



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Nazir, Daf נז – Daf נז

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H  
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf נז--40-----

- **R' Chisda** said, shaving even one hair will subject a nazir to malkus; leaving over two hairs when he shaves at the conclusion of the nezirus is significant enough to prevent the process from being complete; he only loses days of nezirus counted if he shaved most of the hair on his head during the nezirus. All these halachos just stated apply only to cutting with a razor.
  - **Q:** How can he say that only shaving with a razor is prohibited to the nazir? We have learned a Braisa that says that any form of hair removal is assur!? **A: R' Chisda** meant “similar to a razor” – meaning a full cutting down to the scalp.
- A Mishna says, there are 3 people who must shave their hair, and their shaving is a mandatory mitzvah: a nazir, a metzora, and the Levi'im. If any of them shaved not using a razor, or if they left over two hairs, they have not fulfilled the mitzvah.
  - **Q:** It is stated explicitly in the pesukim that these 3 must shave their heads, so why does the Mishna need to say this? **A:** We would have thought that the obligation is to remove the hair, by any means. The Mishna teaches that it must be done with a razor.
  - **Q:** The Mishna said they all must be done with a razor. Regarding nazir the pasuk says “taar lo yavor ahl rosho”. Regarding the Levi'im the pasuk says “v'hevuru taar ahl kol besaram”. How do we know a metzora must use a razor? We can't learn it from the Levi'im, because the Levi'im required their bodies to be lifted, and therefore can't serve as the basis to learn from. We also can't learn from nazir, because a nazir is required to bring a korban of breads, and therefore can't serve as the basis to learn from. **A:** We can learn from nazir and Levi'im, since they each don't have the uniqueness of the other and yet still must shave using a razor, the same should be true for a metzora.
    - **Q: Rava of Barneish** asked **R' Ashi**, maybe we can ask that nazir and Levi'im don't have different korbanos if the person is poor, whereas a metzora does, and maybe that is why a metzora cannot be learned from a nazir or the Levi'im?
  - **Q: Rava bar Mesharshiya** asked **Rava**, in an earlier Braisa the Tanna seemed to take it as a given that metzora can be the source for the razor requirement, and now the Tanna says that not only is metzora not the source for this rule, it cannot even be learned from nazir or Levi'im!? **A:** The earlier Braisa follows the **Rabanan**, and the Gemara that says we need a different source follows **R' Eliezer** – based on a machlokes in a Mishna, as follows: A Mishna says that one is only chayuv for shaving his beard with a razor, and **R' Eliezer** says he is chayuv even if he uses other instruments. The reason of the **Rabanan** is explained in a Braisa. The Braisa says, the pasuk says specifically that a metzora must shave his beard. The reason this was necessary to say is because we would think that since one may not shave his beard, the metzora should not be allowed to shave his beard, the pasuk therefore specifically states that he must shave his beard as well. Now, if the metzora's shaving is not done with a razor, there would be no reason to specifically allow it. It must be that his shaving must be done with a razor. And, they know that it is only assur to shave a beard with a razor based on the pasuk that says “lo yigaleichu” and “lo sashchis”. This teaches that it is only assur to do a cutting that completely cuts – i.e. with a razor.
    - **Q:** Maybe a metzora does not need to shave with a razor, but the pasuk is teaching that if it is done with a razor he would be not be chayuv for shaving his beard with a razor? **A:** If so, the pasuk would not have to teach that it would be mutar for a metzora, because if it is mutar for a nazir to shave his head (and peyos) with a razor even though the acceptance of nezirus is itself an aveirah, then surely a metzora would be allowed to shave with a razor. **Also**, if the metzora could fulfil his obligation by shaving with something other than a razor, we would not let him

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

use a razor, based on the reasoning of **Reish Lakish**, who says that an assei only overrides a lo saasei when there is no way to fulfil the assei without being over the lo saasei.

