

14 Elul 5775
August 29, 2015



Nazir Daf 7

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

Mishna

If one says, “I am hereby a *nazir* for one large period,” or “I am hereby a *nazir* for one small period,” or “from here until the end of the world,” he is a *nazir* for thirty days. (7a)

Terms of Nezirus

The *Gemora* asks: Why is he a *nazir* for only thirty days? Didn’t he say that he wishes to be a *nazir* until the end of the world (*which could be interpreted to mean “until the end of his life”*)?

The *Gemora* answers: He could very well mean that the matter of *nezirus* seems very long to him (*we must rule leniently that he is a nazir for thirty days*).

The *Gemora* asks on this explanation from a *Mishna* below (8a): If one says, “I am hereby a *nazir* from here until Such-and-such a place,” we evaluate how many days it would take to travel from here until that place. If it would take less than thirty days, he is a *nazir* for thirty days. If it would take more than thirty days, he is a *nazir* for that amount of days. Why don’t we say here also that he meant that the matter of *nezirus* seems very long to him (*and he should be a nazir for thirty days*)?

Rava answers: The *Mishna* is referring to a case where he made the *neder* after he began to travel (*and it is assumed that he wishes that the nezirus should protect him for the*

duration of his journey, and therefore, he is a nazir for the amount of time it would take to travel).

The *Gemora* asks: Shouldn’t there be a separate period of *nezirus* for every *parsah* of the journey?

Rav Papa answers: We are referring to a place where they do not count distances by *parsaos*.

The *Gemora* asks: Shouldn’t there be a separate period of *nezirus* for every night-lodging of the journey? Did we not learn in the following *Mishna* (8a): If one said, “I am hereby a *nazir* in the amount of the dust on the earth,” or “in the amount of hair on my head,” or “in the amount of sand by the sea,” he is a *nazir* for life and he shaves every thirty days (*he is not a permanent nazir, but rather, he is required to observe perpetually repeating thirty days of nezirus until the end of his life, since he vowed to be a separate nazir for each and every speck of dust, granule of sand, or piece of hair*)!

The *Gemora* answers: This principle does not apply to a vow of *nezirus* in which a definite term is mentioned (*such as the amount of days that the journey will take; there, we presume that the vower meant to declare one period of nezirus which will last as long as the amount of days it takes for the journey; when the vower refers to an uncountable number, such as the specks of dust, we cannot assume that he meant a certain amount of days; rather, he meant that he will be repeating thirty days of nezirus until the end of his life*).

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which supports this distinction: If one says, “I am hereby a *nazir* for all the days of my life,” or “I am hereby a permanent *nazir*,” he is a permanent *nazir*. However, if he says, “I am hereby a *nazir* for a hundred years,” or “for one thousand years,” he is not a permanent *nazir*, but rather, he is a *nazir* forever (*since he most probably will not live that long; he is not permitted to trim his hair at all, because his term of nezirus is for a hundred years; this is in contrast to the case where he says for all the days of his life, which is an indeterminate amount of time, he therefore is a permanent nazir*).

Rabbah offers a different explanation: Hairs are different because they are each separated one from the other (*and that is why we rule that he must observe perpetual periods of nezirus; time and distance are continuous, and therefore, we rule that he observes one continuous nezirus*).

The *Gemora* asks: But days are separate one from the other, as it is written: *It was evening and it was morning, one day?*

The *Gemora* answers: The verse is saying that a day and a night constitute one day; however, each day is not separated from the other.

Rava explains the *Mishna*: The case of the *Mishna* is where he said, “I am hereby a *nazir* for one period, which will last from here until the end of the world.” (*That is why he is a nazir for thirty days.*) (7a)

Mishna

If someone says, “I am hereby a *nazir* and one day,” or “I am hereby a *nazir* and one hour,” or “I am hereby a *nazir* one and a half,” he must observe two sets of *nezirus*. (*In all these cases, he is a nazir already from his first expression; the extra words obligate the second set.*) (7a)

Nazir Plus

The *Gemora* asks: Why does the *Mishna* find it necessary to list all these cases?

The *Gemora* answers: They are each necessary. For if the *Mishna* would have only taught the case where he said “I am hereby a *nazir* and one day,” I would have thought that only there, where there is no such a thing as *nezirus* for one day, he is obligated to observe two sets of *nezirus*, but in the case where he said “I am hereby a *nazir* and one hour,” perhaps he is a *nazir* for thirty-one days (*because the hour is viewed as being a portion of the day; not a portion of the nezirus*). The *Mishna* teaches us that this is not the *halacha*. And if the *Mishna* would have only taught the case where he said “I am hereby a *nazir* and one hour,” I would have thought that only there, where there is no such a thing as *nezirus* for one hour, he is obligated to observe two sets of *nezirus*, but in the case where he said “I am hereby a *nazir* one and a half,” perhaps he is a *nazir* for forty-five days. The *Mishna* teaches us that this is not the *halacha*. (7a – 7b)

Mishna

If someone says, “I am hereby a *nazir* for thirty days and one hour,” he is a *nazir* for thirty-one days, for there is no such thing as *nezirus* for hours. (7b)

Superfluous Expressions

Rav said: If one said, “I am hereby a *nazir* for thirty-one days,” he is a *nazir* for thirty-one days. However, if he said, “I am hereby a *nazir* for thirty days and one day,” he is required to observe two sets of *nezirus* (*this is based upon the extra word “day”*).

