

17 Adar 5783
March 10, 2023



Nazir Daf 46

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

Mishnah

He would either cook or overcook the *shelamim*. The *Kohen* would then take the cooked foreleg from the ram (*shelamim*), and one *matzah* loaf from the basket, and one *matzah* wafer, and he places them on the palms of the *nazir* and waves them. Afterwards, the *nazir* is permitted to drink wine and become *tamei* from the dead. Rabbi Shimon said: As soon as the blood from one of his *korbanos* has been sprinkled on the Altar, he is permitted to drink wine and become *tamei* from the dead. (45b3 – 46a1)

How Many Korbanos?

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: It is written: *And afterwards, the nazir may drink wine*. After the entire process is completed; these are the words of Rabbi Eliezer. The *Chachamim* say: Even if only one action is completed (*the blood from one of his korbanos has been sprinkled on the Altar releases him from the nazir’s prohibitions*).

What is the Rabbis’ reason? — In this verse it is written: *And after that the nazir may drink wine*, while in the preceding verse occur the words: *After he has shaven his consecrated head*, and so just as there [‘after’] means after the single act, here too it means after a single act. - But may it not mean after both acts? — If that were so, there would be no need for the similarity of phrase. (46a1)

Is the Waving Essential?

Rav said: If the waving is not performed, the *nazir* is not released from his prohibitions.

The *Gemora* asks: According to whose opinion is Rav following? It cannot be the *Chachamim*, for they hold that even if the *nazir* doesn’t shave, he still is released from the prohibitions! Certainly the waving should not hold him back! And he cannot be following Rabbi Eliezer’s opinion, for he maintains that the *nazir* is released from his prohibitions only after the entire process is completed (*obviously including the waving*)!

The *Gemora* answers: We might have thought that (*even according to Rabbi Eliezer*) since with respect to atonement, waving is only a residual part of the offering (*it is never regarded as an integral part of the service, and even without it, one achieves full atonement*), perhaps the *nazir* shall be released from his prohibitions even without the waving. Rav teaches us that this is not the case.

The *Gemora* asks: Did we not learn in a *Baraisa* that the *halachos* of the *nazir* apply whether he has palms or whether he does not have palms (*which would seemingly indicate that the nazir is released from his prohibitions even if no waving was done*)?

The *Gemora* answers: That cannot be the proper interpretation of the *Baraisa*, for we learned in a different *Baraisa* that the *halachos* of the *nazir* apply whether he has hair or whether he does not have hair. Do you think that this *Baraisa* means that a *nazir* is released even

without shaving his head? But we learned in a *Baraisa*: Beis Shammai says that a bald *nazir* is not required to pass a razor over his head. Beis Hillel holds that he must. And Ravina explained: When Beis Shammai said that “he is not required,” he meant that he has no remedy (*for it is useless for him to pass a razor over his bald head*). We can infer that according to Beis Hillel, he does have a remedy (*by passing a razor over his head*). (*It is therefore evident that the second Baraisa means that both a nazir with hair and one without are required to pass a razor over their heads; so too, the first Baraisa should mean that waving is required and is essential.*)

The *Gemora* notes that Ravina’s explanation of Beis Shamai’s opinion is in agreement with Rabbi Pedas. For Rabbi Pedas said that Beis Shamai and Rabbi Eliezer both say the same thing. What ruling did Rabbi Eliezer say? - Rabbi Eliezer said in a *Baraisa*: A *metzora* that does not have a thumb (*on his right hand*) or a big toe (*on his right foot*) can never become *tahor* (*for his purification process involves the Kohen sprinkling blood from the korban asham on his thumb and big toe*). These are the words of Rabbi Eliezer. Rabbi Shimon says: The blood shall be applied on the place of his thumb and toe and he will have discharged his obligation. The *Chachamim* say: The blood shall be applied on his left thumb and toe and he will have discharged his obligation.

The *Gemora* cites an alternative version of the previous discussion. Rav said: If the waving is not performed, the *nazir* is not released from his prohibitions.

