

11 Elul 5775
August 26, 2015



Nazir Daf 4

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Wine

The *Gemora* had stated that Rabbi Shimon derived from the verse: *He should abstain from new wine and aged wine* that one may not drink *mitzvah* wine in the same manner that he is forbidden to drink optional wine.

The *Gemora* asks: What *mitzvah* wine is he referring to?

The *Gemora* notes: He cannot be referring to the wine of *kiddush* and *havdalah*, for is there an oath from Mount Sinai that one is commanded to drink wine for *kiddush* and *havdalah* that a verse would be necessary to teach us that he may not (*while one is Biblically obligated to recite kiddush, he is not Biblically required to recite it over wine*)!

Rather, he is referring to that which Rava stated: If one took an oath to drink wine and then he became a *nazir*, he is forbidden to drink wine (*based upon the aforementioned verse*).

The *Gemora* asks: But don't the *Chachamim* need this verse for the same *halachah* that one may not drink *mitzvah* wine in the same manner that he is forbidden to drink optional wine (*so how can they use this verse to teach the halachah that one is a*

nazir with all the halachos even if he only specified one halachah)?

The *Gemora* answers: If so (that the verse is teaching only one *halachah*), the Torah could have written: *from wine*; what is the necessity to say: *and aged wine*? We can derive both *halachos* from here.

The *Gemora* asks: What does Rabbi Shimon derive from the extra phrase, (*sheichar*) and *aged wine*?

The *Gemora* answers: It is used for the *gezeirah shavah* (*one of the thirteen principles of Biblical hermeneutics; it links two similar words from dissimilar verses in the Torah*) of '*sheichar*,' '*sheichar*' by entering into the Temple. For it is written [Vayikra 10:9]: *Wine and sheichar you (a Kohen) shall not drink, you and your sons with you (when you enter the Tabernacle)*. Just as the prohibition by a *nazir* applies only to wine, but not to other beverages, so too, with respect to the prohibition of a *Kohen* entering the Temple (while intoxicated), it is only wine that is forbidden, but other intoxicating beverages would not be forbidden.

The *Gemora* comments: This is to the exclusion of the opinion of Rabbi Yehudah, for we learned in a *braisa*: Rabbi Yehudah said: One who eats pressed figs from Ke'ilah, or drinks honey or milk, (*and*

becomes intoxicated) and then enters the Temple, he is liable.

Alternatively, the *Gemora* answers that Rabbi Shimon does not hold that one prohibition can take effect upon another prohibition. For we learned in a *braisa*: Rabbi Shimon says: One who eats *neveilah* (*carcass of an animal that was not slaughtered properly*) on *Yom Kippur* is exempt from bringing a *korban chatas* (*for eating on Yom Kippur, since it was forbidden from beforehand; Rabbi Shimon expounds the verse by nazir to teach an exception that one prohibition may take effect upon another one*).

The *Gemora* asks: And according to the Rabbis, as well, but it is written: *From anything made of the grapevine* (so what do they use this verse for)?

The *Gemora* answers: The Rabbis would tell you: This verse teaches us that the prohibitions of a nazir combine with each other (to complete the minimum quantity for liability).

The *Gemora* notes: Rabbi Shimon does not need a combination (of prohibitions with regard to a nazir), for it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Shimon said that one who eats a small amount (*less than the minimum required*) incurs lashes; they only said the minimum of a *k'zayis* (olive – volume) with respect to a *korban*. (3b3 – 4a2)

Mishna

If someone says, “I am hereby like Shimshon, like the son of Manoach, like the husband of Delilah,” or, “I am hereby like the one who uprooted the gates of

Gaza,” or “I am hereby like the one whom the Philistines blinded,” he is a *nazir Shimshon*. [A nazir Shimshon is a lifelong nezirus; this was taught by tradition of the Oral Law. The precise halachos of this type of nazir will be discussed in the next Mishna.] (43a3)

Shimshon

The *Gemora* asks: Why was it necessary for the vower to say all those details?

