



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Using a single haircut for his nazir and metzorah obligation (cont.)

R' Chiya cites a Baraisa that explains why a single haircut can not count for one's nazir and metzorah obligations.

### 2) The purpose of the haircuts in the Mishnah

Rami bar Chama inquires whether the purpose of the haircuts of the Mishnah are for a mitzvah or to remove the hair.

The practical difference between these two approaches is explained.

Rava demonstrates that the function of these haircuts is to fulfill a mitzvah.

### הדרן עלך שני נזירים

3) **MISHNAH:** Non-Jews cannot become nezirim but women and slaves can be nezirim. The Mishnah explains how the nezirus of a woman is more stringent than the nezirus of a slave.

### 4) Idolaters

A Baraisa presents the expositions that teach that non-Jews cannot become nezirim but slaves can.

The necessity for the ruling concerning slaves is explained.

The exposition that excluded non-Jews from becoming nezirim is challenged from the case of arachin where the phrase בני ישראל appears and non-Jews are not excluded.

It is suggested that non-Jews are excluded from nezirus due to the parent reference in the parsha but that suggestion is rejected.

It is decided that non-Jews are rejected from nezirus because of the tumah reference.

The exposition that non-Jews are excluded from tumah is cited.

This exposition is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Acha bar Yaakov suggests that non-Jews could be excluded from nezirus because of an inheritance related matter, as mentioned earlier in the Gemara.

This suggestion is rejected.

Rava offers another explanation to explain why the phrase בני ישראל excludes non-Jews for nezirus but not for arachin.

Rava's explanation is unsuccessfully challenged. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### Why is the law of women listed in the Mishnah?

נשים ועבדים יש להן נזירות

The commentators each note that the Mishnah did not need to list the halacha that women are eligible to participate in the law of nezirus. The opening verse in the Torah in Parashas Naso which presents this halacha explicitly states (Bemidbar 6:2), "If a man or a woman clearly declares a vow of nezirus..."

Torah Temima (#3) struggles with this problem, and he suggests that "women" is listed in the Mishnah for no reason other than a stylistic consistency, that a phrase which mentions "slaves" usually begins by listing the law of women who are also included in various laws. Although in our Mishnah there is no particular insight taught by listing women, it is fitting that the entire phrase be used.

Sefer **משה באר** points out that there is a classic dispute among the Rishonim as to whether a Mishnah can teach a halacha which is explicit in the Torah, or if there must be some type of insight included before a Mishnah will list a law found in a verse in the Torah. Tosafos (Yevamos 50a, **שנה ד'**) states that on occasion, a Mishnah will record a halacha which is explicit in a verse. Rashi (ibid.) and Ran (to Sanhedrin 18a) write that a Mishnah will not list a halacha that does not either contain a novel idea or introduce an insight. Here, the listing of נשים is only to introduce the later phrase of the Mishnah which contrasts the law of women with that of slaves (**חומר בנשים מבעבדים**). ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Can a non-Jew make himself into a nazir?  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. What is the source that teaches that a non-Jew inherits his father's property?  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. How do we know that non-Jews are not subject to the laws of tumah?  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. What is the source that allows a non-Jew to be the subject of an erch vow?  
\_\_\_\_\_

## HALACHAH Highlight

### *Is there an obligation to honor a non-Jewish parent?*

אלא במי שמוזהר על כיבוד אביו

*Rather [the reason a non-Jew cannot be a nazir is that] it only applies to those who are commanded to honor their father*

The Or Sameach<sup>1</sup> proves from our Gemara's discussion that a non-Jew is not obligated in the mitzvah of honoring his father. This is also the implication of the Gemara Kidushin (31) that recounts the incident of Dama ben Nesina who excelled at honoring his father. Upon seeing the behavior of Dama ben Nesina, R' Chanina commented that if one who is not commanded and nevertheless performs the mitzvah is rewarded so generously all the more so will those who are commanded to do the mitzvah be rewarded generously. This clearly indicates that non-Jews are not commanded to honor their fathers.

Rambam<sup>2</sup> rules that a convert may not disparage his biological father so that people should not say that upon conversion he went from a higher degree of sanctity to a lower degree of sanctity (i.e. from a circumstance where he was obligated to honor his father to a circumstance where he is no longer obligated to honor his father). This implies that

before converting he was obligated to honor his non-Jewish father. Rav Akiva Eiger<sup>3</sup> cites Pri Megadim who maintains that even according to Rambam there is no obligation for a non-Jew to honor his father. What the Rambam meant was that since etiquette mandates that a son should honor his father people will mistakenly think that upon converting it is no longer necessary to follow basic precepts of etiquette.

Rav Moshe Feinstein<sup>4</sup> also explains that Rambam was not referring to a mitzvah for a non-Jew to honor his father; rather he was referring to the prohibition against behaving ungrateful (כפוי טובה). As a character trait even non-Jews are expected to behave in a grateful manner, therefore a non-Jew is expected to honor the man who brought him into this world. If upon conversion the convert would no longer be obligated to show appreciation to the one who brought him into the world it would appear ungrateful and thus cause a desecration of Hashem's name. Therefore, the convert is obligated to continue to show appreciation to his biological father who brought him into this world. Accordingly, it is not necessary to follow all the halachic details of honoring a father; rather it is sufficient to behave in a manner that shows appreciation and does not come across as ungrateful. ■

1. אור שמח פ"ה מהלי ממרים הי"א.
2. רמב"ם פ"ה מהלי ממרים הי"א.
3. הגרע"א ליו"ד סי' רמ"א סעי' טו.
4. שו"ת אג"מ יו"ד ח"ב סי' ק"ל. ■

## STORIES Off the Daf

### *The Most Weighty of All Mitzvos*

"אלא במי שמוזהר על כיבוד אביו..."

On today's daf, we find that a non-Jew is not commanded to honor his father. Rashi explains that non-Jews don't have halachic fathers. But for Jews it is important to recall that the Yerushalmi calls the mitzvah of Kibud Av 'חמורה שבחמורות'—the most weighty of all mitzvos!

The Toras Chaim, zt"l, was very affectionate with his beloved young son, Rav Menachem Mendel, the author of the Tzemach Tzedek. Once, his followers asked what led him to hold his son so dear to such an unusual extent. This was just after his son's marriage to the daughter of the Ruzhiner

Rebbe, zt"l, and he had received a princely sum as a dowry. Rav Menachem Mendel had immediately distributed it to charity. "Wait, and I will show you why he is so precious to me," said the Toras Chaim.

The Toras Chaim summoned his son to his private room and said, "You have received a big dowry—I want you to have it all here this evening, because I have need of it." Rav Menachem Mendel rushed out of the room and began to race all over town to beg a loan from every wealthy man, and by that evening Rav Menachem Mendel had the full sum. He entered the Toras Chaim's room and laid the money on his desk. His father picked up the money, looked at it...and threw it in his son's face! "Is this the money you received as your dowry? You were given gold coins of high value—and you've

brought me the amount in small coins!" Rav Menachem Mendel left his father's room shamefaced.

It was Rav Menachem Mendel's practice to rise at dawn every morning to wash his father's hands, and the very next morning he went to do his duty as usual. When his father woke to see him standing with the washing cup and basin as always, he washed and then hugged and kissed him straight away. Afterward, he called those followers who had questioned his devotion to his son and said, "Did you see what I did to him yesterday? And in the end, when I was angry with him—and he was in the right—he wasn't swayed by it at all and rose this morning to do his duty like always? This proves how much more refined he is than others, and that is why I love him more than anyone else!" ■