes tamei, she gets malkus. If her husband was meifer her nezirus without her knowledge, and she drank wine or became tamei, she does not get malkus. **R’ Yehuda** says she would not get malkus D’Oraisa, but she would get malkus D’Rabanan.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “ishah hafeiram vaHashem yislach lah”. This refers to a woman who is unaware that her husband has been meifer her neder, and she nevertheless transgresses the neder. The pasuk teaches that this woman needs a kaparah. When **R’ Akiva** would reach this pasuk he would cry and say, if someone who intended to do an aveirah but did not do it, needs a kaparah, how much more so someone who intends to do the aveirah and actually does do it! Similarly, the pasuk says that if someone is unsure that he did an aveirah he must bring an asham taluy as a kaparah for his aveirah. If someone who did not intend to do an aveirah, but ultimately did one, as in the case where he thought he was eating kosher fats but may have eaten cheilev (there was one piece there and he thought it was kosher), needs a kaparah, how much more so is a kaparah needed for someone who intends to do the aveirah and actually does it! **Issi ben Yehuda** said, this pasuk is teaching that if someone who is unsure if he did an aveirah, such as in a case where there are two pieces of fats – one kosher and one non-kosher – and he ate one thinking it was kosher, must bring a korbon, because he needs a kaparah, how much more so is a kaparah needed for someone who intends to do an aveirah and actually does it!
 - All the cases in the Braisa are needed. If we would just say the case of the woman, we would think only she needs a kaparah, because she intended to do an aveirah. If we would just say the second case we would say that there a kaparah is needed, because an aveirah may have been committed. If we would say these 2 cases, we would say that a kaparah is only enough for these 2 cases (the woman didn’t do an actual aveirah and the second case didn’t have a definite issur there), but in the third case where there was a definite issur present, maybe there is no form of kaparah. That’s why all 3 cases are needed.
 - **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R’ Yochanan** said, the pasuk says “The roads of Hashem are straight, the tzaddikim walk in them and the resha’im stumble in them”. This refers to two people doing the same action with different results. For example, one person eating the Korbon Pesach for the sake of the mitzvah, and another person eating it when he is beyond full.
 - **Reish Lakish** asked, this second person has not done the mitzvah in its best form, but he can’t be referred to as a rasha!? Rather, the example would be where a man is in a dark room with his wife and his sister and has bi’ah with one of them. If he ends up with his wife, that would be an example of the “tzadikim walking in them” and if he ends up with his sister, that would be an example of a rasha stumbling in it.
 - The Gemara asks, this would be an example of 2 distinct roads (the wife and the sister), not one road as referred to in the pasuk!? Rather, the example would be the story of Lot and his 2 daughters. The daughters had bi’ah with their father for proper reasons (they thought the world was destroyed and had to carry on the human race), whereas Lot didn’t have proper intention

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

and would be the rasha who stumbles on the road. **R' Yochanan** said, we see from the verbiage in the pasuk that Lot was steeped in znus.

- **Q:** Lot was forced, so how can he be called a rasha? **A: R' Yose bar R' Choni** taught, there is a dot over the letter “vuv” in the story, which teaches that Lot realized what happened when he awoke after the first night, and he therefore should not have allowed himself to drink wine the next night.
- **Ulla** said, Tamar was mezaneh and Zimri was mezaneh. Tamar had good intentions and therefore she bore kings. Zimri had bad intentions and therefore caused the death of tens of thousands.
- **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, an aveirah done with good intention is greater than a mitzvah done with improper intention.
 - **Q: R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** has taught that a mitzvah should be done even for ulterior motives, because it will lead to the mitzvah being done for the proper reason!? **A:** Rather, an aveirah done with good intention is equally as good as a mitzvah done with ulterior motives.
 - We learn this from Yael, who the pasuk compares to Sarah, Rivka, Rachel, and Leah, and Yael's greatness was from her having been mezaneh with Sisra with the good intention of killing him and saving the Yidden.
- We stated above that **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said that one should do mitzvos even with ulterior motives, because it will lead to doing them with the proper intentions. We see this is correct, because Balak brought 42 korbanos with bad intentions, and yet he was rewarded for it by having Rus as a descendent.
- **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, we learn from the story of Lot and his daughters that Hashem does not withhold reward even for one's use of finer speech. Regarding the older daughter, who called her son Moav (meaning “from my father”) and announced to all that he was the product of incest, Hashem told Moshe that the Yidden cannot fight a war with the nation of Moav, but this seems to allow the Yidden to harass them. Regarding the son of the younger daughter, Amon, whose name does not announce to all that he was the product of incest, Hashem told Moshe that the Yidden may not even harass the nation of Amon.
- **R' Chiya bar Avin in the name of R' Yehoshua ben Korcha** said, a person should always try to do a mitzvah as soon as possible, because the older daughter of Lot, who did the “mitzvah” (in their minds it was a righteous act) one night earlier merited to have Jewish kings come from her descendants four generations before the descendant of the younger daughter became a Jewish king.

