

7 Shevat 5783
Jan. 29, 2023



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 *Mishnah* 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 *Mishnah*, 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 *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 halachah 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 the *Mishnah* explains itself by stating that the thirtieth day will count for

the first *nezirus* and for the second. (*Obviously, the Mishnah holds that nezirus lasts for thirty days, and not twenty-nine, for otherwise, the Mishnah would have no need to say that the thirtieth day counts for the first one.*)

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

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 *Mishnah* teaches us that the principle applies even in this case. (5b2 – 6a1)

The *Gemora* asks on Bar Pada from the same *Mishnah*: 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 *Mishnah* 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 *Mishnah* 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). (6a1 – 6a2)

The Gemora asks on Bar Pada from the same Mishnah: 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 Mishnah, 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 Mishnah 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 Mishnah: 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). (6a2 – 6b2)

May we say [that the difference between Rav Masna and Bar Pada] is the same as that between the following Tannaim? [For it was taught:] From the verse: Until the days be fulfilled, I can only infer that the vow must continue in force at least two days, and so the text adds: He shall be holy; he shall let the tresses grow long, and hair does not ‘grow long’ in less than thirty days; these are the words of Rabbi Yoshiyah. Rabbi Yonasan, however, said that this [reasoning] is unnecessary, for we have the text: Until the days be

fulfilled. What days then are those which have to be 'fulfilled'? You must say the thirty days [of the lunar month]. May we assume that Rav Masna agrees with Rabbi Yoshiyah, and Bar Pada with Rabbi Yonasan? — Rav Masna can maintain that both [authorities] agree that thirty days is the necessary period and the point at issue between them is whether the word 'until' [preceding a number] signifies the inclusion or exclusion [of the last unit of that number]. Rabbi Yoshiyah is of the opinion that in the term 'until' [the last unit] is not included, whereas Rabbi Yonasan is of the opinion that by the use of 'until', [the last unit] is included. (6b2)

The Master stated: What days then are those which have to be 'fulfilled'? You must say: The thirty days [of a lunar month]. But could it not be a week? — [In the case of] a week, what deficiency is there to make up? Could it then not be a year? — Are these reckoned in days? Surely the Rabbis of Caesarea have said: How do we know that a year is not reckoned in days? Because Scripture says: months of the year: [this signifies that] months are counted towards years but not days. (6b2 – 7a1)

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*.

DAILY MASHAL

Rabbi Levi said (Yoma 86a): Great is repentance, for it reaches up to the Throne of Glory, as it is said: Return, O Israel, unto Hashem your God. If we say that 'until' means 'until and not including,' it emerges that repentance does not actually reach the Heavenly Throne, but just below it! How can this be explained?

The Tzlach writes that sins are committed on account of Amalek. The verse mentioned is referring to those who repented out of fear but not out of love; and the Gemora notes that such a repentance accomplishes that the sins committed intentionally are regarded as mistakes.

Chazal say that the Throne is not complete until Amalek is completely eradicated; since it is Amalek that caused the teshuvah to be out of fear and not out of love, Amalek still exists and cannot be eradicated from the world. Accordingly, such repentance only reaches just below the Heavenly Throne, but not the Throne itself, for the Throne is not complete as long as Amalek remains in existence.