



# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## Maseches Nazir, Daf נז – Daf יד

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 נז---61-----

### PEREK HAKUSIM EIN LAHEM -- PEREK TESI'U

#### MISHNA

- Kusim (goyim) are not subject to the halachos of nezirus (accepting nezirus upon themselves has no consequence). Women and slaves (non-Jewish slaves owned by Jews) are subject to nezirus. There is a stringency of a woman nezira over a slave who is a nazir, in that a slave may be forced by his master to violate his nezirus, whereas a woman may not be forced to do so.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that goyim are not subject to nezirus? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding nezirus says “daber ehl Bnei Yisrael”, which comes to exclude goyim, and continues “v’amarta aleihem”, which comes to include slaves.
  - **Q:** Why do we need a pasuk to include slaves, when we know that any mitzvah that a woman is obligated in, a slave is obligated in as well!? **A:** **Rava** said, the pasuk regarding nedarim says “lessor issar ahl nafsho”, which would suggest that only someone who “owns” himself may make a neder, and a slave, therefore, may not (and likewise cannot become a nazir).
  - **Q:** Is it true that whenever a pasuk uses the term “Bnei Yisrael” it means to exclude goyim? Regarding the halachos of “eirechin” a Braisa says that the words “Bnei Yisrael” would exclude goyim, but the word “ish” written afterwards serves to include goyim. Regarding nazir the same words are written and therefore goyim should be included as well! **A:** Regarding nezirus the pasuk says that the nazir may not become tamei “to his father or his mother”. Since goyim don’t have a halachic father, they cannot become a nazir.
    - **Q:** In what sense do we mean that he has no father? We find that **R’ Chiya bar Abba in the name of R’ Yochanan** says that a goy inherits his father even D’Oraisa!? **A:** It means in the sense that there is no obligation for a goy to honor his father.
      - **Q:** The pasuk regarding nazir doesn’t require him to honor his father, so why should that have any effect on nezirus!? **A:** The reason a goy is excluded is because the pasuk says “lo yitamah”, and a goy is not subject to tumah at all, and we learn from pesukim that a goy is not subject to the laws of tumah since he is not subject to laws of tahara (e.g. if a goy touches a meis he does not become tamei). **A2: R’ Acha bar Yaakov** said, only someone who is subject to all laws of inheritance is subject to the laws of nezirus, and a goy does not inherit the slaves of his father (according to the Torah) and is therefore not subject to nezirus.
      - **Q:** If so, slaves should not be subject to nezirus!? **A:** **Rava** said, regarding “eirechin” the words “Bnei Yisrael” teach that goyim cannot make an eirech vow, and the word “ish” teaches to include goyim in that they may be the *subject* of an eirech vow. Regarding nezirus there is no way to darshen the pesukim as an inclusion and an exclusion. We can’t say that a goy is excluded from bringing the nezirus korbanos, but is included in the other laws of nezirus, because we learn elsewhere that a goy may not bring the korbon of a nazir. Therefore, the pesukim regarding nazir cannot be darshened in the way that the pesukim of eirechin are darshened.
      - **Q:** Maybe the exclusion could be that a goy cannot become a *permanent* nazir, and the inclusion is that a goy can become a regular nazir? **A:** **R’ Yochanan** said, the pasuk refers

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

to nazir in general, without specifying the type of nazir. Therefore, we can't say that this is the difference.

- **Q:** Maybe the exclusion is that a goy cannot make his son a nazir and the inclusion is that he can make himself a nazir? **A: R' Yochanan** said, the halacha that a person can make his son a nazir is based on a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai. Therefore, this cannot be something excluded in a pasuk.
- **Q:** Maybe the exclusion is that a goy may never use the nezirus funds of his father for his own nezirus korbanos (although there are times when a Yid may do so), and the inclusion is that a goy may become a nazir? **A: R' Yochanan** said, this halacha of using his father's money is based on a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai. Therefore, this cannot be something excluded in a pasuk.

### -----Daf 62-----

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

### MISHNA

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

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## GEMARA

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

## MISHNA

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

## GEMARA

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

-----Daf 10---63-----

## MISHNA

- If a nazir shaved his head and brought his korbanos as a nazir tahor and then found out that he was tamei during his nezirus, if the source of the tumah was a “known tumah” then he loses the nezirus already counted. If the

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

source of the tumah was a “tumas tehom” (it was likely unknown to anyone at the time) then he does not lose the previously counted nezirus.

