

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the Mishnah (cont.)

Rava explains the nature of the doubt mentioned in the Mishnah.

The Gemara explains that the Mishnah's ruling that a seminal discharge is tamei refers to its capacity to convey tumah by transporting the zivah.

This explanation is successfully challenged.

R' Ada bar Ahavah offers an alternative explanation for the Mishnah.

R' Pappa suggested an explanation for R' Ada bar Ahavah's ruling.

Rava successfully challenged this ruling from a Mishnah and suggests that the matter is subject to a dispute amongst Tannaim.

The Gemara identifies the point of dispute.

2) MISHNAH: R' Nehorai and R' Yosi dispute whether Shmuel Hanavi was a nazir.

3) Reciting the beracha or answering אמן

Rav instructed his son Chiya to be quick to recite berachos. R' Huna also advised his son to do the same.

The implication that it is best to recite the beracha is challenged from R' Yosi's position in a Baraisa that answering אמן is greater than reciting a beracha.

The Gemara answers that the matter a dispute between Tannaim.

R' Elazar in the name of R' Chanina teaches that Torah scholars increase peace in the world. ■

הדרן עלך הכותים אין להם נזירות
 וסליקא לה מסכת נזיר

■ ■ ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. In what way does זרע transmit tumah?

2. Why is conversion considered a cause for an illness?

3. Why did R' Nehorai assert that Shmuel Hanavi was a nazir?

4. Which is greater: to recite the beracha or answer אמן?

Distinctive INSIGHT

A declaration to be like Shmuel

נזיר היה שמואל כדברי רבי נהוראי שנאמר ומורה לא יעלה על ראשו

Rambam, in his Commentary to the Mishnah, and Rabbi Obadiah of Bertinoro, note that knowing that Shmuel was a nazir has a practical application in a case where a person declares, "I shall be like Shmuel!" or if he says, "I will be like the son of Elkana!" or "I will be like the one who killed Agag at Gilgal!" Knowing that Shmuel was, indeed, a nazir results in our determining that a person who says any of these statements has accepted nezirus upon himself.

Earlier, in the Mishnah (4a) we find a similar situation, where a person states, "I will be like Shimshon, or like the son of Manoach, or like the husband of Delila," the person has accepted nezirus upon himself." There, Rashi and Tosafos write that a person would only be a nazir if he would say all three of these phrases. Otherwise, the speaker would not be a nazir, as he can claim that he was referring to someone else, and not the Biblical Shimshon. Kesef Mishnah (to Hilchos Nazir 3:15) discusses whether Rambam disagrees with Rashi and Tosafos, and he concludes from the comments of Rambam to our Mishnah that, in fact, Rambam holds that even one of the phrases alone is enough to result in a commitment by the speaker to be a nazir. Tosafos Yom Tov notes that Rambam (Hilchos Nazir 3:16) rules that if a person declares that he will be like "Shmuel of Ramma," he is a nazir. According to the understanding of Kesef Mishnah, though, it would not be necessary for the person to have added and to clarify "of Ramma," as we would interpret even a less than perfect declaration as being definitive.

Tosafos Yom Tov asks why the Mishnah did not record this halacha back in the first chapter together with the law of one who proclaims that he will be like Shimshon. He points out that the reason is that we find a dispute whether Shmuel was a nazir or not. Therefore, Rabbeinu Hakadosh did not want to list this halacha until the end of the masechta.

Birkas Rosh and Melech Shlomo note that the final series of comments in the Mishnayos deal with the issue of רגלים לדבר—when less than certain circumstances lead us to arrive at conclusions. Here, Rabbi Nehorai prevails

(Insight...Continued on page 2)

HALACHAH Highlight

Answering אמן to another's beracha

והתניא ר' יוסי אומר גדול העונה אמן יותר מן המברך

Did we not learn in a Baraisa: R' Yosi taught that the one who answers אמן is greater than the one who recited the beracha

The Gemara's conclusion is that there is a dispute amongst Tannaim whether it is better to be the one who recites a beracha for others or is it better to answer אמן to another's beracha. Sefer Chassidim¹ offers an interesting explanation why it is better to answer אמן than to recite the beracha. The numerical value of the word אמן is 91 which is equal to the value of Hashem's name as it is written (י-ה-ו) and as it is pronounced (א-ד-נ-י). Elya Rabba² explains that the word אמן contains three elements: An oath (שבועה), an acceptance (קבלה) and an expression of faith (אמונה). Therefore, when a person answers אמן to a beracha he is accepting the beracha with faith and with an oath.

