



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Using a razor for the final haircut

The Gemara concludes its citation of a Baraisa that discusses the requirement that the final haircut should be done with a razor.

Rebbi's position in the Baraisa is unsuccessfully challenged.

2) Cutting the nazir's hair

R' Chisda teaches that removing one hair violates one's nezirus; two remaining hairs means that the concluding haircut was not done properly, and that a nazir does not forfeit days of his nezirus unless most of the hair on his head was shaved and specifically with a razor.

The assertion that a nazir forfeits his days only if his hair was shaved with a razor is successfully challenged and it is revised to teach that any time the hair is cut down to the scalp he will forfeit days.

A Baraisa is cited that supports R' Chisda's statement.

3) Haircuts that are a mitzvah

A Mishnah cites three instances where a haircut is a mitzvah. Details related to those haircuts are discussed.

The Gemara explains that the necessity of the Mishnah to state that there is a mitzvah for the nazir, metzora and Levi'im to cut their hair is that one may have thought that the only requirement is for the hair to be removed.

The sources that a razor is required for a nazir and Levi are identified.

The Gemara struggles to find the source that a razor is required for the metzora's haircut and concludes that it is de-

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. How many hairs does the nazir have to remove to be subject to lashes?

2. Who are the three people who must shave their hair?

3. What is the dispute between Rabanan and R' Eliezer?

4. What type of facial hair is biblically prohibited?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by
 By the Sutker Family
 In loving memory of
 ר' אלעזר בן ר' מאיר
 Mr. Les Sutker O.B.M.

Distinctive INSIGHT

Deriving the rule of a metzora shaving with a razor

ולפרוך מה להצד השווה שכן אין קרבנו בדלות

The Gemara cites the Mishnah from Negaim (14:4) which teaches the law of three cases where one's hair must be shaved, and it must be done with a razor. The three are nazir, metzora, and the Levi'im (when they were initially chosen for service in the desert—see Bamidbar 8:7).

As the Gemara analyzes this halacha, it notes that the only in reference to nazir and the Levi'im do the verses specify that the shaving of hair must be done with no cutting device other than a razor. Regarding metzora, the Torah only says that he must remove his hair (Vayikra 14:9), but it does not stipulate that it be done with a razor. Nevertheless, the Gemara concludes that we learn the halacha of a metzora from a **צד השווה**—a lack of common factor derivation—from nazir and the Levi'im.

At this point, Rava from Barnish questions the premise of the **צד השווה**, as he asks Rav Ashi that the two sources, nazir and Levi'im, do, in fact, share a common factor which would undermine the lesson. Both nazir and the Levi'im bring offerings which are set and do not vary depending upon whether a person is poor or rich. Metzora, however, has the option of bringing his offering based upon his financial status. A financially-capable metzora must bring two lambs, while a poor person brings a sheep and two birds. Accordingly, perhaps the nazir or Levi'im must use a razor when they shave, whereas a poor metzora might be eligible for the leniency of not using a razor.

The Nesivos Hakodesh asks that the question of Rava to Rav Ashi assumes that the dispensation for a poor metzora to bring a less-expensive offering is a leniency. This, however, is not the case, as we know that the simple offering of a poor man is just as desirable before Hashem as the full offering of the wealthy man (see Menachos 110a). Why, then, is this consideration presented as a leniency which then leads us to believe that the Torah will offer the poor metzora another leniency not to use a razor?

Or Sameach also notes that the offering of a poor metzora is not more lenient than a nazir tamei, whose set offering, brought by rich and poor alike, must also bring a sheep (for an asham) and two birds. We could then learn metzora from nazir tamei, thus maintaining the integrity of the **צד השווה**.

The conclusion of the Gemara is that metzora needing to use a razor is not derived from nazir and the Levi'im, but it is learned from the word **זקנו** written in the topic of metzora. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by
 כ"ק מרן הרה"צ
 רבי יהושע העשיל אייכענשטיין זצ"ל
 האדמו"ר מזידטשוב - שיקאגו
 נלב"ע י"א אדר ת"ש

HALACHAH Highlight

Listening to the shofar over the phone

מהו דתימא משום עבורי שער הוא ואפילו סך נשא קא משמע לן דלא
What might you have said? The purpose is to remove the hair and even if one smears a depilatory [it would be sufficient,] therefore the Mishnah teaches that the shaving must be performed with a razor.