### -----Daf נל--41-----

- **Q:** How does **R' Eliezer** know that a metzora must use a razor to shave his hair? **A:** He learns it from the word “rosho” in the pasuk regarding metzora, which a Braisa says comes to teach that even if a metzora is a nazir, he must shave his hair. Now, since the pasuk needs to teach that this shaving overrides the nazir restriction, which prohibition is with a razor, it must be that the pasuk is saying that the metzora must shave his hair with a razor.
  - **Q:** Maybe the metzora may remove his hair with other methods, and the pasuk is just teaching that if he decides to use a razor he may? **A:** If he was able to remove his hair in any other way, we would not allow him to be over the nazir prohibition and use a razor, as was stated by **Reish Lakish** earlier.
  - **Q:** What do the **Rabanan** use this word “rosho” for? **A:** They use it to teach that the metzora must shave his entire head even though it would cause him to over the lav of “lo sakifu pe’as roshchem”.
    - **Q:** A Braisa learns from the word “zekano” written by a nazir that he must shave his beard, although that is normally forbidden to do, so why would we also need “rosho” to teach that he may shave his head although that is normally forbidden to do? **A:** If we would only have the word “zekano” we would think that there is no true issur in shaving one’s entire head (and the issur of “lo sakifu” is when hair is left on top of the head, but removed on the sides all around). Therefore the pasuk had to say “rosho” to teach that shaving the hair of the entire head is included in the issur of “lo sakifu”. If the pasuk would only say “rosho” we would learn that an assei overrides a lo saasei and we would learn that shaving the entire head is included in the issur of “lo sakifu”, but we would not know that the shaving of the metzora must be done with a razor (since one is over lo sakifu even if his head is shaven by means other than a razor). The pasuk must therefore write “zekano” to teach that it must be done with a razor (because shaving the beard is only assur when done with a razor).
    - **Q:** According to **R' Eliezer**, who uses these pesukim for his drashos, where would he learn that an assei overrides a lo saasei? **A:** He learns it from the pasuk that tells us to wear tzitzis even though doing so involves the issur of shatnez.

### -----Daf נב--42-----

- The Mishna quoted earlier said that if a nazir, metzora, or Levi left two hairs unshaved, they have not fulfilled their obligation.
  - **R' Acha the son of R' Ika** said, from here we learn that the concept of “ruba kikulo” (most is like all) is D’Oraisa. We see this from the fact that the pasuk had to tell us that the nazir has not fulfilled his shaving obligation until *every* hair is shaved. It must be that elsewhere, ruba kikulo.
    - **Q:** **R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** asked, this pasuk is written by the shaving of a tamei nazir, so how do we know it applies by a tahor nazir!? **A:** In Eretz Yisrael they said, just as we learn that the shaving of the tamei nazir must be done by razor, because we learn it from a tahor nazir, the same way we will learn that a tahor nazir must have *all* his hair shaved (and a majority will not suffice) from the case of a tamei nazir.
  - **Q:** **Abaye** asked, if a nazir shaved his hair but left over two hairs, he then let his hair grow back and then shaved the two hairs that he had previously not shaved, has he fulfilled his obligation (since at the end of the day all his hairs were shaved off) or not (since at the time he shaved the last two hairs all his other hair existed)?
  - **Q:** **Rava** asked, if a nazir shaved his head but left over two hairs, and he then went and shaved one of the two and the second one then fell out on its own (shaving less than two hair is not considered to be an act of “shaving”), has he fulfilled his obligation?
    - **Q:** **R' Acha MiDifti** asked **Ravina**, since two hairs were there when he shaved the first one it is considered to be an act of shaving!? **A:** **Ravina** said, **Rava’s** question was where first one of the

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

two hairs fell out and then he shaved the last one. **Ravina** said, although he has no hair left on his head, he has not fulfilled the mitzvah of shaving his head in this case.

### MISHNA

- A nazir may shampoo his hair and may separate hairs by hand. However, he may not do so with a comb.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** The beginning of the Mishna seems to follow **R' Shimon**, who says that an unintended result would be permitted. However, the end of the Mishna seems to follow the **Rabanan** who say it would be assur! **A:** The entire Mishna follows **R' Shimon**. When one combs his hair he *intends* to remove the loose hairs, and that is why the nazir may not use a comb, because he intends to remove hairs.

### MISHNA

- **R' Yishmael** says a nazir may not shampoo his hair with earth, because it causes hair to fall out.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** Does the Mishna say “because the earth causes hair to fall out” or does it say “because of the type of earth that causes hair to fall out”? The difference would be to use earth that doesn’t cause hair to fall out. If it is the first way, then if he uses earth that does not cause hair to fall out it would be mutar. If it is the second way, any earth would be assur as a gezeira for the earth that does cause the hair to fall out. **A: TEIKU.**

### MISHNA

- If a nazir drank wine all day long, but was only warned once, he is only chayuv one set of malkus. If he was warned at multiple intervals, he would chayuv a set of malkus for each warning that he followed with a drinking of wine.
  - The same difference would be between where he cut his hair all day long or where he had multiple warnings not to do so.
  - The same difference would be where he kept becoming tamei all day long and had only one warning or where he had multiple warnings.

