

15 Shevat 5783
Feb. 6, 2023



Nazir Daf 14

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

Interrupted Nezirus

Rava inquired: If someone said, “I will be a *nazir* in twenty days’ time, and I am hereby a *nazir* for one hundred days (not necessarily to begin immediately),” what is the *halachah*? Do we say that since the “one hundred days” cannot be completed within the first twenty days, they do not take effect now (since he will be forced to interrupt the *nezirus* – twenty days first, and eighty days afterwards; we assume that people do not want to make such a *nezirus*)? Or perhaps, we say that since there is ample time for a “growth of hair” (thirty days) to grow at the end (within the eighty days), the *nezirus* (of one hundred days) takes effect now.

The *Gemora* asks: Why didn’t he inquire regarding a minimal *nezirus* (if he said, “I will be a *nazir* in twenty days’ time, and I am hereby a *nazir* (for thirty days), do we say that since the “thirty days” (of the second *nezirus*) cannot be completed within the first twenty days, they do not take effect now, or they should take effect now, and it should be completed after he completes the first *nezirus*)?

The *Gemora* answers: Rava, as a matter of fact, did inquire about that, and this was his thought process: If you will conclude that in the case of the minimal *nezirus*, where there will only be ten days remaining (to complete the second *nezirus* after he has completed the first *nezirus*), those ten days cannot combine with the first twenty (for the person never intended for the *nezirus* to be split up in such a manner, and therefore, the first *nezirus* should not take effect until the conclusion of his second *nezirus*).

However, when he declares himself a *nazir* for one hundred days, since there are eighty days remaining at the end, they would combine with the original twenty; or perhaps, even in this case, *Nazir* do not (for a person prefers to have an uninterrupted *nezirus*).

If you will conclude that (in the “one hundred-day” case) it does take effect immediately, what would be the *halachah* if he said, “I will be a *nazir* in twenty days’ time, and I am hereby a permanent *nazir*”? Does the permanent *nezirus* take effect immediately (perhaps it should not, for it is a different kind of *nezirus* than an ordinary term, and the person does not wish to start one type of *nezirus* (where he may trim his hair) and then switch to the standard type (where he cannot cut his hair), and then revert back to the permanent *nezirus*)?

If you will conclude that (in the “permanent *nezirus*” case) it does take effect immediately because he can have the ordinary *nezirus* nullified (and the permanent *nezirus* will be uninterrupted), what would be the *halachah* if he said, “I will be a *nazir* Shimshon in twenty days’ time, and I am hereby a permanent *nazir*”? Here, where he cannot have this *nezirus* nullified, does the “thirty-day” *nezirus* take effect immediately or not?

What is the *halachah* if he said, “like Moshe on the seventh of Adar”? (Is he referring to Moshe’s birthday – a day of celebration, and then, he would not be declaring himself as a *nazir*; or perhaps, he was referring to the day that Moshe died – a day of sorrow, and then, he would be declaring himself as a *nazir*?)

The *Gemora* states: Let us resolve the first inquiry from the following *Baraisa*: If someone said, "I will be a *nazir* in twenty days' time, and I am hereby a *nazir* for one hundred days," he counts twenty (*starting the "one hundred-day" term*), and then he counts thirty (*for his standard nezirus*), and then he counts eighty in order to complete his first *nezirus*. (13b2 – 14a1)

Forfeiting Days

[The *Mishnah* had stated: If he says, "I will be a *nazir* when I have a son and I am also hereby a *nazir*," and he started counting his own *nezirus* (*his initial unconditional nezirus*), and then a son was born to him, he stops counting his *nezirus* and begins to count the *nezirus* for his son, and then (*after he finishes the nezirus for his son; he does not bring korbanos now, nor does he shave his head*) he returns to finish his own *nezirus* (*and upon completion of this nezirus, he shaves his head and brings two sets of korbanos*).]

If he became *tamei* during the days of his son's *nezirus*, Rabbi Yochanan said: He forfeits the days of his own *nezirus* (*besides the nezirus for his son; when a nazir becomes tamei, he must repeat his nezirus all over again; Rabbi Yochanan is ruling that he must begin both sets of nezirus again*). Rish Lakish said: He does not forfeit any days of his own *nezirus*.

The *Gemora* explains: Rabbi Yochanan said: He forfeits the days of his own *nezirus* as well because both terms of *nezirus* are regarded as one. Rish Lakish said: He does not forfeit any days of his own *nezirus* because each term of *nezirus* is treated separately. (14a1 – 14a2)

Nezirus and Tzaraas

If a *nazir* became *tamei* (*from a corpse*) while he was afflicted with *tzaraas* (*a group of skin conditions, for*

which the Torah decrees tumah; the person is regarded as an av hatumah; a nazir who is afflicted with tzaraas temporarily suspends his nezirus count until he is purified), Rabbi Yochanan said: He forfeits the days of his *nezirus*. Rish Lakish said: He does not forfeit the days of his own *nezirus*.

The *Gemora* explains: Rabbi Yochanan said: He forfeits the days of his *nezirus* because he is still in middle of his *nezirus* count. Rish Lakish said: He does not forfeit any days of his *nezirus* because his term of *tzaraas* is separate from his term of *nezirus*.

And it is necessary [to have both these disagreements on record]. For if only the first were recorded, [we might say that] there Rabbi Yochanan was of the opinion that [the first period] becomes void because the same term, *nezirus*, applies to both, whereas in the other he would agree with Rish Lakish that the *nazir* period and the *tzaraas* are distinct. Similarly, had only the other [regarding *tzaraas*] been recorded, [we might suppose that] only there did Rish Lakish hold [the two periods to be distinct], whereas in the first he would agree with Rabbi Yochanan. Thus the necessity [for recording both disagreements] is demonstrated. (14b1)

Day of Hair Growth

(*The halachah is that if a nazir's hair was cut within his term of nezirus, he must observe all of the nazir's halachos until he has a "thirty-day growth of hair."*) If he became *tamei* during the "day of hair growth," Rav said: He does not forfeit his days of *nezirus*. This, he says, is even according to Rabbi Yochanan. For Rabbi Yochanan only said that he must forfeit the days of *nezirus* when he is still within his term of *nezirus*. Here, however, the "day of hair growth" is considered post-*nezirus*.

