

Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Nazir Daf Chuf Gimmel

MISHNA

• If a woman accepts nezirus and then drinks wine or becomes tamei, she gets malkus. If her husband was meifer her nezirus without her knowledge, and she drank wine or became tamei, she does not get malkus. **R' Yehuda** says she would not get malkus D'Oraisa, but she would get malkus D'Rabanan.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says "ishah hafeiram vaHashem yislach lah". This refers to a woman who is unaware that her husband has been meifer her neder, and she nevertheless transgresses the neder. The pasuk teaches that this woman needs a kaparah. When R' Akiva would reach this pasuk he would cry and say, if someone who intended to do an aveirah but did not do it, needs a kaparah, how much more so someone who intends to do the aveirah and actually does do it! Similarly, the pasuk says that if someone is unsure that he did an aveirah he must bring an asham taluy as a kaparah for his aveirah. If someone who did not intend to do an aveirah, but ultimately did one, as in the case where he thought he was eating kosher fats but may have eaten cheilev (there was one piece there and he thought it was kosher), needs a kaparah, how much more so is a kaparah needed for someone who intends to do the aveirah and actually does it! Issi ben Yehuda said, this pasuk is teaching that if someone who is unsure if he did an aveirah, such as in a case where there are two pieces of fats one kosher and one non-kosher and he ate one thinking it was kosher, must bring a korbon, because he needs a kaparah, how much more so is a kaparah needed for someone who intends to do an aveirah and actually does it!
 - All the cases in the Braisa are needed. If we would just say the case of the woman, we would think only she needs a kaparah, because she intended to do an aveirah. If we would just say the second case we would say that there a kaparah is needed, because an aveirah may have been committed. If we would say these 2 cases, we would say that a kaparah is only enough for these 2 cases (the woman didn't do an actual aveirah and the second case didn't have a definite issur there), but in the third case where there was a definite issur present, maybe there is no form of kaparah. That's why all 3 cases are needed.
 - Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan said, the pasuk says "The roads of Hashem are straight, the tzaddikim walk in them and the resha'im stumble in them".
 This refers to two people doing the same action with different results. For example, one person eating the Korbon Pesach for the sake of the mitzvah, and another person eating it when he is beyond full.
 - Reish Lakish asked, this second person has not done the mitzvah in its best form, but he can't be referred to as a rasha!? Rather, the example would be where a man is in a dark room with his wife and his sister and has bi'ah with one of them. If he ends up with his wife, that would be an example of the "tzadikim walking in them" and if he ends up with his sister, that would be an example of a rasha stumbling in it.
 - The Gemara asks, this would be an example of 2 distinct roads (the wife and the sister), not one road as referred to in the pasuk!? Rather, the example would be the story of Lot and his 2 daughters. The daughters had bi'ah with their father for proper reasons (they thought the world was destroyed and had to carry on the human race), whereas Lot didn't have proper intention and would be the

rasha who stumbles on the road. **R' Yochanan** said, we see from the verbiage in the pasuk that Lot was steeped in znus.

- Q: Lot was forced, so how can he be called a rasha? A: R' Yose bar R'
 Choni taught, there is a dot over the letter "vuv" in the story, which
 teaches that Lot realized what happened when he awoke after the first
 night, and he therefore should not have allowed himself to drink wine
 the next night.
- Ulla said, Tamar was mezaneh and Zimri was mezaneh. Tamar had good intentions and therefore she bore kings. Zimri had bad intentions and therefore caused the death of tens of thousands.
- R' Nachman bar Yitzchak said, an aveirah done with good intention is greater than a mitzvah done with improper intention.
 - Q: R' Yehuda in the name of Rav has taught that a mitzvah should be done even for ulterior motives, because it will lead to the mitzvah being done for the proper reason!? A: Rather, an aveirah done with good intention is equally as good as a mitzvah done with ulterior motives.
 - We learn this from Yael, who the pasuk compares to Sarah, Rivka, Rachel, and Leah, and Yael's greatness was from her having been mezaneh with Sisra with the good intention of killing him and saving the Yidden.
- We stated above that R' Yehuda in the name of Rav said that one should do mitzvos even with ulterior motives, because it will lead to doing them with the proper intentions. We see this is correct, because Balak brought 42 korbanos with bad intentions, and yet he was rewarded for it by having Rus as a descendent.
- o **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, we learn from the story of Lot and his daughters that Hashem does not withhold reward even for one's use of finer speech. Regarding the older daughter, who called her son Moav (meaning "from my father") and announced to all that he was the product of incest, Hashem told Moshe that the Yidden cannot fight a war with the nation of Moav, but this seems to allow the Yidden to harass them. Regarding the son of the younger daughter, Amon, whose name does not announce to all that he was the product of incest, Hashem told Moshe that the Yidden may not even harass the nation of Amon.
- R' Chiya bar Avin in the name of R' Yehoshua ben Korcha said, a person should always try to do a mitzvah as soon as possible, because the older daughter of Lot, who did the "mitzvah" (in their minds it was a righteous act) one night earlier merited to have Jewish kings come from her descendants four generations before the descendant of the younger daughter became a Jewish king.