The *Gemora* answers: If he would have just said that he is like Shimshon, we might have thought that he meant a different Shimshon (*and therefore, he would not be regarded as a nazir*), therefore, he said “like the son of Manoach.” And if he would have just said, “like the son of Manoach,” we might have thought that there was a different person with that very same name. The *Mishna* teaches us that he is required to say, “like the husband of Delilah,” or “like the one whom the Philistines blinded.” (4a3)

Mishna

What is the halachic difference between a *nazir* forever and a *nazir Shimshon*? With respect to a *nazir* forever, if his hair becomes too heavy, he may trim it with a razor and then he would bring three *korbanos* (*similar to an ordinary nazir upon completion of his nezirus*); and if he becomes *tamei*, he would be required to bring the *korbanos tumah* (*just like an ordinary nazir*). A *nazir Shimshon* may not trim his hair, even if it becomes too heavy, and he is not required to bring the *korbanos tumah* if he becomes *tamei*. (4a3 – 4a4)

Two Types of Nezirus Forever

The *Gemora* asks: Who mentioned a *nazir* forever (that the *Mishna* suddenly contrasted it to a *nazir* Shimshon)?

The *Gemora* answers: There are some words missing in the *Mishna* and this is how the *Mishna* should be taught: If one says, "I am a *nazir* forever," he is a *nazir*. What is the halachic difference between a *nazir* forever and a *nazir* Shimshon? With respect to a *nazir* forever, if his hair becomes too heavy, he may trim it with a razor and then he would bring three *korbanos* (similar to an ordinary *nazir* upon completion of his *nezirus*); and if he becomes *tamei*, he would be required to bring the *korbanos tumah* (just like an ordinary *nazir*). A *nazir* Shimshon may not trim his hair, even if it becomes too heavy, and he is not required to bring the *korbanos tumah* if he becomes *tamei*. (4a4 – 4b1)

Nazir Shimshon becoming Tamei

The *Gemora* infers from the *Mishna* that a *nazir* Shimshon is not required to bring a *korban* for becoming *tamei*, but, it would seem that it is forbidden for him to become *tamei*.

The *Gemora* asks: According to which *Tanna* is the *Mishna* following? Apparently, it is not Rabbi Yehudah, nor is it Rabbi Shimon. For we learned in the following *braisa*: Rabbi Yehudah said: A *nazir* Shimshon is permitted to contract *tumah* from the dead, for Shimshon himself became *tamei*. Rabbi Shimon said: If someone said, "I am hereby a *nazir*

Shimshon," he has not said anything, for we do not find regarding Shimshon that *nezirus* was accepted by anyone's mouth (it was an angel that declared him to be a *nazir*).

The *Gemora* elaborates: Our *Mishna* cannot reflect Rabbi Yehudah's opinion, for he says that a *nazir* Shimshon is permitted to become *tamei*, and our *Mishna* implied that he is prohibited to become *tamei*. It cannot be according to Rabbi Shimon, for he holds that there is no such thing as a *nezirus* Shimshon.

The *Gemora* answers: Our *Mishna* is following Rabbi Yehudah's opinion (and he could become *tamei*); but since the *Mishna* mentioned by a *nazir* forever 'if he became *tamei*,' the *Tanna* used the same expression by a *nazir* Shimshon as well. (4b1)

Nazir Shimshon Compared to Bechor

The *Gemora* suggests that the dispute between Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Shimon is the same as the argument between the following *Tannaim*: If a person said, "This meat should be forbidden to me like a *bechor* (firstborn male of a cow, sheep or goat, which is born with sacrificial sanctity and is brought as a *korban*)," Rabbi Yaakov says: The meat is forbidden to him. Rabbi Yehudah permits it. (Now, a *bechor* does not become *kadosh* by the means of a vow; rather, it is automatic. Rabbi Yaakov would hold that it is not necessary to link the permissible item to a forbidden item whose prohibition is based upon a vow. Rabbi Yosi disagrees.)

The *Gemora* explains: Rabbi Yehudah would hold like Rabbi Yaakov that it is not necessary to link to an item whose prohibition is based upon a vow (*and that is why a nezirus Shimshon is valid, even though Shimshon's nezirus did not come about through a vow*). Rabbi Shimon would hold like Rabbi Yosi that one is required to link to an item whose prohibition is based upon a vow.

The *Gemora* rejects this explanation: Everyone would hold that one is required to link to an item whose prohibition is based upon a vow, but it is different with respect to a *bechor*, where it is written: *to Hashem*. This teaches us that if one makes a vow and links the permissible item to a *bechor*, the *neder* is valid.

The *Gemora* asks: What does Rabbi Yosi derive from this verse?

The *Gemora* answers: It teaches us that one could make a *neder* and link the permissible item to a *chatas* and an *asham*.

