

3 Tishrei 5776
Sept. 16, 2015



Nazir Daf 25

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

Extra Chatas

The *Gemora* had stated: If a *nazir* died and he had designated an unspecified amount of money for his *korbanos*, they are to be used for voluntary communal offerings.

The *Gemora* asks: But aren't monies for the *chatas* mixed in with them? (*How can all the money be used for voluntary communal offerings, when the money designated for a chatas must be cast into the Dead Sea?*)

Rabbi Yochanan answers: It is a special *Halacha* (*I'Moshe mi'Sinai*) that was said regarding the monies of a *nazir*.

Rish Lakish answers: It is written: *Whether any of their vows or any of their voluntary offerings*. The Torah is teaching us that the leftover funds (*from an unspecified amount*) should be used for voluntary *olah* offerings.

The *Gemora* asks: It is understandable according to Rabbi Yochanan why there is a distinction between unspecified monies and specified monies (*the specified monies will not be used for communal offerings; this is because the Halacha was only said regarding unspecified monies*). However, according to Rish Lakish, why is there a distinction between the two (*the verse can apply to specified monies as well*)?

Rava answers: You cannot say that specified monies may be used for voluntary offerings, for the following was taught in the Beis Medrash of Rabbi Yishmael: It is written: *Only your holy things, which you will have, and your vows*. The Torah is discussing the offspring of *korbanos* and their *temurah* exchanges (*the owner attempts to exchange a different animal with the original korban; the halacha is that the temurah animal gets the same sanctity as the original one, and both animals must be brought as a korban*). What shall be done with these animals (*which are regarded as extra*)? It is written: *You shall take them and go to the place that Hashem will choose*. Perhaps, you might think that he should bring them to the Beis Hamikdash and withhold from them water and food so that they should die, the Torah teaches us: *And you shall offer your olah sacrifices, the meat and the blood*. This teaches us that whatever you do with the *olah* offering, so you shall do with its exchanges, and whatever you do with the *shelamim* sacrifices, so you shall do with its offspring (*bring them as a korban*). Perhaps, you might think that this *halacha* should apply to the offspring of a *chatas* and the *temurah* of an *asham*, the Torah teaches us: *Only (it is only the offspring and temurah of an olah or shelamim that you bring as a korban, but not that which comes from a chatas or an asham)*. These are the words of Rabbi Yishmael. (*We can learn from here that just as the "extra" chatas cannot be brought as a korban, so too, the monies which were designated for a chatas cannot be used to purchase other korbanos.*)

Rabbi Akiva says: It is unnecessary to expound the verse in this manner (*that the temurah of an asham cannot be brought as a korban*), for it is written in a different verse: *It is an asham*. This teaches us that only an original *asham* may be brought as a *korban*. (24b – 25a)

Offspring of Korbanos

The *braisa* had stated: Perhaps, you might think that he should bring them (*the offspring and the temurah exchanges of an olah or shelamim*) to the Beis Hamikdosh and withhold from them water and food so that they should die, the Torah teaches us: *And you shall offer your olah sacrifices, the meat and the blood*.

The *Gemora* asks: Why would I think that they should not be brought as a *korban*? Isn't there a *halacha l'Moshe mi'Sinai* that the offspring of a *chatas* must be left to die (*evidently, the offspring from all other korbanos may be brought on the Altar*)?

The *Gemora* answers: If not for the extra verse, I would have thought that the offspring of a *chatas* may be left to die anywhere, but the offspring from other *korbanos* must be left to die in the Beis Hamikdosh. The verse teaches us that they may be brought as a *korban*. (25a – 25b)

Offspring of a Chatas

The *braisa* had stated: Perhaps, you might think that this *halacha* should apply to the offspring of a *chatas* and the *temurah* of an *asham*, the Torah teaches us: *Only (it is only the offspring and temurah of an olah or shelamim that you bring as a korban, but not that which comes from a chatas or an asham)*.