Beis Yosef³ writes that answering אמן to a ברכת נהנין is not an obligation. Rav Shlomo Kluger⁴ challenges this assertion from our Gemara. The Gemara states that the one

who answers אמן is greater than the one who makes the beracha and we know that the one who is eating is obligated to make a beracha. Accordingly, if the one who makes the beracha is obligated to make the beracha then certainly the one who will answer אמן, who is greater, is obligated to answer אמן. Rav Shlomo Kluger suggests that a distinction could be made between ברכות המצוות and ברכת הנהנין. Those berachos that are obligatory, like berachos recited on mitzvos, also create an obligation for the listener to answer אמן. ברכות הנהנין, on the other hand, are not obligatory in the sense that a person is required to eat, rather the beracha is recited on the benefit that will be experienced by the one who will eat. But since the listener will not experience that benefit he cannot be required to answer אמן. This is in contrast to the case of one person who is reciting a beracha to do a mitzvah where the listener must answer אמן. The reason is that although he may not be performing the mitzvah at this moment he is nonetheless commanded to do the mitzvah, so it is appropriate to answer אמן on the very fact that he is commanded to perform this mitzvah. ■

1. ספר חסידים סי' י"ט.
2. אליה רבה סי' קכ"ד ס"ק י"א.
3. בית יוסף או"ח סי' רט"ו.
4. שו"ת האלף לך שלמה או"ח סי' צ"ה. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Rainbow at Night

"אורחא דקרא למתיא בלילה..."

There was a certain man who was very meticulous to do whatever mitzvah he could. One time he saw a rainbow at night. Just as he was getting ready to make the correct brochah, his friend stopped him. "Who told you this blessing may be said at night?"

"Why shouldn't it?" asked his puzzled friend.

"Because the Targum Yoanan translates the verse in Noach (Bereishis 9:14): '...And a rainbow was seen in the clouds,' as 'And a rainbow was seen during the day...' Perhaps this brochah may only be said during the day?"

They decided to consult with the Maharsham, ז"ל. After hearing them

out he replied, "Although the Ramah states regarding a rainbow that if we do Hashem's will we won't see a rainbow except on Shabbos, we don't find such a differentiation in Shas or poskim. Therefore, one may certainly make the brochah at night.

The Maharsham continued, "The proof is from Nazir 66. There the gemara states that the sages learn that the phrase, 'when a man will be tamei, a nighttime emission,' also means during the day. The fact that the verse discusses the night is only because this usually occurs at night. The Targum Yonasan only meant that a rainbow is usually seen during the day, not that a rainbow seen at night doesn't symbolize the bris and that a brochah can't be said on it. Besides, although by birchas chama it says 'one who sees the sun...' the Panim Meiros says this even means the light of day even if the sun is not visi-

ble. It seems reasonable to say that seeing a rainbow at night also counts just like a rainbow by day.

The Maharsham concluded, "In any event, I heard that the famous Rav Yehoshuah of Belz, ז"ל, made a brochah on a rainbow at night. Since he is very meticulous in halachic matters, it is clear he wouldn't have done so if the law did not permit it!" ■

(Insight...Continued from page 1)

against Rabbi Yose about the status of Shmuel based upon the verse (I Shmuel 1:11): "no blade shall pass over his head." This indicates, albeit inconclusively, that Shmuel was a nazir. This Mishnah was taught by Rabbi Nehorai, who was actually Rabbi Nechemia (see Shabbos 147a). We now see that this final Mishnah is a continuation of the words of Rabbi Nechemia, who was discussing the guidelines of גלים לדבר earlier (65b). ■