

19 Shevat 5783
Feb. 10, 2023



Nazir Daf 18

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

Resolving Rav Ashi’s Inquiry

[Rav Ashi had inquired: If one declared to be a nazir in a cemetery, does he require a head-shaving (on the seventh day of his purification process) or not (in the same manner that he does not require to bring the korbanos)? Perhaps only a nazir tahor that became tamei requires a head-shaving, but not for a tamei person who became a nazir, or perhaps, there is no difference?]

The Gemora attempts to resolve this from a Baraisa: I am only told here that the nazir’s days of corpse tumah (including his days of purification) are not reckoned (towards his term of nezirus). How do we know (that the same is true) regarding the period of declared tzara’as (the days when he is tamei as a metzora and the eight days of his purification process)? This can be derived through the following argument: Just as after the period of corpse tumah, he is required to shave his head (on the seventh day of purification) and bring a sacrifice (on the eighth day), so after the period of declared tzara’as, he is required to shave (his body) and bring a sacrifice; and so, just as the days of (corpse) tumah are not reckoned, the period of declared tzara’as ought not to be reckoned.

The Baraisa counters: Not so! For in the case of the period of tumah, it may be because this renders void the former reckoning, and therefore they will not be

reckoned (for his term), whereas the period of declared tzara’as does not render void the former reckoning, and therefore it should itself be reckoned (for his term).

[The Baraisa attempts to prove this argument through the use of a kal vachomer.] You can say as follows: Seeing that ‘a nazir in a cemetery,’ whose hair is fit for (head) shaving, does not count the days (of tumah) as part of his nezirus term, surely the period of declared tzara’as, when his hair is not fit for (head) shaving, should not be counted as part of his nezirus term.

[The Baraisa had stated: ‘a nazir in a cemetery,’ whose hair is fit for (head) shaving. This would seemingly resolve Rav Ashi’s inquiry.] Does the Baraisa not mean (head) shaving for tumah (and this would prove that one who declared to be a nazir while in a cemetery is indeed obligated to shave his head)!?

The Gemora disagrees: No! The reference may be to the (head) shaving in purity (when the nazir concludes his term).

The Gemora notes: This is indeed reasonable, for if you assume that (head) shaving as a result of the tumah is intended, does he not have to shave after the period of declared tzara’as as well (so why should they be different)?

The Gemora answers: No (this does not constitute proof), for the reference is to the (head) shaving on account of nezirus. (17b2 – 18a1)

The Gemora attempts to resolve this from a *Baraisa*: It is written: *But if someone would suddenly die beside him and render tamei his nazir head* etc. This is referring to a *nazir tahor* that became *tamei*. He is required to shave his hair and bring the birds (for *korbanos*). The verse also teaches us that a *tamei* person who declared *nezirus* does not require the shaving of his hair, nor is he obligated to bring the birds. We could have learned otherwise based upon the following *kal vachomer*: If a *nazir tahor* that became *tamei* is required to shave his hair and bring the birds, certainly one who was *tamei* to begin with, should be required to shave his hair and bring the birds. The verse states: *and render tamei his nazir head* etc. This teaches us that a *nazir tahor* that became *tamei* is required to shave his hair and bring the birds, however, a *tamei* person who declared *nezirus* does not require the shaving of his hair, nor is he obligated to bring the birds.

The Gemora concludes: This is indeed a proof that a *tamei* person who declared *nezirus* is not required to shave his head. (18a1)

The Day that the New Nezirus Begins

The Gemora asks: Who is the *Tanna* that taught the following *Baraisa*? There is no difference between a *tamei* person who declared *nezirus* and a *nazir tahor* who became *tamei* except that a *tamei* person who declared *nezirus*, his seventh day counts towards his *nezirus* count (after he has completed his purification process, he may begin to count *nezirus* and the remainder of that day counts towards his term of *nezirus*), however, a *nazir tahor* that became *tamei*, his

seventh day does not count towards his *nezirus* count (like we learned in the previous *Mishnah*; he cannot resume his *nezirus* until after he brings the *korbanos* on the eighth day).

Rav Chisda said: This is in accordance with Rebbe, for Rebbe said: The *nazir tamei's* new *nezirus* does not begin until the eighth day. For if it would be in accordance with Rabbi Yosi bar Yehudah, he said that the new *nezirus* begins on the seventh day (but the *Baraisa* states that the count does not start until the eighth day).

The Gemora asks: Which Rebbe and which Rabbi Yosi bar Yehudah are we referring to?

The Gemora quotes the *Baraisa* which cites their respective opinions: It is written: *And he shall sanctify his head on that day*. Rebbe said: "That day" is referring to the day that he brings his *korbanos*. Rabbi Yosi bar Yehudah said: "That day" is referring to the day that he shaves (he may begin the new *nezirus* count on the seventh day).

