

23 Shevat 5783  
Feb. 14, 2023



Nazir Daf 22

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 the Inquiry**

[*The Gemora had inquired: When the husband revokes his wife’s neder, does his revocation take away the vow retroactively as if it never happened or is the revocation only for the future?*]

The *Gemora* attempts to resolve this inquiry from the following *Baraisa*: 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. Now, if you would conclude that his revocation works only for the future, she should also bring a *korban olah*!

The *Gemora* counters: If you would conclude that a husband’s revocation takes away a vow retroactively as if it never happened, she also should not have to bring the *chatas* (for she was never a *nezirah*)!

The *Gemora* concludes: In truth, the husband does revoke her vow retroactively, and she should not bring the *chatas* bird either. The *Baraisa*’s ruling that she does in fact bring a *chatas* bird can be explained according to the following teaching of Rabbi Eliezer HaKappar. 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. (*This is why she is obligated to bring the chatas.*)

The *Gemora* resolves the inquiry from the following explicit *Baraisa*: If a woman vowed to be a *nezirah* and her friend heard about it and she said, “And I,” and the husband of the first woman heard her *neder* and revoked it, she is released, but her friend’s vow remains intact. This proves that the husband’s revocation only affects the future.

The *Baraisa* continues: Rabbi Shimon says: If the second woman said to the first one, “I am like you,” they would both be released from their vows (*if the first woman’s vow is revoked*). (22a1)

### **Comparing to Rami bar Chama**

Mar Zutra the son of Rav Mari says that this discussion is the same as the inquiry of Rami bar Chama, for Rami bar Chama inquired: If there was a piece of *korban shelamim* lying next to a loaf of bread, and a person said, “This (*bread*) should be like this (*shelamim*).” Is he referring to the prohibition that the meat originally had

before its blood was sprinkled on the Altar, or is he referring to the fact that the meat is now permitted? (*This would be comparable to the case of the second woman, who upon hearing her friend declare herself to be a nazir, she said, "And I." She is linking to the first woman's present situation of nezirus, and not to her later state, when she might be permitted, if her husband would revoke her neder.*)

The Gemora asks: Are the two cases comparable? For in Rami bar Chama's case, it is possible that he is referring to its later permitted state, for when he said, "This (*bread*) should be like this (*shelamim*)," and after its blood is sprinkled, he is permitted to eat it outside of the Beis Hamikdash, it nevertheless is still sacred meat (*so it is understandable that one might attempt to link the bread to a shelamim in this state*). However, here, it is not logical to assume that she is referring to the time after her *nezirus* is revoked, for at that time, there is no *nezirus* left whatsoever.

The Gemora cites another version: This case is certainly comparable to Rami bar Chama's inquiry. (22b1)

### **Footsteps of her Friend**

The Gemora inquires: If the second woman said to the first woman, "I am hereby a *nezirah* in your footsteps," what is the *halachah*? Does she mean to be completely like the first woman, and therefore she will be permitted (*when the first one is released*)? Or perhaps she is only referring to the first woman's state before her husband revoked it, and she will therefore be prohibited.

The Gemora attempts to resolve this inquiry from our *Mishnah*: If a woman said, "Behold, I am a *nezirah*," and upon hearing this, her husband said, "And I," he cannot

revoke her *nezirus*. Now if you will think that when a woman says, "I am hereby a *nezirah* in your footsteps," she is only referring to the first woman's state before her husband revoked it, then let the husband (*who said, "And I," which is similar to the second woman's declaration of "I am hereby a nezirah in your footsteps"*) revoke his wife's vow, and his will remain intact! This proves that when a woman says, "I am hereby a *nezirah* in your footsteps," she mean to be completely like the first woman, and that is why the husband cannot revoke his wife's vow (*for if he would, his vow would be cancelled as well*). And therefore we would conclude that if the second woman said to the first woman, "I am hereby a *nezirah* in your footsteps," she means to be completely like the first woman, and therefore she will be permitted (*when the first one is released*).

The Gemora rejects the proof: In truth, the second woman is referring only to the first woman's state before her husband revoked her vow. The reason that he cannot revoke her *neder* in this instance is because his statement of "and I," is in effect, a confirmation of her *neder*, for if she is not a *nazir*, he can't be either. If he has his confirmation annulled, he may revoke her *neder*; otherwise, he cannot. (22b1 – 22b2)

### **DAILY MASHAL**

#### **Raising Children**

The Haftorah for Parshas Nasso is the famous story of the birth of the mighty Shimshon. There is a difficulty in this story that troubles all the commentaries. The Angel announced to the barren wife of Manoach that she would have a child and instructed her to abstain from wine and strong drink and from coming into contact with tumah [impurity]. The Angel further

instructed her that the child to be born would be a Nazir from birth. No razor would ever be allowed to pass over his head. This child, the Angel informed Manoach's wife, would become the savior of Israel. After delivering this information and these instructions, the Angel departed from the woman.

Manoach's wife related the incident to her husband and Manoach prayed to G-d that he may be able to hear the Angel directly: "Please, my L-rd, may the man of G-d whom you sent come now again to us and teach us what we should do with the lad who is to be born." [Shoftim 13:8]

G-d responded to Manoach's plea and sent the Angel back. Manoach asked him "What should be the conduct of the lad and his behavior?" [Shoftim 13:12]

The Angel responded: "Of everything that I spoke to the woman, she should beware. Of anything that comes from the grapevine, she shall not eat. Wine or strong beverage, she shall not drink. Anything contaminated she shall not eat. Everything that I commanded her, she shall observe." [Shoftim 13:13]

This is virtually a verbatim restatement of what the Angel already told Manoach's wife. The commentaries ask two questions. First - the Angel did not answer Manoach's question. Manoach asked about the "conduct of the lad and his behavior". The Angel spoke about the conduct and behavior of Manoach's wife! Second - what new piece of information did the Angel convey to Manoach that the Angel had not already told to his wife? It appears to be a totally redundant statement of something Manoach already knew!

Rav Yissochar Frand cites a beautiful insight from Rav Elya Meir Bloch: There is only one slight difference

between what the Angel said the first time and what he said the second time. The first time the Angel said she should not drink wine and strong drink. The second time the Angel said "anything that comes from the grapevine she shall not eat." This would include grapes, grape-flavored lollipops -- anything that is remotely related to grapes. In addition he adds, do not drink wine and strong beverage.

This, Rav Elya Meir says, was the answer to Manoach's question. Manoach's question was how to raise a child who would grow up to be the savior of Israel. It is hard enough to raise any child. However, the challenges of raising a child who is called upon to be a 'nazir from the womb' are infinitely harder. Manoach wanted to know "How should I raise such a child? What techniques in child rearing should I utilize to insure his spiritual purity and to guarantee the success of his Divine mission?"

The Angel responded that the way to successfully raise a 'nazir from the womb' is through the meticulousness and the zealousness of accepting "fences" (har-chokos), above and beyond the letter of the law (lifnim m'shuras hadin). The secret to raising the future leader of the Jewish Nation involved taking the extra step and going the extra mile. Your wife should not only refrain from drinking wine -- which is the basic requirement for a nazir -- but she should not even go near grapes! Such meticulous observance on her part will make an impression on the child.

The way to instill Fear of G-d into any child is to allow the child to see Fear of G-d in his or her parents.