- If he had not yet shaved his head and at that time finds out that he had become tamei at some point, then for either type of source of tumah he loses his nezirus count.
- How is this demonstrated? If a nazir went to the mikveh in a cave and a meis was later found floating at the opening to the cave, he would be considered tamei from a “known tumah”. If a meis was found sunken into the floor of the cave, then if the nazir was tahor and had gone into the water only to cool himself, then he is considered tahor because of his chazakah. If he was tamei and had gone into the water to be toivel, then he remains tamei (based on his chazakah).

### GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that tumas tehom is treated leniently in this way? **A: R’ Elazar** said, the pasuk says “v’chi yamus meis *alav*”, the word “*alav*” (meaning next to him) teaches that it must be known to him. **Reish Lakish** said, the pasuk says “ki yihyeh tamei lanefesh oh *b’derech* rechoka”, which teaches that the meis must be like a “*derech*” (road), which is out in the open.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that tumas tehom is only when no one in the entire world knew of the tumah. This makes sense according to **Reish Lakish**, but not according to **R’ Elazar**, because according to him, as long as the meis is not near him (i.e. unknown to him) it is tumas tehom!? **Q2:** A Braisa says that if a meis was found to have been buried across the width of a road, a person who has walked over that road becomes tamei regarding terumah but not for nezirus (if he found out after completing his nezirus) or regarding Pesach (if he found out after bringing his Korbon Pesach). According to either reason given above, why should there be a difference between terumah, and nazir and Pesach? **A:** This halacha of tumas tehom is a Halacha L’Moshe MiSinai.

### IHM AHD SHELO GILACH...

- **Q:** Who is the Tanna who holds that the shaving of the head is the determining time regarding whether tumas tehom will cause a problem or not? **A: R’ Yochanan** said it is **R’ Eliezer**, who says that shaving of the head is essential to release the nazir from his restrictions.
  - **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked, if a nazir became tamei during his term, but became aware of his tumah after completion of his counting but before shaving his head, do we follow the time of tumah or the time of his becoming aware? The difference would be regarding whether he would lose all of the previously counted days or would only lose 7 days (which is what **R’ Eliezer** holds when a person becomes tamei after completing the count). **A: Rava** said, we can answer from our Mishna, which says that if he became aware of the tumah before he shaved his head, then no matter what kind of tumah, he loses the previous count. Now, this must be talking about where he became aware after the counting was complete, because if not, it would be obvious that he loses the whole count!
    - **Q:** The Gemara says, we still need to determine whether he loses the entire count or only 7 days!? When **R’ Eliezer** says that if he becomes tamei after the count he loses 7 days is that only when the tumah happens then or even if the tumah happened earlier and the knowledge happened then? **A:** From the words of the Mishna that say that in either case he will lose his count, and does not make a difference whether the tumah happened before the count was over or after, we can learn that in both cases the Mishna would hold that since the knowledge happened after the count he only loses 7 days.
- A Braisa says, if a meis was found to have been buried across the width of a road, a person who has walked over that road becomes tamei regarding terumah but not for nezirus (if he found out after completing his nezirus) or regarding Pesach (if he found out after bringing his Korbon Pesach). This is only if it is impossible to have walked on the road without walking over the meis. If it was possible, then he would even be tahor for purposes of terumah. This is also only true if the meis was complete. If the meis was in pieces, then even if it takes up the entire width of the road he would be tahor, because we can assume that he walked between the pieces. However, if the meis was in a tomb, then even if he was in pieces the person is tamei, because the entire tomb becomes a single unit of tumah. All this is only true if the person was walking by foot. However, if he was riding

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

or carrying a burden, then he is tamei, because it is assumed impossible for him not to have touched, moved, or made an ohel over the meis. This is all in regard to tumas tehom. If it is known tumah, then he becomes tamei with regard to all 3 areas (terumah, nazir, and Pesach). Tumas tehom refers to tumah that is not known to a single person in the entire world. If the meis was covered by pebbles or straw it is considered to be tumas tehom. If the meis was able to be seen but was located in the seas, in darkness, or in crevices in the rocks, it is not tumas tehom. Finally, tumas tehom is only said in regard to tumas meis.

