

7 Shevat 5783
Jan. 29, 2023



Nazir Daf 5

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

Shimshon

The *Gemora* asks: Wasn't Shimshon also a *nazir* based upon a human vow? Behold it is written: *for this child shall be a nazir of God from the womb* (apparently meaning that Shimson's father should declare him to be a nazir as soon as he would be born)?

The *Gemora* answers: That was stated by the angel (*declaring him to be a nazir at that time, and not an instruction as to what his father should do later*).

The *Gemora* asks: How do we know that Shimshon became *tamei* from the dead? If you will say that it is from that which is written: *With the jawbone of a donkey I (Shimshon) smote a thousand men*, perhaps it means that he threw it (the jaw) at them, but he did not in fact touch them!

The *Gemora* answers: Rather, it is from here: *And he smote from among them thirty people and took their garments*. [This would indicate that he did indeed touch them after he killed them; the verse must be teaching us that he was permitted to do so.]

The *Gemora* asks: Perhaps he stripped them first (while they were still alive) and then he killed them?

The *Gemora* answers: It is written: *he smote* and then *he took*.

The *Gemora* asks: Perhaps he only mortally wounded them (as he brought them to the throes of death, but did not touch them when they were actually dead, for he took their clothing first)?

The *Gemora* answers: It must be that it is a tradition (transmitted orally that he removed their garments after they died, and thus we see that he was permitted to become *tamei* to them). (4b3 – 4b4)

Avshalom's Trimmings

The *Gemora* asks: Where is it written regarding a permanent *nazir* (that he may trim his hair if it becomes too heavy)?

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: Rebbe said: Avshalom was a permanent *nazir*, for it says: *And it came to pass at the end of forty years, Avshalom said to the king: "May I go and pay my vow which I have vowed to Hashem in Chevron?"* And he cut his hair every twelve months, for it says: *[And when he cut his hair] It was at the end of every period of "Yamim" [for when the hair was heavy on him, therefore he cut it]*.

The *Gemora* explains: Rebbe learns (the meaning of the word) "Yamim" from the word "Yamim" mentioned by the houses of the walled cities. Just as there it means twelve months, so too, here, it means twelve months.

The *Baraisa* continues: Rabbi Nehorai says: Avshalom cut his hair every thirty days. Rabbi Yosi said: He cut his hair from Friday to Friday, for so we find regarding the sons of kings that they cut their hair from Friday to Friday (and Avshalom was the son of King David). (4b4 – 5a1)

[We have said that] Rebbe's reason [for interpreting 'yamim' as a year] is because of its occurrence in connection with houses in walled cities. But hasn't Rebbe himself said that 'yamim' [in that connection] means not less than two days?

— The only reason that he uses the *gezeirah shavah* at all is because of the reference to the heaviness [of Avshalom's hair] and two days' growth is not heavy.

Why should it not be two years, in accordance with the verse: And it came to pass at the end of two full years? From a text containing 'yamim' without mention of years' conclusions may be drawn concerning another text containing 'yamim' without mention of years'; but no conclusion can be drawn here from this verse where there is mention of 'years'.

Why should it not be thirty days, for there is a verse: but a whole month? — From a text mentioning 'yamim' without 'months', conclusions may be drawn concerning another text mentioning 'yamim' without 'months', but this verse affords no indication since 'months' are mentioned together with it.

Why shouldn't the inference be made from *mi-yamim yamimah* ['from days to days'] (meaning three months)? — Conclusions may be drawn concerning a text containing 'yamim' from another [text] containing 'yamim', but not from one containing 'yamimah'.

But what is the difference [between 'yamim' and 'yamimah']? Haven't the school of Rabbi Yishmael taught that in the verses: And the Kohen shall return; Then the Kohen shall come in, 'return' and 'coming in' mean one and the same thing? — Inference [from non-identical expressions] is permissible where there is no identical expression [on which to base the inference], but where an identical expression exists, the inference must be drawn from the identical expression.

Another reply [to the suggestion that inference be made from 'yamimah']: How do we know [with certainty] that [they went] once every three months? May not the four times per year have occurred alternately at intervals of four months and of two months. (5a1 – 5a2)

Rabbi Nehorai had stated that a *nazir* for life may trim his hair every thirty days. What is the reason regarding the Kohanim? A *Kohen* trims his hair every thirty days because otherwise, it will become too heavy, so too, a *nazir* for life may trim his hair when it becomes heavy, which is after thirty days.

Rabbi Yosi is of the opinion that he may trim his hair every Friday. [He explains: Generally, the sons of kings would trim their hair every Friday. Avshalom, being the son of a king, trimmed his hair every Friday.]

The *Gemora* asks: What was the difference between his haircuts and his other brothers?

The *Gemora* answers: If a *Yom Tov* would fall out in the middle of the week, his brothers would cut their hair beforehand, but he would not. Alternatively, they would cut their hair on Friday morning, while he would wait until later in the day (*since he was required to bring the korbanos first*). (5a2 – 5a3)

What were the forty years referred to [by Avshalom]? — Rabbi Nehorai, citing Rabbi Yehoshua, said that it means 'forty years after [the Jews] had demanded a king.' It has been taught: The year in which they demanded a king, was the tenth year [under the leadership of] Shmuel the Ramahite. (5a3)

Mishnah

An ordinary *nezirus* is for thirty days (*if he doesn't specify for how long he wishes to be a nazir, he is a nazir for thirty days; he also cannot specify for any time less than thirty days*). (5a3)

Scriptural Sources for "Thirty Days"

The *Gemora* asks: How is it derived that an ordinary *nazir* is for thirty days?