### GEMARA

- **Rabbah in the name of R' Huna** said, one pasuk by a nazir says “lo yitamah” and another pasuk says “lo yavo” (referring to tumas ohel). This teaches that even if a nazir is already tamei, he would get another set of malkus if he then became tamei with tumas ohel. **R' Yosef** said that **R' Huna** said a nazir would get a second set of malkus for becoming tamei in any method even if he was already tamei, because we find that **R' Huna** said that if a nazir was in a cemetery and then touched another meis he would be chayuv malkus for touching the meis.
  - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says, if a Kohen was tamei and then touched another meis he would *not* be chayuv another set of malkus because the Torah says “v'lo yichalel”, which teaches that he is only chayuv if he was not yet tamei. This Braisa is problematic according to **R' Yosef**! **A: R' Yosef** said, our Mishna says that a nazir can get multiple malkus for tumah! This seemingly creates a contradiction between our Mishna and that Braisa. However, we can say that the Braisa is discussing where the Kohen touched the second meis while he was still touching the first meis, and that is why it is not considered to be a separate episode of tumah. The Mishna is discussing where he was no longer touching the first meis when he touched the second meis, and therefore it is a new episode of tumah.
  - **Q:** According to **Rabbah**, the nazir is only chayuv for tumas ohel after becoming tamei, but not for becoming tamei a second time after being tamei, since in that case he was already tamei. In the case of tumas ohel after becoming tamei he also should not be chayuv a second malkus since he is already tamei! **A: Rabbah** means he would be chayuv 2 malkus if the tumah and the tumas ohel came on simultaneously. **R' Yochanan** explains, if he walks into a house in which there is a meis, the nazir becomes tamei (one lav) and enters a tumas ohel (a second lav) at the same instant. Therefore he would

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

be chayuv for 2 malkus. On the other hand, if he was out in the field and touched two meisim at the same time, since it is the same lav he would only be chayuv one set of malkus.

- **Q:** Even in the case of entering a house, his hand enters first (which makes him tamei) and he doesn't enter the tumas ohel until afterward (the majority of one's body must enter an ohel to be subject to tumas ohel)!? **A: R' Elazar** said, the case is where he walked in without sticking his hand in first.
  - **Q:** His nose will still enter before the rest of his body!? **A: Rava** said, the case is where he leans his head back so that no part of his body entered the room until the majority of his body entered the room.
  - **Q:** It must be that his toe enters the room first!? **A: R' Pappa** said, the case is where he was brought into the room in a box (which prevents him from becoming tamei) and someone then went and made an opening in the box. In that case, the tumah and the tumas ohel all take place on the nazir at once. **A2: Mar bar R' Ashi** said, the case is where the nazir was in the room when the person was at the door of death and the person then died. In that case again, the tumah and tumas ohel all take place at the same instant.