### -----Daf 70 ---64-----

#### KEITZAD YARAD

- A floating source of tumah does not give off tumah in the case of sheretz. As a Mishna says, if there is a safek regarding tumah that is floating on the water, whether the water is in a keili or on the ground, the safek is considered to be tahor. **R' Shimon** says that if the water is in a keili the safek is tamei. If it is in the ground it is tahor.
  - **R' Yitzchak bar Avudimi** explained that the **T"K** holds that the pasuk regarding sheretz says "b'chol hasheret hashoretz", which seems to say it is tamei wherever it can swarm, and then the pasuk says "ahl haaretz", which seems to say it is tamei only on the ground. This seeming contradiction can be explained that if it was touched with certainty then it is tamei no matter where it is. However, if there is a safek whether it was touched, then if the safek took place while it was floating in water, it will be tahor. **Ulla** explained that **R' Shimon** holds, the pasuk says "ach mayan" ("but a spring" – suggesting that if the sheretz is floating it will not give off tumah) and then says "yitmah" (suggesting that it always gives off tumah). This seeming contradiction can be explained that if the water is in a keili it is tamei, and if the water is in the ground it is tahor.
- A Braisa says, if any tamei item was being carried or dragged, then a safek regarding someone having touched it is deemed tamei, because they are considered to be resting on the ground. However, if the item is thrown in the air, the safek will be considered tahor, *except* if the safek involves a kezayis from a meis, and something that forms an ohel over a meis, and anything that is metameh things that it sits on even without touching it (which comes to include the case of a zav or zavah).
- **Q: Rama bar Chama** asked, if the meis was in a keili and the keili was floating in water, do we look at the meis (which is not floating in the keili) or the keili (which is floating in the water) with regard to deciding a safek tumah in this case? **Q2:** If we say we look at the meis, what about if the meis is on top of a sheretz which is floating in the water? Do we say that since the meis creates a 7 day tumah and the sheretz only creates a one day tumah, we view the meis as lying in a keili, or do we say that the tumos are viewed as combined and the meis is therefore floating in the water? **Q3:** If we say that these tumos don't combine, what about the case where a sheretz is on a neveilah which is floating in water? Do we say that since they both create one day tumah they are viewed as combining, or do we say that since a sheretz gives tumah even if only the size of a lentil whereas a neveilah must be the size of a kezayis they do not combine? **Q4:** What about if there is one sheretz on top of another sheretz? Do we say these certainly combine or do we say that since they are separate entities they do not combine? **Q5:** If we say that they don't combine, what about the case where a sheretz is on top of a deteriorated piece of neveilah (which is liquified)? Do we say it is considered a liquid and the sheretz is therefore said to be on the water, or do we say that it is still given the status of a solid? **Q6:** If we say that is still considered to be a solid, what about the case of a sheretz on top of shichvas zerah? **Q7:** If you say that since zerah comes out of the body it is considered to be a solid, what about the case of a sheretz on top of parah adumah water which is on top of regular water? **A: TEIKU.**
- **R' Hamnuna** said, if a nazir or a person who was bringing his Pesach became tamei, and they went through their tahara process and then completed a full term of nezirus, or brought their Pesach, respectively, and they then found out that on the 7<sup>th</sup> day of their earlier tahara process they walked over tumas tehom, they are still considered tahor. The reason is that tumas tehom is not strong enough to cause them to lose what was already done.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: Rava** asked, our Mishna said that if one was tamei when he walked over tumas tehom it keeps him tamei, because he already has a chazaka of tumah!? **A:** He answered, I would agree with you if the nazir did not yet take a haircut and therefore still had a chazaka of tumah.
  - **Rava** said, I would also agree with you regarding the person bringing his Pesach, that if this safek happens after he went to the mikvah, since he does not require anything else to become tahor, he no longer has a chazakah of tumah and the safek is therefore tahor.
    - **Q: Abaye** asked, the person still needs to wait for nightfall after going to the mikvah!? **A:** **Rava** said, the sun sets without any action taken by the person, so he sheds his cheskas tumah after going to the mikvah.
      - We find elsewhere that **Abaye** later agreed with this logic of **Rava** as well.

-----Daf 70 ---65-----

### MISHNA

- If someone digs and finds a previously unknown meis, which is lying in the way Yidden are normally buried, we can assume that this meis was placed temporarily and that there are no other meisim in this area, and the meis may be moved along with the surrounding earth. If he finds 2 such meisim next to each other, the same process may be followed. If he finds 3 such meisim, and the distance between the two outer meisim is more than 4 amos but less than 8 amos (which would be typical of the way in which they would then bury meisim), we must assume that this entire area is a cemetery and these meisim may not be moved. To make the area lose the status of a cemetery, he must search for other meisim for a distance of 20 amos in all directions. If he finds even one meis at the end of that 20 amos, he would then have to search an additional 20 amos from that newly found meis. For although had he found this one isolated grave initially he would have been allowed to move it, since he had previously found the other graves there is “raglayim l’davar” (“legs to stand on”) that this is part of a cemetery.