Rav Masna said: It is written in regards to a *nazir*: *Kodosh yih'yeh*; *It shall be holy*. The numerical value of the word *yih'yeh* is thirty.

Bar Pada said: There are twenty-nine times that the word with the root *nazir* (or *neder*) is mentioned in the Torah (in the section dealing with a *nazir*).

The *Gemora* asks: Why doesn't Rav Masna learn like Bar Pada?

The *Gemora* answers: Rav Masna would say that some of the times that the words are repeated are needed for other expositions (and are therefore not available to teach us the time period of an ordinary *nazir*). The words *He should abstain from new wine and aged wine* are used to teach us that one may not drink *mitzvah* wine in the same manner that he is forbidden to drink optional wine. The words *If he shall clearly utter a vow, the vow of a nazir, to abstain* teaches us that one *nezirus* can take effect upon another one.

And what about Bar Pada? - Bar Pada will answer that since there is at least one time mentioned that is not needed for any exposition, and is therefore coming to teach us the standard amount of days for an ordinary *nazir*, so too, all the other times that the word is mentioned, is coming to teach us the number of days for a *nazir*. (5a3 – 5b1)

Challenges to Bar Pada

The *Gemora* asks on Bar Pada from our *Mishnah*: An ordinary *nezirus* is for thirty days (it should be twenty-nine days according to him)!

The *Gemora* answers: Bar Pada will answer you: Since the *nazir* shaves and brings his *korbanos* on the thirtieth day (and he remains forbidden to drink wine and to become *tamei* until then), the *Mishnah* states "thirty."

The *Gemora* asks on Bar Pada from a *Mishnah* below (16a): One who said, "I am hereby a *nazir*," shaves his head on the thirty-first day.

The *Gemora* answers: Bar Pada could say that you should look at the latter part of that *Mishnah*, which states: If he shaves on the thirtieth day, he has discharged his obligation. This part of the *Mishnah* supports Bar Pada (that he is a *nazir* for only twenty-nine days), and the first part of the *Mishnah* (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 *Mishnah* 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 this *Tanna* holds that part of a day is like the entire day (and therefore, he may shave on the thirtieth day; Rabbinically, he is required to wait for the thirty-first day). (5b1 – 5b2)

Challenge to Rav Masna

The *Gemora* asks on Rav Masna from the same *Mishnah*: If one says, "I am hereby a *nazir* for thirty days," and he shaves his head on the thirtieth day, he has not discharged his obligation. (According to Rav Masna, it should be valid, for this *Tanna* holds that part of a day is like the entire day!)

The *Gemora* answers: The *Mishnah* is referring to a case where he said, "I am hereby a *nazir* for thirty complete days" (everyone would agree that a partial day is not regarded as a day). (5b2)



INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Thirty Day Extreme

The *Mishnah* states: An ordinary *nezirus* is for thirty days (if he doesn't specify for how long he wishes to be a nazir, he is a nazir for thirty days; he also cannot specify for any time less than thirty days).

The Ram" a (Toras Ha'olah) explains the significance of the thirty days. The *Gemora* had stated: Whoever sees a *sotah* when she is being degraded should restrain himself from consuming wine. The *nazir* wishes to inspire himself that he should not be influenced by the *sotah*'s immoral behavior. For one to break a trait which is at one extreme, he should go to the opposite extreme. Eventually, after practicing this condition for some time, he will balance out to the correct measure. This is why the *nazir* abstains from drinking any wine.

We find that situations are established after thirty days. *Halacha* states that it takes thirty days for one to become accustomed to a change in *davening*. If one is uncertain if he inserted a certain prayer during *Shemoneh Esrei*, after thirty days of recital, we can assume that he said it. One is regarded as a resident of a city after he lives there for thirty days. So too, the Ram" a suggests, this can be applicable to a change in one's character traits. Someone who wishes to be cured from his desires to act immorally should become a *nazir* for thirty days. Practicing this extreme for thirty days will enable him to reach the perfect balance in this area.

DAILY MASHAL

Partial Day as a Minimizer

The *Gemora* stated that Rav Masna maintains that the *Tanna* of the *Mishnah* would hold that part of a day is like the entire day and therefore, a *nazir* may shave on the thirtieth day, even though his *nezirus* is not complete until the conclusion of the day.

Reb Yosef Engel asks that the Rema Mipano asserts that with respect to things involving sanctity, we do not say that part of a day is like the entire day. This is why it is not sufficient to observe *Shabbos* and *Yom Tov* for only part of the day, and on the contrary, we add on in the beginning and upon its conclusion. If so, how could our *Gemora* say that this principle applies by a *nazir*? Shouldn't *nezirus* be included in *halachos* involving sanctity?

He answers that since a *nazir* is referred to as a sinner because of his abstaining from permissible things through a vow, we therefore apply the rule that a part of the day is regarded as the entire day, in order to minimize his sin (*by decreasing the amount of time that he would have been required to observe for his nezirus*).