Shmuel said: He does forfeit his days of *nezirus*. This, he says, is even according to Rish Lakish. For Rish Lakish only

said that he doesn't forfeit the days of *nezirus* when there are two terms of *nezirus*. Here, however, the "day of hair growth" is considered one *nezirus*. (14b1)

Becoming Tamei After the Korbanos, but Prior to his Shaving

Rav Chisda said: Everyone will agree that if his hair was still holy (*his hair was not cut*) when the blood from the *nazir's korbanos* (concluding ritual) was applied to the Altar, and then he became *tamei*, there is no remedy for him. (*The Gemora understands Rav Chisda to mean that he will remain a nazir forever. This is based upon the following: A nazir must shave his head in order to be released from the nezirus prohibitions. He must shave his head while he is tahor. His korbanos must be brought in conjunction with his shaving.*)

The *Gemora* asks: According to whose opinion is Rav Chisda following? If he is following Rabbi Eliezer, who holds that the shaving of the *nazir's* head is essential (*and he will not be released from his prohibitions without it*), then he is still regarded as being within his term of *nezirus*, and he should forfeit his days? And if he is following the *Chachamim*, who hold that the shaving of the *nazir's* head is not essential, why is there no remedy?

The *Gemora* answers: He is going according to the *Chachamim*; and when he said "there is no remedy," he only meant that he will not be able to fulfill the *mitzvah* of shaving his head while he is *tahor*. (14b2)

Status of a Nazir who Delays in the Bringing of his Korbanos

Rabbi Yosi bar Chanina said: If a *nazir* concludes his obligatory days (*but he delays bringing his korbanos*), and then he becomes *tamei*, he will be punished with lashes, but he will not receive lashes for cutting his hair, nor for drinking wine.

What is different regarding *tumah* that he is punished with lashes? [Assuredly] because the Torah says: All the days that he keeps himself a nazir unto Hashem [he shall not come near to a dead body], thus including the days after completion equally with the days before completion! But in that case, for shaving too he should be liable to lashes seeing that the Merciful One said: All the days of his vow of *nezirus* no razor shall pass over his head, thereby including the days after completion equally with the days before completion. And furthermore: All the days of his *nezirus*, from anything that is made of the grape-vine [he shall not eat] should also include the days after completion equally with the days before completion? — [Tumah] is different, for the Merciful One said: And contaminate his nazir head, showing that [the penalty for *tumah* lies] wherever *nezirus* depends on the head.

An objection was raised: A nazir who has completed his period is forbidden to shave, or drink wine, or have contact with the dead. Should he shave or drink wine, or have contact with the dead he is to receive the forty lashes. [This is] a refutation of Rabbi Yosi bar Chanina. (14b2 – 15a1)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Nezirus Shimshon

It is evident from our *Gemora* that one cannot nullify a *nezirus* Shimshon. If so, our version of *hataras nedarim* (the nullification of our vows) that we recite on *Erev Rosh Hashanah* is very problematic. We state explicitly that we are petitioning the *Beis Din* to annul all of our *nedarim* and *nezirus*, and even a *nezirus* Shimshon! How can it be nullified?

The *Pischei Teshuvah* (Y.D. 139:6), based on this question writes that our version is an erroneous one.

However, the Nitzotzei Ohr cites a Minchas Chinuch (368), who says in the name of the Leket Hakemach that *nezirus* Shimshon cannot be nullified only if the *nezirus* had begun already; however, if it did not start yet (*i.e. he said, "I will be a nazir Shimshon in twenty days"*), it may be annulled. On *Erev Rosh Hashanah*, we are petitioning the *Beis Din* to annul any future vows of *nezirus* that we may utter.

The Pardes Yosef answers that they accepted *nezirus* on *Motzoei Shabbos*; not on *Shabbos*. This would certainly be congruent with the opinion who holds that he died at sunset towards the conclusion of *Shabbos*. It is for this reason that we recite the *tefillah* of *tzidkascha tzedek* by *Mincha* on *Shabbos*.

DAILY MASHAL

Moshe's Death and Nezirus on Shabbos

The *Gemora* inquires: What is the *halachah* if he said, "like Moshe on the seventh of Adar"? (*Is he referring to Moshe's birthday – a day of celebration, and then, he would not be declaring himself as a nazir; or perhaps, he was referring to the day that Moshe died – a day of sorrow, and then, he would be declaring himself as a nazir?*)

Tosfos writes that on the day that Moshe died, there were presumably many Jews who declared a vow of *nezirus* because of their sorrow.

The Ben Poras asks: Behold, Moshe died on *Shabbos*! (*Tosfos in Menachos (30a) cites a dispute regarding this. Some say that he died on a Friday.*) How was it permitted for them to accept a vow of *nezirus* on *Shabbos*? He explains: The Rama Mipano rules that a *Kohen Gadol* cannot be anointed with the anointing oil on *Shabbos* because this oil renders him holy, and this would be regarded as *tikkun gavra* (*repairing him, which would be forbidden on Shabbos*). Accordingly, it should be forbidden for one to accept *nezirus* on *Shabbos*, for with his vow, he becomes holy!

He answers that since it is possible to have the *nezirus* annulled, and he is not a permanent *nazir*, it is not regarded as a *tikkun gavra*.