### GEMARA

- **R’ Yehuda** said, the Mishna says that “he finds” a meis, which would exclude a meis that was known to be permanently buried there (and would not be allowed to be moved). The Mishna says that he finds “a meis”, which excludes the case where he finds a person who was killed (and had not died of natural causes, because we assume that the killed people were just buried there, and it is not a cemetery, even if he finds more than 3 such people there, in addition these meisim are considered to be incomplete, because people who are killed lose blood, and incomplete meisim will not give the area the status of a cemetery). The Mishna says that the meis was “lying”, which comes to exclude a case where the meis was found in a sitting position. The Mishna says he was found lying the way Yidden are “normally buried”, which excludes the case where he finds the meis with its head between its legs.
  - **Ulla bar Chanina** taught a Braisa that says, an incomplete meis may be moved without its surrounding earth, and does not count towards the determination of an area being considered a cemetery.
  - The reason that a meis found sitting or lying in a way that Yidden are not buried can be moved without its surrounding dirt and does not create a cemetery is because we assume these meisim to be goyim.
- A Braisa says, if 2 meisim are found buried in opposite directions (the head of one is near the feet of the other), they may be moved without the surrounding earth and there is no cemetery status. If he found 3 graves, of which one was previously known (but not known whether it was permanent or temporary) or even if 2 were previously known, they can be moved with the surrounding earth, and they do not create cemetery status.
  - **R’ Yesheivav** once had a situation where two known graves were found next to one unknown grave and he wanted to give the area the status of a cemetery. **R’ Akiva** told him, the status of a cemetery is only given when there are 3 known graves or 3 unknown graves.

### NOTLAN V’ES TEFUSASAN

- **Q:** Where do we find this concept of taking the surrounding earth along with the meis? **A:** **R’ Yehuda** said, the pasuk says that Yaakov told Yosef “unesasani miMitzrayim”. The word “miMitzrayim” is extra, because it is

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

obvious that since he is in Mitzrayim he means to be taken from there. The word teaches that he asked to be taken “along with Mitzrayim”, meaning along with the surrounding earth.

- **Q:** How much surrounding earth must be taken? **A: R’ Elazar** said, he takes all the loose earth and takes the depth of 3 fingers of the virgin soil below that as well.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that **R’ Elazar the son of R’ Tzadok** gives the parameters for the earth that must be taken, and does not mention the depth of 3 fingers of soil!? **A: R’ Elazar** holds like another Braisa where **R’ Yochanan in the name of Ben Azzai** says that the loose earth and the depth of 3 fingers of virgin soil must be taken.

### BODEK HEIMENU

- **Rava** said, if a person found a grave and moved it elsewhere (as allowed in our Mishna), and he then found a second grave and moved it elsewhere (as allowed in the Mishna), and then afterwards finds a third grave in that same field, he may not move this 3<sup>rd</sup> grave to where he reburied the first 2, and may not return those first 2 to be next to the 3<sup>rd</sup> that he found.
  - **Others** say that **Rava** said that he is allowed to move the 3<sup>rd</sup> one to be with the other two.
    - **Q:** Discovery of a third grave should give the area the status of a cemetery, so why is he allowed to remove the 3<sup>rd</sup> grave? **A: Reish Lakish** explained, they were lenient in this way to limit the tumah in Eretz Yisrael.
- **Q:** If he searched for the additional 20 amos and found no additional graves, **R’ Menashya bar Yirmiya in the name of Rav** said, the 3 that were found still give the area the status of a cemetery.

### MISHNA

- With regard to a safek of tzaraas the halacha is as follows: If the safek comes about before the person was declared a definite metzora, the safek is tahor. If the safek comes about after the person was declared a definite metzora, the safek is tamei.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that a safek before the confirmation is decided as tahor? **A: R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, the pasuk says “l’taharo oh l’tamo”. Since the pasuk first says “tahor” we see that we are to favor something as being tahor and therefore a safek is ruled as tahor.
  - **Q:** If so, then even if he was a confirmed metzora we should say that the safek is tahor!? **A:** The statement of **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** was said regarding a different matter and does not serve as the source for the ruling in the Mishna.