The *Gemora* comments that it would seem that Rav is following the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, who gives significance to superfluities of expression. For we learned

in the following *Mishna*: If a man sells a house, the sale does not include the pit, nor the cistern, even though he wrote the depth and the height in the deed of sale. He must purchase for himself a right-of way (*in order to gain access to the pit inside of the house*). These are the words of Rabbi Akiva, but the *Chachamim* say that he does not need to purchase a right-of-way for himself (*for we assume that the seller kept that right for himself*). Rabbi Akiva does admit, however, that if he explicitly excludes the pit and the cistern (*which is superfluous, since they are anyways excluded*), he does not have to purchase a right-of-way. (7b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

A Short Term of Nezirus

The *Mishna* states: If one says, "I am hereby a *nazir* for one large period," or "I am hereby a *nazir* for one small period," or "from here until the end of the world," he is a *nazir* for thirty days.

The Meiri explains that when he said "one small period," he meant to accept a *nezirus* less than thirty days; and when he said "one large period," he meant to accept a *nezirus* longer than thirty days.

Tosfos explains differently: When he said "one small period," he meant that the observance of the laws of *nezirus* is easy for him; it is not a bother for him at all. When he said, "one large period," he meant that an abstinence of thirty days seems to him as a very long time and is a burden upon him.

The *Mishna Lemelech* asks: Why did Tosfos not explain like the Meiri?

The Be'er Moshe answers: Tosfos wanted the two cases to be similar. Just like by the case of "the large period," he

meant that it is difficult for him, so too, in the case of "the small period," he meant that it would be easy for him.

The *Birchas Rosh* writes that there is a practical halachic difference between the two explanations. If one would say, "I am hereby a *nazir* for one large period and for one small period." According to Tosfos, he will be required to observe two periods of *nezirus*. However, according to the Meiri that "a small period" means a *nezirus* less than thirty days, it will be regarded as if he said, "I am a *nazir* and one day," where the *halacha* is that he will be a *nazir* for thirty-one days.

Reb Moshe Mordechai Halevi Shulzinger writes that there can be another difference according to that which the *Minchas Chinuch* (368:4) states: If one accepts to become a *nazir* for one day, although he is obligated to observe a *nezirus* for thirty days, nevertheless, the prohibition against violating his word is only applicable for one day. According to the Meiri, when one said, "I am hereby a *nazir* for a small period," he is only accepting for one day. Although the *halacha* is that he is a *nazir* for thirty days, the prohibition against violating his vow will only be applicable for one day. However, according to Tosfos, he is accepting an ordinary *nezirus*; he is just saying that it is easy for him. Accordingly, the prohibition against violating his word will apply for the entire *nezirus*.

DAILY MASHAL

Humility

The Torah details the laws which apply to one who makes a vow to be a *nazir*. He must refrain from drinking wine and eating fresh grapes and raisins, grapes and skins. He may not shave his hair; rather he must let it grow long. A *nazir* may also not defile himself by coming in contact with a corpse. And when the term of his vow has ended, and the *nazir* wishes to revert to his former life, he must

first shave off all his hair and then bring korbanos, offerings, to Hashem. In total, there are ten mitzvos pertaining to the nazir (Sefer Hachinuch Mitzvos 368:377).

The mitzvos which are enumerated in the parsha of nazir were given by Hashem in order to provide a means of self-sanctification for one who wishes to do so. The Chinuch (mitzva 374) writes that by abstaining from wine, one breaks his desires and humbles himself. (While one's main focus should be on spiritual pursuits, nevertheless one should not ignore his physical needs. Abstaining from wine allows the nazir to break his desires in a manner that is not detrimental to his health, Sefer HaChinuch, ibid.)

The Chinuch adds that this is also why the nazir must let his hair grow long. By not concerning himself with his appearance, he humbles himself. Similarly, the nazir shaves his hair completely at the end of his nazirus because there is no doubt that either, extremely long hair or totally bald distorts the appearance of man.

The Chinuch proves that the purpose for growing the hair is to subdue the yetzar hara, evil inclination from the following anecdote recorded in the Gemara (Nedarim 9b). "Shimon Hatzaddik (who was the Kohen Gadol) related that once a certain nazir appeared before him. The man had beautiful eyes, was very good looking and his locks were arranged in curls. Shimon Hatzaddik asked him: 'Why do you make a vow of nazirus, which necessitates that you destroy your beautiful hair?' (For he will be required to shave his head at the end of his nazirus.) The man replied: 'I was a shepherd for my father. Once I went to draw water from the well and gazed at my reflection in the water. My yetzer hara seized me and wished to drive me from the world. I said - Rasha (wicked one), why are you conceited in a world that is not yours, with one who is destined to be consumed by maggots and worms? I swear that I will shave you for the sake of Heaven.' "

The Steipler Gaon, HaRav Y. Y. Kanievsky zt"l observes that although the shepherd did not mention the sin that the yetzer hara was enticing him to transgress, nevertheless from his response to himself, we see that he was concerned lest he become conceited. Indeed there is nothing that can drive one from both this world and the next, other than ga'ava, haughtiness. As it is written: "It is an abomination to Hashem, all who are haughty in their heart (Mishlei 16:5)." Chazal also say that regarding one who is conceited, Hashem says: "I and him cannot live in the world together" (Sota 5a). The Shechina departs from a ba'al ga'ava and he is left to his own defenses to combat his yetzer hara and survive in this world.

The Steipler continues that when one is praised for his accomplishments, he is overjoyed. At times, he might let this joy "go to his head" and he begins thinking that he is deserving of honor. One must be wary lest he fall into the trap of haughtiness. We see how this shepherd trembled when he saw his handsome features and realized that it might lead him to ga'ava. He therefore took an oath of nazirus.