The *Gemora* asks: Why does he include a *chatas* and an *asham*, but he excludes a *bechor*?

The *Gemora* answers: *Chatas* and *asham* are included because a person designates and sanctifies them through a vow; a *bechor* is excluded because it is not designated or sanctified through a vow.

The *Gemora* asks: How does Rabbi Yaakov counter this argument?

The *Gemora* answers: It is because he maintains that a *bechor* is also sanctified through a vow. For we learned in a *braisa*: It was said in the name of Rebbe: How do we know that it is an obligation to orally consecrate a *bechor* born in his house? It is because it is written [Devarim 15:19]: *You shall consecrate the male*.

Rabbi Yosi will say that although there is a *mitzvah* to orally consecrate the *bechor*, if he does not do so, it is nevertheless consecrated (*therefore, it is not regarded as something that is prohibited through a vow*). (4b1 – 4b2)

A Virtuous Nazir

The *Gemora* asks: By *nazir*, it also is written: *to Hashem!* (*Shouldn't Rabbi Shimon hold that a vow for nezirus Shimshon should be valid?*)

The *Gemora* answers: That expression is needed for that which was taught in the following *braisa*: Shimon the Righteous said, "I never ate from the meat of an *asham* sacrifice offered by a *nazir* who had become *tamei* except for one case. There was once a handsome young man from the south with beautiful eyes and locks of hair arranged in curls (*who had become tamei and came to the Beis Hamikdash to have his hair removed and to offer the required sacrifice*). I asked him why he had taken upon himself a vow to become a *nazir*, which would eventually lead to having such beautiful hair removed (*even if he would have completed his term of nezirus without becoming tamei, a nazir shaves his head upon completion*). He responded to me, 'I was a shepherd for my father and one day I went to a

spring to fill my pail of water and saw my reflection in the water. My evil inclination suddenly tempted me to take advantage of my looks and wished to drive me out from this world. I said to my evil inclination: Wicked one! Why are you being so haughty in a world that is not yours, with one that in the future will be worms and maggots? I swore at that time to become a *nazir*.’ I was so impressed (*by his piety*) that I kissed him on his head and said to him, May there be more vowers of *nezirus* like you in Israel.” It is those like you to whom the Torah refers in the verse [Bamidbar 6:2]: *A man who will make a nazir oath, for the sake of God.* (4b2 – 4b3)

DAILY MASHAL

A Virtuous Nazir

The *Gemora* states: A *nedavah* for *nezirus* is regarded as virtuous in cases such that of Shimon the Righteous (*a great Kohen Gadol who served in the beginning of the second Beis Hamikdosh*). For we learned in a *braisa*: Shimon the Righteous said, “I never ate from the meat of an *asham* sacrifice offered by a *nazir* who had become *tamei* except for one case. There was once a handsome young man from the south with beautiful eyes and locks of hair arranged in curls (*who had become tamei and came to the Beis Hamikdosh to have his hair removed and to offer the required sacrifice*). I asked him why he had taken upon himself a vow to become a *nazir*, which would eventually lead to having such beautiful hair removed (*even if he would have completed his term of nezirus without becoming tamei, a nazir shaves his head upon completion*). He responded to

me, ‘I was a shepherd for my father and one day I went to a spring to fill my pail of water and saw my reflection in the water. My evil inclination suddenly tempted me to take advantage of my looks and wished to drive me out from this world. I said to my evil inclination: Wicked one! Why are you being so haughty in a world that is not yours, with one that in the future will be worms and maggots? I swore at that time to become a *nazir*.’ I was so impressed (*by his piety*) that I kissed him on his head and said to him, May there be more vowers of *nezirus* like you in Israel.”

The question that is asked is why the young man with the locks of hair arranged in curls did not simply go to a barber for a haircut to remove this temptation.

Rabbi Mendel Weinbach answers that on the way to the barber he was likely to change his mind and give in to temptation. The only solution was to immediately take upon himself a vow of *nezirus* which would eventually force him to eliminate his hair and the problems that accompanied it.

Food for Thought

*** What was the necessity to state that the *nazir* came from the south? What difference did it make where he came from?

*** How was he permitted to look at his reflection in the water; isn’t it forbidden for a man to look at a mirror?

*** Why connection is there between the “haughtiness” of the evil inclination and the temptation to sin?