### MISHNA

- There are 7 ways in which we examine a zav (to ascertain that the zivus was not from an external influence) if he was not yet a confirmed zav. They are: what he ate, what he drank, whether he was carrying a load, whether he was jumping, whether he was sick, whether he had seen something to cause it, and whether he had thoughts that may have caused it. Once he has been confirmed as a zav we do not need to examine him, because at that point even if he is an oneis, or has a safek, and even simple zerah will all make him tamei, since there are “raglayim l’davar” (the fact that he is already a zav shows that these other factors were not an influence).
- If a person hits another person and the doctors feel that the victim will die from the injury, and his condition initially improved, but then took a turn for the worse and the person died, the attacker is subject to the death penalty. **R’ Nechemya** says he is patur, because there are “raglayim l’davar” (the fact that his condition improved shows that he did not die from the injury of the attack).

### GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that once the person is determined to be a zav (he has seen two episodes of zivus) he is not checked for the external influences when he has his third zivus discharge? **A: R’ Nosson** said, the pasuk says “v’hazav es zovo lazachar v’lanikeiva”, which teaches that with regard to the third zivus discharge a man is

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

compared to a woman, and just like a woman is never checked for external influences, the same is true for the third discharge of a man.

- **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Elazar** says he is examined for the third discharge, but not for the fourth discharge!? **A:** **R' Elazar** says the word “es” in the pasuk refers to an additional flow, which means that it is the *fourth* flow that is compared to a woman. However, the earlier 3 flows must all be checked for the possible influence of external factors.

### -----Daf 10 ---66-----

#### ONSO U'SFEIKO

- **Rava** said, this does not mean that there is a safek whether or not he had a discharge (because in that case we would be lenient). The Mishna is referring to a case where there was a definite discharge, and the only question is whether the discharge was zivus or some other substance or factor.

#### SHICHVAS ZARO TIMEI'AH

- **Q:** In what sense is the Mishna saying that the zerah is tamei? If it is in regard to touching it, even the zerah of a tahor person is tamei when touched, so why would this be different? **A:** The Mishna is teaching that the shichvas zerah of a zav is tamei even through carrying it.
  - **Q:** Whose shita would that follow? Even **R' Yehoshua**, who says that the zerah of a zav is tamei via carrying says so because there may be zivus in the zerah. However, he would seem to agree that pure zerah would not be tamei via carrying!? **A:** **R' Ada bar Ahava** said, the Mishna is teaching that although a zivus discharge that follows a zerah discharge is usually given the status of a zerah discharge, if the person with the discharge was a confirmed zav, this zivus discharge will be given the status of zivus and not of zerah.
    - **R' Pappa** said, the reason a zivus discharge after a zerah discharge is not considered tamei as zivus must be because the body is weak after the zerah discharge, and that causes the zivus discharge.
      - **Q:** **Rava** asked, if a goy has a zerah discharge and then converts and has a zivus discharge, it is given the status of zivus. Now, if it is because of weakness of the body, that should be taken into account for this convert as well!? Therefore, that can't be the reason for the non-zivus status. **A:** **Rava** therefore said, the Mishna is teaching that the zerah of a confirmed zav is tamei as zivus. The Mishna is following the view of another Braisa which says that this is the case.

#### MISHNA

- **R' Nehorai** says that Shmuel Hanavi was a nazir, based on the pasuk regarding Shmuel that says “u'morah lo yaaleh ahl rosho” – with the word “morah” meaning razor, as the pasuk says regarding Shimshon. **R' Yose** says the word “morah” by Shmuel refers to fear of people, saying that Shmuel will not fear people. **R' Nehorai** said to him, we see in the pesukim that Shmuel was afraid of Shaul, so “morah” can't refer to fear and must refer to a razor.

#### GEMARA

- **Rav** said to his son **Chiya**, and **R' Huna** said to his son **Rabbah**, jump at the chance to make the bracha rather than to be from the one who says Amen.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Yose** and **R' Nehorai** both say that the saying of Amen is greater than actually making the bracha!? **A:** It is a machlokes among Tanna'im.
- **R' Elazar in the name of R' Chanina** said, talmidei chachomim increase peace on the world, based on the pasuk of “v'chol banayich limudei Hashem v'rav shalom banayich”.

**HADRAN ALACH PEREK HAKUSIM EIN LAHEM!!!**



## **Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah**

**HADRAN ALACH MESECHTA NAZIR!!!**

**MAZAL TOV!!!**