### -----Daf לז--43-----

- A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding a Kohen says he may not become tamei "leheichalo". This teaches that a meis does not give off tumah until he actually dies. **Rebbi** learns this from the words in the pasuk of a nazir which says "bemosam".
  - **Q:** What is the difference between these drashos? **A: R' Yochanan** said, it is simply on how to darshen, but otherwise there is no difference. **Reish Lakish** said, the difference would be regarding a person at death's door (a goseis) – according to the **T"K** he would be metameh and according to **Rebbi** he would not be metameh (only bemosam are they metameh).
  - **Q:** What does the **T"K** do with the word "bemosam"? **A:** He uses it for the drasha of **Rebbi** in a Braisa where he says that "bemosam" teaches that a nazir may not become tamei to a meis, but may become tamei to a metzora or a zav.
    - **Q:** How will **Rebbi** of the first Braisa learn this? **A:** The pasuk could have said "bemos" and instead said "bemosam", therefore allowing for both drashos, and teaching both of these halachos.
  - **Q:** What does **Rebbi** do with the word "leheichalo"? **A:** He learns that the issur of a Kohen to become tamei applies only to a Kohen who is not yet tamei.
    - **Q:** How does the **T"K** learn this halacha? **A:** The pasuk could have said "leheichal" and instead says "leheichalo", therefore allowing for both drashos, and teaching both of these halachos.
  - **Q:** A Mishna specifically says that a goseis does not give off tumah!? **A:** The **T"K** would agree that the person does not give off tumah. However, he holds that there is an issur for a Kohen to profane himself, and touching a goseis would be considered as an act of profaning himself.
- **R' Chisda in the name of Rav** said, if a Kohen's father's head was cut off, the Kohen could not be metameh to him, because the pasuk says he may be metameh "l'aviv", which suggests that the father's body is complete and not missing any parts.
  - **Q: R' Hanunah** asked, if this is true, a Kohen who had his head chopped off by robbers outside of civilization will have no one to bury him (since his son cannot be metameh to him and no one else will go out there to get him)!? **A: R' Chisda** said, that would be a case of meis mitzvah, and a Kohen can be metameh to a meis mitzvah!
    - **Q:** We have learned that a meis mitzvah is only when there is absolutely no one to care for the meis, but in this case, since there is a son he will hire people to bury his father and therefore the father would not be a meis mitzvah!? **A:** Since he is so far away from other people, he is given the status of meis mitzvah (due to the difficulty in getting him buried).

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A Braisa says that after burying his father a Kohen may become tamei again if he finds a bone of his father the size of a barley. This would mean that he was originally allowed to bury him even though he was missing a piece!? **A:** The Braisa follows **R' Yehuda**, who allows the Kohen to become tamei in this case, but would not follow the **Rabanan**, whose opinion is followed by **R' Chisda**, who does not allow it.
- **Q:** A Braisa taught by **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** says that a Kohen may be metameh to less than a complete body of his relative!? **A:** This Braisa also follows the view of **R' Yehuda**, and **Rav** (who is quoted by **R' Chisda**) follows the view of another Braisa where **R' Yehoshua ben Elisha and four Elders** told **R' Tzadok Hakohen** (who was a Kohen) that he may not become tamei to his father 3 years after his father's death, since his father's body would be less than complete at that time.

-----Daf 72-----44-----

### MISHNA

- There are 3 categories of issur to a nazir: tumah, shaving his head, and products of the grape vine.
  - Tumah and shaving are more stringent in that they cause days of the nezirus to not count towards the nezirus period, whereas eating grape products would not do so.
  - Grape products are more stringent in that there is never a time when it is mutar for a nazir, whereas shaving is allowed for a nazir who is a metzora and tumah is allowed when a nazir happens on a meis mitzvah.
  - Tumah is more stringent than shaving in that it makes all previously counted days to be lost and requires that a korban be brought, whereas shaving would only require a maximum additional count of 30 days and does not require that a korban be brought.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** We should say that there should never be a time that tumah is allowed for a nazir, based on a kal v'chomer from wine. If there is never an allowance for wine, which also does not affect the nezirus count, then surely tumah, which does affect the nezirus count, should never have an allowance!? **A:** The pasuk of "l'aviv ul'imo lo yitama" teaches that he may become tamei for a meis mitzvah.
- **Q:** We should say from a kal v'chomer that there may be an allowance for wine. If tumah, which affects the count, has an allowance, then surely wine should have an allowance!? **A:** The pasuk of "miyayin v'sheichar yazir" teaches that no wine is ever permitted, even the wine needed for a mitzvah.
- **Q:** We should say that wine affects the full nezirus count based on a kal v'chomer. If tumah, which has an allowance, affects the full count, then wine, which has no allowance, should surely affect the full count!? **A:** The pasuk specifically says that the full count is affected because of *tumah*, which excludes its being effected from the drinking of wine.
- **Q:** We should say that shaving should affect all previously counted days based on a kal v'chomer. If tumah, where the person who makes the nazir tamei is not chayuv for anything, affects the entire count, then shaving, where the person who shaved the nazir is chayuv malkus, should surely affect the entire count!? **A:** The pasuk specifically says that the count is affected because of *tumah*, which excludes its being effected from the drinking of wine.
- **Q:** We should say that the one who makes the nazir tamei should be chayuv based on a kal v'chomer. If the one who shaves the nazir is chayuv even though shaving does not affect the entire count, then the one who makes him tamei should be chayuv since tumah affects the entire count!? **A:** The pasuk of "v'timei rosh nizro" teaches that only the nazir himself is chayuv for his becoming tamei.
- **Q:** We should say that the person who shaved the nazir should not be chayuv, based on a kal v'chomer from tumah. If the person who makes him tamei is not chayuv even though tumah affects the entire count, then the person who shaves the nazir should not be chayuv, since shaving does not affect the entire count!? **A:** We darshen the pasuk of "taar lo yaavor ahl rosho" to include the one who shaves the nazir as well.
- **Q:** Shaving should have no allowance based on a kal v'chomer. If wine, which does not affect the count, has no allowance, then shaving should also have no allowance!? **A:** The pasuk has extra words of "rosho" and "zekano" which teach that a metzora who is a nazir may shave his head.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Shaving should not affect the nezirus count at all based on a kal v'chomer. If wine, which has no allowance, doesn't affect the count, then shaving, which has an allowance, should also not affect the count!?! **A:** The nazir must have 30 days of hair growth when he shaves his head after the nezirus count. Therefore, if he shaved his head he would have to wait 30 days before concluding his nezirus.
- **Q:** Wine should require a 30 day additional count based on a kal v'chomer. If shaving, which has an exception allowance, affects the count for up to 30 days, then wine, which has no allowance, should also do so!?! **A:** Shaving only affects the count because he needs 30 days of hair growth to shave his head after the nezirus. Wine does not cause that problem and would therefore not require any additional days of nezirus to be counted.