-----Daf 72-----24-----

MISHNA

- If a woman makes a neder of nezirus and designates animals for her korbanos that she must bring at the conclusion of her nezirus, and her husband is then meifer her neder, if the animals belonged to him, they lose all their kedusha. If the animals belonged to her, the chatas must be left to die, the olah is brought as a voluntary olah, and the shelamim is brought as a voluntary shelamim. The shelamim is treated like the shelamim of a nazir in that it may only be eaten for one day, but it is unlike the shelamim of a nazir in that she does not need to bring the various breads with the shelamim that are typically brought along with the shelamim of a nazir.
 - If she had set aside money to buy korbanos and the money was unspecified (as to specifically which korbon the various coins were), the money is used for voluntary olos tzibbur. If the money was specified as to which korbon, then the money for the chatas must be thrown into the Yam Hamelach and it is assur to benefit from, but is not subject to me'ilah. The money for the olah should be used to bring an olah, and it is subject to me'ilah. The money for the shelamim should be used to bring a voluntary shelamim, and this shelamim may be eaten for only one day, but does not require the various breads typically brought with the shelamim of a nazir.

GEMARA

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The Gemara assumes that a husband is not obligated to give animals for his wife's korbanos obligations, which is why if he gives her animals the Mishna still refers to them as being "his". The Gemara therefore asks, who is the Tanna of our Mishna who holds that a husband is not obligated to give animals for his wife's obligation? **A: R' Chisda** said it is the shita of the **Rabanan**, because we find in a Braisa that **R' Yehuda** clearly says that a husband must provide for his wife's korbanos obligations. **Rava** said, the Mishna can even follow **R' Yehuda**, because even he would hold that he is only obligated to give her animals for a korban that she ultimately must bring. In this case, since he was meifer, she no longer must bring the korban. Therefore, the animal goes back to him and is considered to be "his".
 - **Others** say that **R' Chisda** said the Mishna follows **R' Yehuda**, because he holds that a husband is only obligated to give her animals for a korban that she ultimately must bring. In this case, since he was meifer, she no longer must bring the korban. Therefore, the animal goes back to him and is considered to be "his". However, according to the **Rabanan** he need not supply her with any animals for her obligations. So, the only reason he would give her animals is if he voluntarily decided to do so. If he did so, they would no longer be considered "his". **Rava** said the Mishna may even follow the **Rabanan**, because when he voluntarily decides to give her animals for her korbanos he does so only for korbanos that she ultimately must bring. In this case, since he was meifer, she no longer must bring the korban. Therefore, the animal goes back to him and is considered to be "his".

IHM SHELAH HUYSAH B'HEMTA CHATAS TAMUS V'OLAH TIKRAV

- **Q:** The rule is that a husband owns anything that is acquired by his wife. If so, how can she have her own animals? **A: R' Pappa** said, we are talking about animals that were bought with the money she is given to buy herself food. That money becomes totally hers and the animals are therefore considered to be totally hers as well. **A2:** The animals were given to her by someone else on the condition that her husband has no rights to them. In that case as well, the animals would belong exclusively to her.

HA'OLAH TIKRAV OLAH V'HASHLAMIM TIKRAV...