The *Gemora* asks: According to whose opinion is Rav following? He cannot be following Rabbi Eliezer’s opinion, for he maintains that the *nazir* is released from his prohibitions only after the entire process is completed (*obviously including the waving*)! And it cannot be the *Chachamim*, for they hold that even if the *nazir* doesn’t shave, he still is released from the prohibitions! Certainly the waving should not hold him back!

The *Gemora* asks: Did we not learn in a *Baraisa* that the *halachos* of the *nazir* apply whether he has palms or whether he does not have palms (*which would seemingly indicate that the nazir is released from his prohibitions even if no waving was done*)?

The *Gemora* answers: That cannot be the proper interpretation of the *Baraisa*, for we learned in a different *Baraisa* that the *halachos* of the *nazir* apply whether he has hair or whether he does not have hair. Do you think that this *Baraisa* means that a *nazir* is released even without shaving his head? But we learned in a *Baraisa*: Beis Shammai says that a bald *nazir* is not required to pass a razor over his head. Beis Hillel holds that he must. And Rabbi Avina explained: When Beis Hillel said that “he is required,” he meant that he is required, but he has no remedy (*for it is useless for him to pass a razor over his bald head*). We can infer that according to Beis Shammai, he does have a remedy (*by passing a razor over his head*). (*It is therefore evident that the second Baraisa means that both a nazir with hair and one without are required to pass a razor over their heads; so too, the first Baraisa should mean that waving is required and is essential.*)

According to this version, he is disagreeing with Rabbi Pedas (*for Beis Shammai holds that a bald nazir has a remedy and Rabbi Pedas equated Beis Shammai’s opinion with Rabbi Eliezer’s viewpoint that a metzora without a thumb cannot become tahor*). (46a1 – 46b3)

Mishnah

If he shaved his head after the first *korban* was brought, and the *korban* was found to be invalid, his head-shaving is ruled to be invalid and the *korbanos* that are brought afterwards are also invalid (*for his disqualified shaving violates his nezirus and he is required to grow his hair for another thirty days and only then may he bring the concluding korbanos*). If he shaved his head after his

chatas was brought not for its specified name (*the korban was slaughtered with the intent for a different korban, which disqualifies a chatas*) and the other *korbanos* were brought correctly, his head-shaving is ruled to be invalid and the *korbanos* that are brought afterwards are also invalid. If he shaved his head after his *olah* or *shelamim* was brought not for their specified name (*they are nevertheless valid, but they do not count towards his obligation; he is required to bring another olah or shelamim for his nezirus*), and the other *korbanos* were brought correctly, his head-shaving is ruled to be invalid and the *korbanos* that are brought afterwards are also invalid. Rabbi Shimon said: That *korban* does not count for him, but the other *korbanos* do. If he shaved his head after all three *korbanos* were brought, and only one of them was found to be valid, his head-shaving is valid, and he is required to bring the other *korbanos*. (46b3 – 46b4)

Any Shelamim

Rav Ada bar Ahava said: Rabbi Shimon must hold that a *nazir* who shaves his head after bringing a voluntary *shelamim* (*the nazir's shelamim which was brought with the wrong intent is not regarded as a nazir's shelamim; but rather, a voluntary shelamim*) has fulfilled his obligation. – what is the reason? - Because the verse says: And put it on the fire which is under the sacrifice of *shelamim*, and not: **his** *shelamim*. (46b4)

DAILY MASHAL

Once a Nazir

It is written: *And afterwards, the nazir may drink wine.* The *Gemora* cites several opinions as to when precisely is he permitted to drink wine and become *tamei* to the dead. According to one opinion, he only has to wait until after one of the *korbanos* have been brought, and according to another opinion, he is required to wait until all the *korbanos* have been brought.

The question is asked: Why does the Torah say that the *nazir* is permitted to drink wine? He is no longer a *nazir*!

Reb Moshe Feinstein answers that the inspiration that a *nazir* attains from abstaining from some of the worldly pleasures remains with him his entire life. Although the *halachos* of *nezirus* no longer apply to him, he is nevertheless in an elevated state, similar to the sanctity he had imposed upon himself during the term of his *nezirus*.