

26 Elul 5775
Sept. 10, 2015



Nazir Daf 19

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

The Sinning Nazir

The *Gemora* asks: Who is the *Tanna* who authored this *braisa*? The *braisa* states: If a woman made a *neder* to become a *nazir*, and she became *tamei* from the dead, and she designated animals for her *korbanos* (a *nazir* who becomes *tamei* brings three *korbanos* upon completion of the purification process; two birds, one for a *chatas* and one for an *olah*, and a lamb for an *asham*), and then the husband revoked her *neder*, she offers the *chatas* bird, but not the *olah* bird.

Rav Chisda said: The author of this *braisa* must be Rabbi Yishmael (who maintains that the *olah* is an essential part of the *tumah korbanos*, and therefore it cannot be brought; according to the *Chachamim*, who hold that it is merely a gift, it may be brought).

The *Gemora* asks: What does Rabbi Yishmael hold? If he holds that a husband’s revocation takes away a vow retroactively as if it never happened, she as well should not have to bring the *chatas* (for she was never a *nezirah*)! If he holds that the revocation works for the future (that there is presently no longer any vow), she should bring a *korban olah* as well!?

The *Gemora* answers: Rabbi Yishmael holds that it is retroactive. However, he also agrees with the

following teaching of Rabbi Elozar HaKappar. For Rabbi Elozar HaKappar asks: What does the verse mean when it says, “and he shall atone for him for having sinned on his soul?” What “soul” did he “sin” against? It must be referring to the fact that he pained himself by abstaining from wine. This additionally teaches us that if this person who merely abstained from wine is called a sinner, someone who abstains from many things is certainly a sinner.

The *Gemora* asks: This teaching of Rabbi Elozar HaKappar is discussing a verse regarding a *nazir* who becomes impure! However, his teaching implies that it even refers to a *nazir* who remains pure!?

The *Gemora* answers: Rabbi Eliezer HaKappar indeed holds that even a pure *nazir* is a sinner. The reason that this lesson is taught through a verse discussing an impure *nazir* is because he doubled his sin (he became a *nazir*, and also became impure during his *nezirus*). (19a)

Nazir in the Cemetery

The *Mishna* states: If he left the cemetery and he came back in, the day counts towards his counting of days.

The *Gemora* asks: Just because he left, the *nezirus* should start!?

Shmuel answers: The case is where he left, was sprinkled with purifying water (*mixed with the ashes of the red heifer*), and then immersed into a *mikvah* (*and went back into the cemetery after a number of days*).

The *Gemora* asks: The language of the *Mishna* indicates that because he went back into the cemetery, the days counted towards his *nezirus*. Can this possibly mean that if he would not have gone back, they would not have counted?!

The *Gemora* answers: It means that not only does it count if he did not go back into the cemetery, but it even counts if he does go back in.

Rav Kahana and Rav Assi said to Rav: Why didn't you explain this (*explanation above*) to us?

Rav answered: I didn't think you needed me to tell it to you. (19a)

Explaining Rabbi Eliezer

Rabbi Eliezer says: Not for that day, as the verse says "*and the first days will fall*," implying that he must have first days, and only then does he forfeit his days.

Ulla says: Rabbi Eliezer stated the above only regarding a *tamei* person who made a vow of *nezirus*. A *tahor* person who would make this vow and then become *tamei* on his first day would indeed forfeit that day.

Rava says: What is Rabbi Eliezer's reasoning? The verse says, "for his *nezirus* is impure." This implies that the reason that this day is not forfeited is because he made the vow when *tamei*.

Abaye asked a question from the following *braisa*. If someone said he would be a *nazir* for one hundred days and he became *tamei* in the beginning of his *nezirus*, one might have thought that he forfeits the previous days. The verse therefore says, "*and the first days will fall*," implying that he must have first days and only then does this infraction have this effect. If he becomes *tamei* at the end of the hundred days, one might have thought that the previous days are forfeited. The verse therefore says, "*and the first days will fall*," implying that there must be later days in order for the first days to fall. This person does not have all of the later days (*and therefore he does not take away all of his nezirus days through this impurity*). If he becomes *tamei* on the ninety-ninth day, one might have thought that he does not forfeit his previous days. The verse, "*and the first days will fall*" teaches us that if someone has first and last days that all of his days are forfeited when he becomes *tamei*.

This *braisa* is not referring to someone who was *tamei* and made a vow, as it states the case of someone who said he would be a *nazir* for one hundred days and he became *tamei* towards the beginning of these days. Even so, the *braisa* still invokes the teaching that he must have first days in order to forfeit previous days (*unlike the statement of Ulla and Rava*). This seems to be an unanswerable question.

Rav Pappa asked Abaye: How do you understand this case in the *braisa* regarding the early days? Did one day pass and he became *tamei* on the second day, or did two days pass and he became *tamei* on the third day? Abaye was unsure. He asked Rava, who answered with the verse “*they will fall*” (implying that at least two days had to have gone by).

The *Gemora* says: It is necessary for the verse to have said “*days*” and “*they will fall.*” If it would only have said “*days,*” we would have thought that two full days are needed and the third must have already started. This is why the Torah says that the two days have “fallen” (meaning that they have already started, even if they are not full days). If it would have merely said “*days,*” but not “*they will fall,*” we would have thought that even one day would be sufficient. This is why the Torah wrote “*days.*” (19a – 19b)

Mishna

Someone vowed many periods of *nezirus*, finished them, and then arrived in *Eretz Yisroel*. Beis Shammai say that he must do one more period of *nezirus*, while Beis Hillel maintain that he must start over. There was an incident with Queen Helena whose son had gone to battle. She vowed that if her son came back from battle intact, she would be a *nazir* for seven years. He came back, and she indeed was a *nazir* for seven years. At the end of the seven years she went to *Eretz Yisroel*. Beis Hillel ruled that she should remain a *nazir* for another seven years. At the end of those seven years she became *tamei*, meaning that she ended up being a *nazir* for twenty-

one years. Rabbi Yehudah said: She was a *nazir* for only fourteen years. (19b)

DAILY MASHAL

Abstaining from Wine

Ben Yehoyadah explains why one who deprives himself from wine or any food is regarded as a sinner. Portions of one’s soul are contained within foods and drinks. When one recites a blessing before eating these foods, he can cause a remedy for those parts of the soul, and through his blessing, they will be able to go to their rightful place. It emerges that one who declares himself to be a *nazir* and therefore refrains from eating grapes or drinking wine, is sinning regarding his soul, for now his soul will remain deficient.

Furthermore, there are many *mitzvos* where wine is required, such as *kiddush* on *Shabbos* and *Yom Tov*, *havdalah*, *birkas hamazon*, *bris milah* and *sheva brochos*. Chazal established the *mitzvos* in this manner in order to rectify the sin of Adam Harishon, which was with wine. One who vows to be a *nazir* and therefore abstains from drinking wine causes anguish to his soul.