- **Shmuel** asked **Avuha bar Ihi** to tell him all cases of a nazir's shelamim that are brought without the breads. He answered the cases are: 1) his, 2) hers, 3) after death, and 4) after kaparah.
 - The case of "hers" is the case of our Mishna.
 - The case of "his" is where a person declares his son to be a nazir and the son or relatives protest to the declaration. If the father had designated money for a shelamim, the money is used to bring a shelamim that is brought without breads.
 - The case of "after death" is stated in a Mishna which says that a nazir who dies before bringing his korbanos and he had designated money for the korbanos, the money designated for the shelamim is to be used to bring a shelamim that is brought without the breads.
 - The case of "after kaparah" (where the owner used a different animal and has already gotten his kaparah) is based on the logic that this is the same as a shelamim whose owner has died – the animals in both cases are no longer fit for a kaparah. Therefore, they are used for a shelamim that is brought without breads.
 - **Q:** There is another case of such a shelamim – namely the case where the shelamim of a nazir was brought in an improper way (e.g. with the wrong intention or at the wrong age), in which case the halacha is that it does not suffice for his obligation, but it is brought without the accompanying breads!?
A: The list was only meant to include cases in which the procedures were properly followed.

-----Daf 72-----25-----

MEIS V'HAYU LO MAOS STUMIN YIPLU L'NEDEVA

- **Q:** There is chatas money mixed in, so how can it be used for voluntary korbanos? **A: R' Yochanan** said, there is a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai that says that the unspecified money designated for a nazir's korbanos are to be used for voluntary olos of the tzibbur. **Reish Lakish** said, we learn from a pasuk that the leftover of a neder should be used for these voluntarily olos. Nezirus is an example of this neder.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** According to **R' Yochanan** we can understand why the money can be used for this purpose only when the money was unspecified with regard to which korban it would be used for, because that is what was taught by the Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai. However, according to **Reish Lakish** who learns from the pasuk, why doesn't he learn that even money that was specified should be used for this purpose? **A: Rava** said, that cannot be said, because we have a Braisa of **R' Yishmael** that teaches differently. The Braisa learns from a pasuk that the offspring and temurah of olos and shelamim should be brought to the Beis Hamikdash. One would think they should be brought there to be left to die. The pasuk therefore says "v'asisa olosecha habasar v'hadam", to teach that the offspring and temurah should be dealt with as the actual korbanos themselves. We would think that the same should be for the offspring and temurah of a chatas and ashram, so the pasuk says "rak", which teaches that this is only so for an olah and shelamim. **R' Akiva** says we don't need this pasuk, because another pasuk already says "Asham hu", which teaches that only the original ashram is offered on the Mizbe'ach.
 - **Q:** Why would we think that the offspring or temurah of the olah and the shelamim are left to die? We have a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai that by a chatas they are left to die, but not by an olah or shelamim!? **A:** If not for the pasuk we would say that the offspring or temurah of a chatas can be left to die anywhere, but the offspring or temurah of an olah or shelamim must be brought to the Beis Hamikdash and left to die there. The pasuk teaches that they are not left to die altogether.
 - **Q:** How could we think that the offspring and temurah of a chatas are not left to die? The Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai teaches that they must be left to die!? **A:** The pasuk teaches regarding an ashram, which is not included in the Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai.
 - **Q:** There is another Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai which says that for any reason that a chatas would have to be left to die, an ashram would have to be left to pasture, get a mum, and be redeemed (but clearly may not be offered on the Mizbe'ach), so why would we need a pasuk to teach this? **A:** The pasuk teaches that if someone goes ahead and offers these on the Mizbe'ach anyway, he would have transgressed an asei.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Akiva**, why is an additional pasuk needed to teach that the ashram is not offered, since we already know this from the Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai, stated above!? **A:** In truth, we learn it from the Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai. The pasuk is needed for the halacha of **Rav**, who said that once the ashram has been relegated to grazing until it gets a mum, if it was then offered as an olah (before it got a mum) it would be a valid olah (even though it should never have been offered in the first place). However, if it was offered as an olah before being relegated to grazing, it would not be a valid olah.