

20 Tishrei 5776
Oct. 3, 2015



Nazir Daf 42

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

All of it

The *Gemora* above (40a) had cited a *Mishna*: If any of them (*a nazir, a metzora, and the Levites at the time of Moshe Rabbeinu*) shaved without a razor or left two hairs, they are considered to have done nothing.

Rav Acha the son of Rav Ikka said: This proves that the principle “most of something is equal to all of it” is a Biblical one. He explains: It is written: *On the seventh day he shall shave it (teaching us that the nazir must shave his entire head)*. Here, all of it is necessary; in all other cases, most of something is equal to all of it.

Rabbi Yosi son of Rabbi Chanina asked: But this verse is speaking of a nazir tamei?

In the West, they laughed at this objection. Consider the following: That a nazir is required to use a razor (in shaving his head) is inferred from where? It is derived from a nazir tahor. It stands to reason then that we can now derive the rule of the nazir tahor from the nazir tamei, as follows: just as when a nazir tamei leaves two hairs standing, his act is invalid, so too when a nazir tahor leaves two hairs standing, his act is invalid. (42a1)

Shaving Inquiries

Abaye inquired: If a *nazir* shaved his head except for two hairs (*not fulfilling the mitzvah*) and then his hair grew back and he shaved only those two hairs, has he discharged his obligation of shaving (*since all the hairs that were on his head at the conclusion of his nezirus have been shaved*) or not (*because he did not shave his entire head at once*)?

Rava inquired: If a *nazir* shaved his head except for two hairs (*not fulfilling the mitzvah*) and then (*before any hair grew back*) he shaved one of the two remaining hairs and the other one fell out, has he discharged his obligation of shaving or not (*because shaving one hair is not regarded as shaving, or perhaps he has discharged his obligation, since when he began this shaving, there were two hairs remaining*)?

Rav Acha from Difti asked Ravina: Is Rava inquiring if the shaving of one hair at a time is valid (*it certainly is! And therefore there should be no concern in this case, for two hairs remained and he shaved one, leaving only one hair remaining, why should it not be valid*)?

Rather, the following was Rava’s inquiry: If a *nazir* shaved his head except for two hairs (*not fulfilling the mitzvah*) and then (*before any hair grew back*)

one of the two remaining hairs fell out and he shaved the other one, has he discharged his obligation of shaving (*because every hair was shaven except for one*) or not (*the first shaving was not valid because two hairs remained and the second shaving was likewise not valid, for there was only one hair on his head when he shaved*)?

Ravina said: Since there is no hair here, there is no shaving!

The *Gemora* asks: If there is no hair, there was a shaving!

The *Gemora* explains: Although there is no hair here, he has not fulfilled his *mitzvah* of shaving (*the first shaving was not valid because two hairs remained and the second shaving was likewise not valid, for there was only one hair on his head when he shaved; it is as if his hair fell out by itself, where he cannot fulfill the mitzvah*). (42a1 – 42a2)

Mishna

A *nazir* is permitted to shampoo his hair or separate his hairs by hand, but he may not comb them. (42a2)

Unintentionally Removing Hair

The *Gemora* asks: Who is the *Tanna* who holds that the *nazir* is permitted to shampoo his hair or separate his hairs by hand?

The *Gemora* answers: The *Mishna* reflects the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, who holds that an unintentional act is permitted (*and the nazir did not intend to remove the hairs from his head*). However, that which the *Mishna* states that he may not comb

his hair is following the opinion of the *Chachamim* (*who maintain that an unintentional act is forbidden*).

The *Gemora* asks: Can it be that the first part of the *Mishna* follows Rabbi Shimon's opinion and the second part follows the *Chachamim*?

Rabbah answers: The entire *Mishna* is according to Rabbi Shimon. The reason that combing is forbidden is because combing hair inevitably leads to removing loose hairs (*and Rabbi Shimon concedes that in such cases, it would be forbidden*). (42a2)

Mishna

Rabbi Yishmael says: A *nazir* may not shampoo his hair with earth, because it will remove his hair. (42a2)

Earth Removing Hair

The *Gemora* inquires: Does the *Mishna* say "because it will remove his hair," or does the *Mishna* say "because earth removes hair" (*but not necessarily the earth being used*)?

The *Gemora* notes that earth which does not remove hair would be a practical halachic difference between them. If the *Mishna* said "because it will remove his hair," then it would be permitted for the *nazir* to shampoo with earth that we know would not remove his hair. However, if the *Mishna* said "because earth removes hair," it would be forbidden to use any type of earth.

The *Gemora* leaves this question unresolved. (42a3)

Mishna

A *nazir* who was drinking wine the entire day will only be liable once (*he will only receive lashes one time*). If they told him, “Do not drink,” “Do not drink,” but he kept on drinking, he will be liable for each and every time (*that he drank after he was warned*).

A *nazir* who was shaving his head the entire day will only be liable once (*he will only receive lashes one time*). If they told him, “Do not shave,” “Do not shave,” but he kept on shaving, he will be liable for each and every time (*that he shaved after he was warned*).