### MISHNA

- How is the head shaving of the tamei nazir done? He would get sprinkled with the parah adumah on the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> days of his tumah, shave his head on the 7<sup>th</sup> day, and bring his korbanos on the 8<sup>th</sup> day. If he did not shave his head until the 8<sup>th</sup> day, **R' Akiva** says he would still bring his korbanos on that 8<sup>th</sup> day. **R' Tarfon** said to him, why is this nazir different than the metzora (who may not bring his korbanos on the same day that he shaves his hair)!?! **R' Akiva** said to him, the tahara of the nazir is dependent on days, whereas the tahara of the metzora is dependent on his shaving his hair and he therefore cannot bring his korbanos until the sun has set on the day that he shaved his hair.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** Did **R' Tarfon** accept **R' Akiva's** answer or not? **A:** We find that **Hillel** taught a Braisa that says that if the nazir shaved on the 8<sup>th</sup> day he brings his korbanos on the 9<sup>th</sup> day. If **R' Tarfon** accepted the answer then this Braisa would not be following any view. It must be that he did not accept the answer!
  - **Rava** said, this is no proof, because the Mishna may be discussing where he was toivel on the 7<sup>th</sup> day and therefore could bring his korbanos on the 8<sup>th</sup> day (since he had the sun set after his tevila) and the Braisa is discussing where he was not toivel until the 8<sup>th</sup> day, which is why he could not bring his korbanos until the 9<sup>th</sup> day.
- **Abaye** said that he found the colleagues of **R' Nosson bar Hoshaya** sitting and teaching a Braisa that says that the pasuk regarding a zav that says that he shall come "lifnei Hashem ehl pesach Ohel Moed unisanam ehl haKohen" teaches that he may only enter the Machaneh Leviya ("lifnei Hashem") after he was toivel and had the sun set after the tevila. They said, it must be that the Braisa holds that a zav who is a "t'vul yom" (has not yet had the sun set after his tevila) is considered to have the status of a zav. **Abaye** said to them, based on this, we should say the same thing regarding a nazir, where the pasuk also says that he should bring his korbanos to the "pesach Ohel Moed", and we should therefore also say that he may only do so after he was toivel and had the sun set after his tevila. However, we know that this is not the case, because a Braisa says that a tamei meis may enter the Machaneh Leviya!?! **Abaye** said, the Braisa must hold that the zav who is a tevul yom is not given the status of a zav. The reason he may not enter the Machaneh Leviya is because he has not yet brought his korbanos and is therefore a mechusar kippurim.

## -----Daf 72-----45-----

### MISHNA

- What is the process for the head shaving of a tahor nazir? He would bring 3 korbanos – a chatas, an olah and a shelamim. **R' Yehuda** says he would first shecht the shelamim and then shave his head. **R' Elazar** says he would first shecht the chatas and then shave his head, because we find that a chatas is always brought first from a series of korbanos.
  - If he didn't follow the preferred order and shechted any of the korbanos first and shaved his head, he is yotzeh.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, if a nazir brought 3 animals for his korbanos and did not specify which animal should be for which korban, the halacha is that the animal fit for the chatas should be brought as the chatas, the one fit for the olah is brought as the olah, and the one fit for the shelamim is brought as the shelamim.