The Gemora asks: Who is the *Tanna* that taught the following *Mishnah*? A *nazir* who became *tamei* with many *tumos* brings only one *korban*.

Rav Chisda said: This is in accordance with Rabbi Yosi bar Yehudah who said that that the new *nezirus* begins on the seventh day. He will explain the case of the *Mishnah* as follows: The *nazir tamei* became *tamei* again on the seventh day of his *taharah* process (after he was sprinkled upon from the waters of the red heifer and he immersed in the *mikvah*; this allows him to begin counting his new *nezirus* again according to Rabbi Yosi bar Yehudah, and is therefore regarded as a distinct *tumah* from before) and then he became *tamei* again

on the seventh day of his *taharah* process. He is only liable to bring one set of *korbanos* for all these *tumos*, since the time which is fit to bring the *korbanos* (the eighth day) had not arrived. For if this *Mishnah* would be following the opinion of Rebbe, how could it be explained? If the *nazir tamei* became *tamei* again on the seventh day of his *taharah* process (after he was sprinkled upon from the waters of the red heifer and he immersed in the *mikvah*; this allows him to begin counting his new *nezirus* again according to Rabbi Yosi bar Yehudah, and is therefore regarded as a distinct *tumah* from before) and then he became *tamei* again on the seventh day of his *taharah* process, this is one long case of *tumah* (for Rebbe holds that he cannot begin counting the new *nezirus* until the eighth day, and the *Mishnah* was dealing with a case of many *tumos*). And if the case was speaking about where the *nazir tamei* became *tamei* again on the eighth day of his *taharah* process and then he became *tamei* again on the eighth day of his *taharah* process, he became *tamei* at a time which is fit to bring the *korbanos* (he should be liable to bring multiple sets of *korbanos*).

What is Rebbe's reason [for his opinion]? — The verse says [first]: And make atonement for him that he sinned by reason of the dead, and then: And he shall sanctify his head on that day. And what does Rabbi Yosi bar Yehudah [say to this]? — If this is its intention, the text should read simply: 'And he shall sanctify his head'. What is the purpose of [the additional phrase], 'on that day'? Since it cannot refer to the eighth day, we may take it as referring to the seventh day. And Rebbe? He can say that the purpose of the phrase on 'that day' is to tell us that even if he should fail to bring his sacrifices [the *nezirus* commences].

Now what compelled Rav Chisda to ascribe the authorship of this dictum to Rabbi Yosi bar Yehudah?

Why should he not have interpreted it as referring to where he became *tamei* on the eighth night, and ascribed the authorship to Rebbe? Are we to understand from the fact that he does not ascribe the authorship to Rebbe, that in his opinion the night [before the day that his sacrifice is due] is not regarded as belonging to the preceding period? — Rav Adda bar Ahavah replied: One thing depends on the other. If we hold that the night [before the day his sacrifice is due] is regarded as belonging to the preceding period, then, since he can offer his sacrifice only in the morning, the *nezirus* does not begin to operate until the morning; whereas if the night [before the day his sacrifice is due] is not regarded as belonging to the preceding period, the *nezirus* after purification [from *tumah*] begins in the evening. (18a1 – 18b1)

The Necessary Korbanos

It was taught in a *Baraisa*: If a *nazir tamei* became *tamei* again on the seventh day of his *taharah* process (after he was sprinkled upon from the waters of the red heifer and he immersed in the *mikvah*) and then he became *tamei* again on the seventh day of his *taharah* process, he is only liable to bring one set of *korbanos* for all these *tumos*. If, however, the *nazir tamei* became *tamei* again on the eighth day of his *taharah* process and then he became *tamei* again on the eighth day of his *taharah* process, he is liable to bring *korbanos* for each incident of *tumah*. He begins to count the new *nezirus* on the seventh day of his *taharah* process (after he was sprinkled upon from the waters of the red heifer and he immersed in the *mikvah*); these are the words of Rabbi Eliezer.

The *Chachamim* say that he is only required to bring one set of *korbanos* for all the *tumos* (even if the *tumah* occurred on the eighth day). If, however, he already

brought the *korban chatas*, and only then did he become *tamei*, he is liable to bring *korbanos* for each incident of *tumah*. If he brings his *korban chatas*, but he did not yet bring his *korban asham*, he may still begin to count the new *nezirus*.

Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah says: Just like the *chatas* prevents him from counting his new *nezirus*, so too, the *korban asham* will prevent him from counting his new *nezirus*.