A *nazir* who was becoming *tamei* the entire day will only be liable once (*he will only receive lashes one time*). If they told him, “Do not become *tamei*,” “Do not become *tamei*,” but he kept on becoming *tamei*, he will be liable for each and every time (*that he became tamei after he was warned*). (42a3)

A Tamei Becoming Tamei Again

Rabbah said in the name of Rav Huna: A complete verse is written with respect to a *nazir* when it says: *He may not contaminate himself (which would include all types of corpse tumah; touching a corpse or entering a room that contains a corpse)*. When a different verse states: *He may not come upon a dead person (which is seemingly superfluous)*, we learn as follows: The verse (*He may not contaminate himself*) teaches us that he cannot become *tamei* (*in any manner*), and the other verse (*He may not come upon a dead person*) teaches us that he shall not enter a room that contains a corpse (*and therefore, if he was warned on both of them, and he entered a room that contained a corpse, he will be liable for*

both of them and he will receive lashes twice). However, if he touched a corpse and simultaneously touched another corpse, he will only be liable once (*even though he was warned twice*).

And Rav Yosef said: I swear by God that Rav Huna said that if he touched a corpse and simultaneously touched another corpse, he will be liable twice. For Rav Huna said: If a *nazir* was standing in a cemetery, and they gave him his relative’s corpse (*which he is forbidden to contaminate himself with*), or a different corpse, and he touched it, he will be liable. But why is he liable? He is already *tamei* for being in the cemetery! It is surely a proof that Rav Huna holds that if he touched a corpse and simultaneously touched another corpse, he will be liable twice.

Abaye asks from a *braisa*: If a *Kohen* (*Gadol* or a *nazir*) was carrying a corpse on his shoulder, and they gave him his relative’s corpse (*which he is forbidden to contaminate himself with*), or a different corpse, and he touched it, we might have thought that he would be liable (*for the second one*), the Torah therefore states: *He will not profane*. This teaches us that the prohibition is only applicable to someone who is not already profaned. However, someone who is already profaned is excluded from this prohibition. (*From here we see that Rav Huna holds that if a nazir touched a corpse and simultaneously touched another corpse, he will be liable twice.*)

Rav Yosef answered him back: Our *Mishna* challenges your opinion, for we learned in our *Mishna*: A *nazir* who was becoming *tamei* the entire day will only be liable once (*he will only receive lashes one time*). If they told him, “Do not become *tamei*,”

Do not become *tamei*," but he kept on becoming *tamei*, he will be liable for each and every time (*that he became tamei after he was warned*). But according to you, (*why is he liable for each and every time*) he was already *tamei* from the first time! And if you will ask that the *Mishna* contradicts the *braisa* (*mentioned above*), that is not a question. For the *braisa* is referring to a case where he was still touching the first corpse at the time that he touched the second one (*and therefore he is not liable for the second touching, for nothing was added by becoming tamei again*). However, the *Mishna* is discussing a case where he touched the first corpse, then let go of it and then he touched the second corpse (*here, he will be liable for the second touching, for touching the second corpse raises his level of tumah; Tosfos explains as follows: If after he let go of the first corpse, someone else would touch him, the other person would become tamei for one day; however, if someone else would touch him as he is touching the second corpse, that person would become tamei for seven days*).

The Gemora asks: And is the law of "tumah while he is still touching" a Biblical one? But Rav Yitzchak bar Yosef said in the name of Rabbi Yannai: The law of "tumah while he is still touching" was said only with respect of terumah and kodashim, but regarding a nazir or one who is bringing a pesach offering, it was not said? Now, if you will say that this law is Biblical, what should be the distinction between the two?

The Gemora answers: Here (R' Yannai), the case is where there is contact between one man and another (and the other man is touching a corpse; if a man touches the first man, he is tamei for seven days

only by Rabbinical law), and here (Rav Yosef), the case is where the person is in direct contact with the corpse (and another person touches him; he is tamei for seven days on a Biblical level). (42b)

DAILY MASHAL

Kohen and a Nazir

The halachic distinction between a *nazir* and a *Kohen* is noteworthy. A *nazir* is forbidden to become *tamei* to anyone, including his close relatives, whereas a *Kohen* is permitted. Why is that?

The following explanation is brought in the name of the Avnei Neizer: The sanctity of a *Kohen* emanates from his ancestors. It is fitting therefore that he should be allowed to contaminate himself by involving himself in the burial of his close relatives, for it was them (*his father*) that brought about his *kedushah*. The *kedushah* of a *nazir*, on the other hand, he imposed upon himself, and it does not create any type of bond between him and his relatives.

The Beis Yisroel suggests an alternative explanation. The sanctity of a *Kohen* emanates from heaven, and there is no concern that by becoming *tamei* to his relatives that he will tarnish that *kedushah*. However, a *nazir*, where his sanctity was self-imposed, the Torah was concerned that contaminating himself in any manner, even to his relatives, could blemish his *kedushah*.