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says that the nazir shaves his head at the “pesach Ohel Moed”. This means that he shaves his head after bringing the korban that is shechted at the “pesach Ohel Moed”, which is the Shelamim. Maybe it means that he actually should shave his head at the entrance to the Ohel Moed? That can't be, because that would be degrading to the Beis Hamikdash. **R' Yoshiya** says we can learn from a pasuk that he may not shave his head there. A pasuk says it is assur to have steps in the Beis Hamikdash because it is considered degrading, so kal v'chomer that he can't shave his hair there. **R' Yitzchak** says we can learn from a pasuk that his head is not shaven at the entrance to the Ohel Moed. The pasuk says “he should take the hair and put it on the fire”. This means the hair cutting must be done right near the place of the fire on which the shelamim will be cooked. Since the shelamim is cooked away from the entrance of the Ohel Moed, the hair cutting must be done away from there as well.
  - **Others** say that **R' Yitzchak** first said the original pasuk refers to the shelamim and teaches that the nazir shaves his head after bringing the shelamim. However, you may ask that maybe “pesach Ohel Moed” refers to the place to do the hair cutting!? The pasuk therefore says he should “take the hair and put it on the fire” to teach that the hair cutting must be done near the fire for cooking the shelamim, which is not done near the entrance to the Ohel Moed.

The Braisa continues, **Abba Chanan in the name of R' Eliezer** says, the pasuk says “v'gilach hanazir pesach Ohel Moed”, which teaches that if the doors to the Ohel Moed are not open (i.e. at night) the nazir may not shave his head. **R' Shimon Shezuri** says, the pasuk of “v'gilach hanazir” teaches that this is only for a nazir, but not for a nezirah, because the young Kohanim may have bad thoughts if they were to see her hair uncovered there. They said to **R' Shimon Shezuri**, we see that a sotah has her hair uncovered there and we do not consider this concern! He responded, the nezirah is allowed to be dressed nicely, with makeup, etc., and therefore the concern exists. The sotah is made to look ugly, and therefore the concern does not exist there.

### MISHNA

- He would take the hair that was shaved off and throw it into the fire under the pot in which the Shelamim was cooking. If he shaved his head outside Yerushalayim, he would not throw the hair under the pot.
- This is said regarding the shaving of a tahor nazir, however when shaving a tamei nazir the hair is not thrown under the pot. **R' Meir** says the hair from all nazir shavings are thrown under the pot, except when the shaving is done outside of Yerushalayim.

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, after shaving the nazir's head he takes some gravy of the shelamim and puts it on the shaved hair, and then throws it underneath the pot of the shelamim. If he threw it underneath the pot in which the chatas or ashram was cooking, he is yotzeh.
  - **Q:** A tahor nazir does not bring an ashram!? **A: Rava** said, the Braisa means, if he is a tamei nazir and throws it beneath the ashram pot, he is yotzeh.
  - **Q:** How do we know that he is to put gravy onto the hair? **A: Rava** said, the pasuk says “asher tachas zevach hashelamim”, which teaches that there should be some of the korban (i.e. the gravy) underneath the pot as well.
  - **Q:** How do we know that if he threw the hair underneath the pot of the chatas or ashram he is yotzeh? **A:** The pasuk says the extra word “zevach”, which teaches to include the chatas and the ashram.
    - **Q:** The word “zevach” was already used to teach that the gravy should be placed onto the hair!? **A:** If it was only to teach that, the pasuk should have said “rotev”. The pasuk instead says “zevach”, which can therefore teach both halachos.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Maybe we should not use it to teach regarding the gravy at all!? **A:** If it was only to teach regarding the chatas and asham the pasuk would have said “shelamim v’zevach”. Since the pasuk says “zevach hashelamim”, we can learn out both halachos.
- A Braisa says, **R’ Meir** said the hair of all nezirim would be thrown under the pot, except for a tamei nazir who shaved his head outside of Yerushalayim, in which case the hair was buried. **R’ Yehuda** says, the hair of a tahir nazir was thrown under the pot even if shaved outside of Yerushalayim, and the hair of a tamei nazir was never thrown under the pot. The **Chachomim** said, the only hair that was thrown under the pot was that of a tahir nazir who shaved his head at the Beis Hamikdash, because that is the only one that was done the way it is supposed to be done.