The Gemara relates that were it not for extra words in a Mishnah it would be acceptable for a nazir to remove his hair using a depilatory. Rav Tzvi Pesach Frank¹ challenges the premise that it would be acceptable to remove hair using a depilatory when the Gemara Kiddushin rules that one may not pierce the ear of a Jewish slave with a caustic substance (סס) since the mitzvah is to pierce the slave's ear and the caustic substance makes the hole by itself without human action. Similarly it should not be acceptable for the nazir to remove his hair using a depilatory since the hair comes off on its own rather than through human intervention. He cites Rav Eliezer Gordon who suggested that fulfilling mitzvos indirectly (על ידי גרמא) is a valid method of fulfillment and explains that the Gemara in Kiddushin was teaching a different lesson.

Teshuvus Sha'arei Deah² raised the question of whether it is possible to fulfill the mitzvah of shofar by hearing it over the phone and demonstrated its acceptability from our Gemara that maintains that were it not for the exposition it would be acceptable for the nazir to remove his hair using indirect means. This implies that barring an exposition that teaches that indirect fulfillment is not acceptable, the assumption is that indirect fulfillment of a mitzvah is an acceptable way to perform a mitz-

rived from the cases of nazir and the Levi'im.

Rava from Barnishya successfully challenges this derivation.

Rav bar Mesharshiya notes that earlier the Gemara assumed that there was a definitive source that a metzorah must cut his hair with a razor and nazir was to be derived from metzorah and now the Gemara is attempting to do the opposite.

Rava explains that the two discussions represent the opposing views of Rabanan and R' Eliezer.

The Mishnah that contains the dispute between Rabanan and R' Eliezer is cited.

The source for Rabanan's position that the general prohibition refers to shaving with one's beard and that this is the source that the metzorah must shave with a razor is identified.

The assertion that the metzorah must shave with a razor is unsuccessfully challenged. ■

(Overview. Continued from page 1)

vah. Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach³, however, argued strongly that one does not fulfill mitzvos that must be heard (e.g. shofar, megilla, krias hatorah, etc.) if the listener is listening over the phone. Furthermore, Rav Auerbach maintains that one may not even answer אמן to a beracha that one hears over the phone. The only leniency that Rav Auerbach allows is to answer amen to a beracha that one hears over a loudspeaker if one is in shul or nearby because in that case he may answer אמן as part of the tzibbur, as opposed to when he is not part of the tzibbur and merely hears the beracha over the phone. ■

1. שר"ת הר צבי יו"ד סי' קמ"ג
2. שר"ת שערי דעה סי' ב'
3. שר"ת מנחת שלמה סי' ט' ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The use of the razor

ומנלן דבתער

Today's daf examines the prohibition against shaving one's beard with a razor.

The search for a halachically acceptable method of shaving has existed for quite a while. At first, the issue arose regarding depilatory creams to remove facial hair and eventually the original mechanical shavers were questioned. The Chofetz Chaim, zt"l, prohibited the use of the electric shavers of his day. Subsequently, some claimed that the more modern shavers are permitted. Rav Noach Berman heard conflicting rumors

about the opinion of the Chazon Ish, zt"l. He decided to approach the Chazon Ish, zt"l, and verify what he truly held regarding this issue. He asked regarding the most lenient proclamation he had heard. Rav Noach said, "Is it true that you said that one who fears heaven must be careful not to shave his beard with an electric razor?"

"No," the Chazon Ish replied. "Shaving with an electric razor is halachically prohibited for all, not just for those who fear heaven. As for the claim that these shavers don't touch the skin, I soiled my hand and ran a shaver over it. Since it got clean in places, it appears as though these shavers do touch the skin. Therefore they may not be used."

Rav Aharon Kotler, zt"l, is also reputed to have had serious questions regarding the permissibility of shaving with an electric razor. On the other hand, it is well known that Rav Moshe Feinstein, zt"l, did permit the use of certain electric shavers.

Someone once approached him and asked why he didn't write a teshuvah outlining the parameters of which shavers are permitted and which are not. "After all, your teshuvos cover every subject under the sun!"

Rav Moshe explained, "Although I permit this practice halachically, I don't want to write a teshuvah formally permitting this since the proper way is for a Jew to have a beard. Although this is not halachically prohibited, a Jew ought to grow a beard!" ■