The *Gemora* asks: Why would I think that the offspring of a *chatas* may be brought as a *korban*? Isn't there a

halacha l'Moshe mi'Sinai that the offspring of a *chatas* must be left to die?

The *Gemora* answers: The verse is necessary to teach us the *halacha* of the *temurah* of an *asham*.

The *Gemora* asks: Why is it necessary to teach this *halacha*? Didn't we learn that it is a *halacha l'Moshe mi'Sinai* that whenever a *chatas* must be left to die, an *asham (in that same instance)* must be sent to graze (*until it develops a blemish, and then it can be redeemed*)?

The *Gemora* answers: Without the verse, I would have thought that one is not liable if he brings the offspring of a *chatas* as a *korban (and the korban is valid)*. The verse comes to teach us that he has violated a positive commandment (*and the korban is not valid*). (25b)

Extra Asham

The *braisa* had stated: Rabbi Akiva says: It is unnecessary to expound the verse in this manner (*that the temurah of an asham cannot be brought as a korban*), for it is written in a different verse: *It is an asham*. This teaches us that only an original *asham* may be brought as a *korban*.

The *Gemora* asks: Why is a verse necessary to teach this *halacha*? Didn't we learn that it is a *halacha l'Moshe mi'Sinai* that whenever a *chatas* must be left to die, an *asham (in that same instance)* must be sent to graze (*until it develops a blemish, and then it can be redeemed*)?

The *Gemora* answers: The verse is necessary to teach us Rav's *halacha*. For Rav Huna said in the name of Rav: An *asham* that was given over for grazing (*since it was extra*), and it was slaughtered for an *olah*, it is valid for

a *korban olah* (as if it was redeemed and the money was used to purchase a *korban olah*). This *halacha* is only applicable if the *asham* was given over for grazing; however, if it was not given over to a shepherd, it will not be a valid *olah*. This is derived from the verse: *It is an asham*. It remains an *asham* until it is given over for grazing. (25b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Nullifying the Chatas Money

The *Gemora* had stated: If a *nazir* died and he had designated an unspecified amount of money for his *korbanos*, they are to be used for voluntary communal offerings.

The *Gemora* asks: But aren't monies for the *chatas* mixed in with them? (*How can all the money be used for voluntary communal offerings, when the money designated for a chatas must be cast into the Dead Sea?*)

The Keren Orah asks: Why can't the money for the *chatas* be negated by the majority of the other money that is mixed together?

He answers that since the money for the *shelamim* cannot be used for a *korban shelamim* (*since a shelamim is not completely burnt on the Altar*), there is no majority that can nullify the money of the *chatas*.

The Get Mekushar says that this question would be a proof to the Rishonim who hold that coins are a significant item and cannot become nullified.

DAILY MASHAL

"By Accident"

After an angel came to inform Manoach and his wife that they would finally merit to give birth to a son (Shimshon) and to educate them about the special nazirite status he would have, they doubted whether this had truly been a Divinely-sent angel or a person playing a cruel trick on them.

Our verse records their resolution to this question. However, the logical flow of the verse seems difficult to follow. It relates that as a result of the fact that the angel no longer appeared to Manoach and his wife, Manoach therefore knew conclusively that it had indeed been a Heaven-sent angel and not a human playing a trick on him. Why did the fact that the angel didn't continue appearing to them constitute a proof regarding its true identity?

Rav Shalom Schwadron explains that human nature is such that a person who has the fortune to inform his friend of good news will be subconsciously pushed to "bump into" his friend to regularly "remind" him of the incident and his friend's obligation to express gratitude. He will take the long way out of the synagogue to pass by his friend and wish him a warm "Gut Shabbos," carefully pausing just long enough to make sure that his earlier good deed is properly remembered.

When Manoach realized that the angel who had come to herald the miraculous news about the impending birth of his son, who wouldn't be a typical child but rather a nazir who would lead the Jewish people, didn't reappear to him even once, not even "by accident," he knew that no human being could restrain himself so, and he concluded that it had surely been an angel.