### -----Daf 17--46-----

#### MISHNA

- He would cook the Shelamim or overcook it. The Kohen would then take the front leg of the Shelamim ram, one matzah from the basket, and one matzah wafer, and put them onto the nazir’s palms and wave them. When that is done the nazir may drink wine and become tamei to meisim. **R’ Shimon** says, as soon as the blood of one of the korbanos is offered on the Mizbe’ach the nazir becomes mutar to drink wine and become tamei to meisim.

#### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “v’achar yishte hanazir yayin”. **R’ Eliezer** says this means after the entire process is done (like the **T”K** in our Mishna). The **Chachomim** say after one thing (the offering of one of the bloods) is done (like **R’ Shimon** in our Mishna).
  - The view of the **Rabanan** is based on a gezeirah shava of pesukim. Here the pasuk says “v’achar yishte hanazir yayin” and the earlier pasuk says “achar hisgalcho es nizro”. Just as there it refers to after doing “one thing”, the same is regarding the time it becomes mutar to drink wine.
- **Rav** said, the waiving required of the nazir is essential to remove his nezirus restrictions.
  - **Q:** Who was this said according to? It can’t be according to the **Rabanan**, because they say that the restrictions are lifted even before the shaving of the hair!? If it was said according to **R’ Eliezer**, this would be obvious, because he says the entire process must be done before the restrictions are lifted!? **A:** We would think that since regarding other korbanos the waving processes are never essential, it should not be essential here either, even according to **R’ Eliezer**. He therefore teaches that regarding nazir it is essential.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, the pasuk of “zos toras hanazir” teaches that the same halachos apply to a nazir with palms and a nazir who doesn’t have palms. This would seem to teach that the waiving process is not essential!? **A:** It does not mean to compare the two, as we see a Braisa says that “zos toras hanazir” applies to a nazir who has hair and a nazir who is completely bald. Would that mean that shaving the hair is not essential? Of course not! A Braisa even says that a bald nazir according to **B”S** can never have his restrictions lifted, because he can never shave his hair, while **B”H** say that he passes a razor over his head and through that becomes released! We see it is essential. The same would be the explanation of the first Braisa, that even a nazir with no palms must do the waiving by using his arms, etc.
  - **Q: Another version** asks, who did **Rav** say his statement according to? According to **R’ Eliezer** this would be obvious, and according to **Rabanan** it would not be essential!? **A:** The Gemara says that even according to the **Rabanan** the waiving must be essential, because the Braisa compares a nazir with palms to a nazir without palms which teaches that waiving is essential in all cases.
    - **Q:** A Braisa compares a bald nazir to a nazir with hair. A Braisa explains that **B”H** would require a razor to be passed over his head. We see that actual shaving is not essential, so why would waiving be essential!? **A:** **R’ Avina** said, **B”H** mean that he must pass a razor over his head and shave off hair, and since he cannot, he can never be released from his restrictions, because shaving is essential. Similarly, the earlier Braisa also means that waiving is essential.



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### MISHNA

- If he shaved his head after offering the first korbon and it was found to be a passul korbon, his shaving is passul as well and his korbanos do not count towards his obligation.
- If he shaved after the chatas, and the chatas was offered with intent for another korbon, but his other korbanos were then brought with proper intent, his shaving is passul and the korbanos do not count for his obligation.
- If he shaved after the olah or the shelamim were brought not for their own sake, and the other korbanos were then brought for their own sake, his shaving is passul and the other korbanos do not count for his obligation. **R' Shimon** says the korbon brought not for its own sake is passul, but the other korbanos do count for his obligation.
- If he shaved after bringing all 3 korbanos and one of them was valid, the shaving is valid and the korbanos that were passul need to be brought again.

### GEMARA

- **R' Ada bar Ahava** said, from the Mishna we see that **R' Shimon** holds that if a nazir shaves his head after bringing a voluntary shelamim, he has fulfilled his shaving obligation (although he would have to bring another shelamim for the sake of the nezirus). This is based on the pasuk that says he is to put the hair on the fire beneath the pot of the “zevach shelamim”, and does not say “shelamav” (*his* shelamim).