The *Gemora* asks: It is understandable according to Rabbi Eliezer, for he expounds the Scriptural verse as follows: *And he shall sanctify his head on that day*. We derive from here that “*on that day*,” he may begin his new *nezirus* even though he did not bring his *korbanos*. It is also understandable according to the *Chachamim*, for they expound as follows: “*On that day*,” he may begin his new *nezirus* even though he did not bring his *korban asham*. However, according to Rabbi Yishmael, what is derived from the verse: “*on that day*”?

The *Gemora* answers: It is to teach us that he may begin his new *nezirus* even though he did not yet bring his *korban olah*.

The *Chachamim* say: It is not necessary to teach us that he may begin his new *nezirus* even though he did not yet bring his *korban olah*, for an *olah* is a gift offering (*and we would not think that withholding the olah would prevent him from beginning the nezirus again*).

What is the Rabbis’ reason [for stating that the *nezirus* may begin even though the *asham* was not brought]? — It has been taught: What is the implication of the verse: *And he shall dedicate to Hashem the days of his nezirus, and shall bring a sheep in its first year as an asham*? Since we find that all other *asham* offerings

mentioned in the Torah are critical [to atonement so long as they are not brought], it might have been thought that this one is also critical, and so the text says, ‘*And he shall dedicate . . . and shall bring [an asham offering]*’ implying that even though he may not yet have brought [the *asham*], he is to dedicate. Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah said: ‘*And he shall dedicate . . . and shall bring*’. When does he dedicate? After he has brought. (18b1 – 19a1)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

The Necessary Korbanos

It emerges from the *Gemora* that there are four Tannaic opinions as to when a *nazir tamei* begins to count his new *nezirus*.

- 1) Rabbi Yosi bar Yehudah maintains that the new *nezirus* begins on the seventh day after he shaves his head.
- 2) Rebbe holds that he begins to count the new *nezirus* on the eighth day, even before he brings any of the *korbanos*.
- 3) The *Chachamim* hold that he cannot count the new *nezirus* until he brings the *korban chatas*. He begins even if the *korban asham* was not brought, and certainly, he begins if the *korban olah* was not brought (*for the olah is merely a gift, and it does not come for atonement*).
- 4) Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah says: Just like the *chatas* prevents him from counting his new *nezirus*, so too, the *korban asham* will prevent him from counting his new *nezirus*.



DAILY MASHAL

Lesson learned

The *Torah* allows one to become a *nazir* voluntarily. This status precludes one from eating or drinking grape products or from coming into contact with a dead body. In addition, the *nazir's* hair may not be cut. By becoming a *nazir*, one enters into a state of extreme sanctity in which what is permissible -- and taken for granted by the average Jew -- becomes incongruous with the *nazir's* elevated status. *Chazal* explain the reason that the *Torah* juxtaposes the laws of the *nazir* upon those of the *sotah*, wayward wife. One who sees a *sotah* in her degradation should accept upon himself to become a *nazir* and abstain from wine. Wine and alcoholic beverages cause one to lose control of his faculties and sin. Hence, the *sotah* serves as a bitter example of one who lost his self-control.

The *nazir* seems to be a person who senses within himself an inability to quell the passions and desires which his *yetzer hora*, evil inclination, is able to conjure. He does not know when or how to stop. What should he do? His only recourse is to abstain totally from all pleasure. Thus, he will be guaranteed success over his *yetzer hora*. After all, if he runs away from everything, he will not have anything over which to lose control. Consequently, the *Torah* tells the *nazir*, "Stay away from the vineyard, for you cannot manage exposure to anything that might bring you in contact with your desires."? The *nazir* who sees the debasement of the *sotah* perceives that the only way to spare himself from such a fate is to "run away" from wine and all pleasures that might undermine his ability to control himself.

Rabbi A. Leib Schainbaum in *Peninim* notes: There is an obvious question that begs explanation. Is there a greater deterrent to sin than seeing the tragic punishment of the wayward wife? On the contrary, the person who has witnessed this phenomenon can drink wine - because he will be cautious not to go beyond his bounds. He clearly sees the results of letting oneself go. Why, then, is it necessary for him to abstain completely from wine?

Horav Baruch Sorotzkin, zl, gives a profound insight into human nature that helps us to understand what motivates the *nazir* to refrain from wine. While on the one hand, the *nazir* sees the bitter outcome of passion unleashed, he also sees that people continue to sin regardless of the consequences. Is it any different today when people know the terrible effect various drugs and intoxicants have on the body - and they still go ahead and indulge? Why? How many funerals does one have to attend before the message becomes clear? The answer is that while some people are suffering, others are not. Human nature -- or, more accurately, the *yetzer hora*-- demands that we look at the "positive" - those who continue to sin unpunished and unhindered. Is there a more influential motive for sin than seeing a successful sinner?