

13 Elul 5775  
August 28, 2015



Nazir Daf 6

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

### **Challenges to Bar Pada**

The *Gemora* asks on Bar Pada from the *Mishna* below (16a): If one made himself a *nazir* for two consecutive terms, he should shave on day thirty-one for the first *nezirus*, and on day sixty-one for the second *nezirus*. This is understandable according to Rav Masna (*for the first term is a complete thirty days and he shaves on the thirty-first day; the second term of nezirus begins on that day, and day sixty-one will be the thirty-first day of the second term*). But according to Bar Pada, it is difficult (*if a standard nezirus is twenty-nine days, why must he wait for the thirty-first day*)!

The *Gemora* answers: Bar Pada could say that you should look at the latter part of that *Mishna*, which states: But if he shaved on the thirtieth day for the first term, he may shave on the sixtieth day for the second term. This part of the *Mishna* supports Bar Pada (*that he is a nazir for only twenty-nine days*), and the first part of the *Mishna* (*which states that he shaves on the thirty-first day*) is because of a Rabbinic decree, as if he said, “I am hereby a *nazir* for thirty days” (*if one would say, “I am hereby a nazir for thirty days,” he would be a nazir for a complete thirty days and shave on the thirty-first because we assume that a person uses complete numbers; therefore, even if he just says, “I am hereby a nazir,” he is also a nazir for thirty days; this halacha is only Rabbinic in nature; Biblically, he is a nazir for*

*twenty-nine days, and he may shave on the thirtieth day*).

The *Gemora* asks: The latter part of the *Mishna* is difficult according to Rav Masna (*for according to him, there should not be any allowance to shave on the thirtieth day*)!

The *Gemora* answers: Rav Masna will say that the *Mishna* explains itself by stating that the thirtieth day will count for the first *nezirus* and for the second. (*Obviously, the Mishna holds that nezirus lasts for thirty days, and not twenty-nine, for otherwise, the Mishna would have no need to say that the thirtieth day counts for the first one.*)

The *Gemora* asks: If the reason for this *halacha* is based upon the principle that part of a day is regarded as a complete day, why would the *Mishna* have to repeat this *halacha*?

The *Gemora* answers: We might have thought that this principle is only applicable for one term of *nezirus*, but it cannot be applied for two terms of *nezirus* (*by saying that day thirty is reckoned as being part of the first*

*nezirus and the second*); the *Mishna* teaches us that the principle applies even in this case.

The *Gemora* asks on Bar Pada from the same *Mishna*: If he shaved on day fifty-nine, he has discharged his obligation, for the thirtieth day is included in the counting (of both terms of *nezirus*). This is understandable according to Rav Masna (for day thirty must be reckoned in the first term in order to validate his shaving on that day, and it must be reckoned in the second term in order to validate his shaving on day fifty-nine, for then it will be day thirty for the second *nezirus*). However, according to Bar Pada, why is it necessary for the *Mishna* to say that the thirtieth day is included in the counting? Even if it would not be included, he could still shave on that day, for Bar Pada holds that *nezirus* is only for twenty-nine days!

The *Gemora* answers: Bar Pada will say that this *Mishna* is his source that an ordinary *nezirus* is only twenty-nine days (for it is illogical to say that day thirty can be reckoned for both terms of *nezirus*; rather, it can be the first day of the second *nezirus*, since the first *nezirus* concluded on the day before – after twenty-nine days).

The *Gemora* asks on Bar Pada from the same *Mishna*: If one said, “I am hereby a *nazir*,” and he became *tamei* on the thirtieth day, he must start his *nezirus* all over again (it is evidently regarded as if he became *tamei* in middle of his *nezirus* term, for if his *nezirus* would be concluded already, and then he would become *tamei*, he would not be required to start the *nezirus* all over again). This is understandable according to Rav Masna (for the thirtieth day, before he shaves and brings his

*korbanos*, is regarded as being within the term of his *nezirus*). However, according to Bar Pada, it is difficult (for according to him, the Biblical term of *nezirus* is twenty-nine days; he should not be required to start the *nezirus* all over again)!

The *Gemora* answers: Bar Pada could say that you should look at the latter part of that *Mishna*, which states: Rabbi Eliezer said: He only loses seven days (he is required to go through a seven-day purification process, and then he may bring the concluding *korbanos*). Now, if a *nezirus* term is thirty days, he should be required to start his *nezirus* all over again! (Bar Pada maintains that both *Tannaim* hold that a *nezirus* term is for twenty-nine days; the dispute in the *Mishna* is regarding the Rabbinic decree of waiting to bring the *korbanos* until the thirtieth day. The *Tanna Kamma* holds that the thirtieth day is regarded as being part of his *nezirus* term, and therefore, he is required to begin the count all over again. Rabbi Eliezer maintains that the Rabbis merely decreed to postpone the bringing of the *korbanos* until the thirtieth day, but it is not regarded as being within the term of his *nezirus*, and therefore, he is not required to begin the count all over again.)

The *Gemora* explains Rabbi Eliezer’s opinion, according to Rav Masna: Rabbi Eliezer holds that the partial day (even prior to the bringing of the *korbanos*) is like the entire day (and therefore, even if a *nezirus* term is thirty days, it is regarded as being after his term of *nezirus*, and therefore, if he then becomes *tamei*, he is not required to start his *nezirus* all over again).

The *Gemora* asks: If this is the explanation of Rabbi Eliezer’s opinion, let us examine the next part of the

*Mishna:* If someone said, "I am hereby a *nazir* for one hundred days," and he became *tamei* on the one hundredth day, he must start his *nezirus* all over again. Rabbi Eliezer said: He is required to observe another thirty days of *nezirus*. Now, if Rabbi Eliezer holds that the partial day (*even prior to the bringing of the korbanos*) is like the entire day, he should only be required to go through a seven-day purification process (*why is he required to observe another thirty days of nezirus*)?

The *Gemora* objects: Is it any better if he would hold that the partial day (*even prior to the bringing of the korbanos*) is not like the entire day? If so, he should be required to start the entire *nezirus* all over again (*for he became tamei within the term of his nezirus*).

The *Gemora* responds to this challenge: In truth, Rabbi Eliezer holds that a partial day is not regarded like the entire day. But if so, he should be required to start the entire *nezirus* all over again! Rish Lakish answers: The following is Rabbi Eliezer's reasoning: It is written: *And this is the law of the nazir on the day when he concludes his nezirus*. Thus the Torah expressly declares that if he becomes *tamei* on the last day of his *nezirus* term, the law of an ordinary *nazir* is to be applied to him (*he should be a nazir for thirty days*). (6a – 6b)

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### *Tefillin on a Nazir*

The following question is asked: How can a *nazir* discharge his obligation of having *tefillin* on his head, if he has an unusual amount of hair on his head?

Shouldn't it be regarded as an interposition (*chatzitzah*) between the *tefillin* and his head?

The Klil Tiferes answers based upon the writings of Reb Shlomo mi'Vilna in his gloss on the Shulchan Aruch (Y"D; 198:6): Anything that is done for the sake of a *mitzvah* cannot be regarded as an interposition. Accordingly, it can be said that the hairs of a *nazir* are being grown long for the sake of the *mitzvah*, and therefore, will not be considered a *chatzitzah*.