



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The majority is equivalent to the whole thing

R' Acha the son of R' Ikka infers from the requirement that the nazir cut all his hair that generally there is a principle that "the majority is equivalent to the entire thing."

R' Yosi the son of R' Chanina unsuccessfully challenges this inference.

2) The nazir's haircut

Abaye presents an unresolved inquiry related to the nazir's haircut.

Rava presents an inquiry related to the nazir's haircut.

The inquiry is slightly revised.

Ravina resolves the inquiry, although the Gemara is forced to slightly revise Ravina's language.

3) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah rules that the nazir may shampoo and separate his hair, but he is not permitted to comb it.

4) Identifying the author of the Mishnah

An inconsistency is noted in the Mishnah regarding unintended actions.

Rabbah asserts that the Mishnah follows R' Shimon that unintended actions are permitted and combing is prohibited because it is considered intentional.

5) **MISHNAH:** R' Yishmael rules that a nazir may not shampoo his hair with dirt since it causes hair to fall out.

6) Clarifying the ruling of the Mishnah

The Gemara makes an inquiry related to the lan-

(Continued on page 2)

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Dr. and Mrs. Reuven Warshell
In loving memory of their parents
ר' שמואל בן ר' נחום ע"ה
ור' פינחס בן ר' ארי' לייב, ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Mr. and Mrs. Michael Allen
In loving memory of their father
יעקב בן יוסף ע"ה

Distinctive INSIGHT

The nazir drinks wine all day long but is liable for only one set of lashes

נזיר שהיה שותה יין כל היום אינו חייב אלא אחת

The ריב"ן, Nimukei Yosef and Ritva in Makkos (20b) explain that where the nazir was warned one time, the nazir is liable for only one set of lashes even if he continues to violate his nezirus multiple times with drinking additional measures of wine all day long. The culpability is for the first violation which immediately follows the warning, but the subsequent violations are lacking a warning, as we have to assume that he might have forgotten about the first warning which was given much earlier.

Tosafos (ibid., לא צריכא ד"ה) wonders why we discount the warning although it was issued only at the beginning, when the Gemara in Kiddushin (77b) rules in a case of a Kohen who is liable for multiple violations, even though he was given only one warning at the beginning. Where the sins are distinct acts, each one requires a chattas offering as a separate atonement, and we do not consider the warning as being deficient. Here, too, asks Tosafos, the nazir should be liable for lashes for each separate measure of wine that he drinks.

Tosafos answers that the case of the nazir being liable only one set of lashes is only where the act of drinking itself is not considered as many separate acts, but rather

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. From where did R' Acha the son of R' Ika derive that the principle of רובו ככולו is biblical?
2. What factor determines whether a nazir who drank wine all day receives one set of lashes or multiple sets of lashes?
3. How does R' Huna understand the phrases לא יבא and לא יטמא?
4. Explain טומאה בחיבורין.

HALACHAH Highlight

Combing one's payos

נזיר חופף ומפספס אבל לא סורק

A nazir may shampoo and separate [the hairs on his head] but may not comb his hair.

Rav Akiva Eiger¹ writes that just like it is prohibited for a nazir to comb his hair, since it is inevitable that he will uproot some hair, so too it is prohibited for any person to comb their payos since it is inevitable that he detach some of the hair of his payos and thus violate the Biblical prohibition against cutting the hair of his payos. He concludes, however, that this halacha requires further analysis. Rav Yaakov Yisroel Kanievsky², the Steipler Gaon, expressed astonishment at this position. Is it reasonable to think that by combing one's payos he will uproot all the hairs of his payos? Concerning the nazir the Gemara states that he may not comb his hair since every two hairs represent another violation, but the prohibition against cutting the hair of the payos is violated only when a person removes all the hair. An explanation that the Steipler Gaon accepts to explain this difficult position is that R' Akiva Eiger follows the opinion of Semag who maintains that the prohibition against cutting the hair of the payos is also violated when two hairs are removed.

Rav Akiva Eiger sent this question to the Chasam Sofer³ who responded that it is evident from our Gemara that there is no prohibition against combing one's payos.

(Overview...Continued from page 1)
guage of the Mishnah that impacts whether shampooing with all dirt is prohibited or only with dirt that causes hair to fall out.

The question is left unresolved.

7) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah presents the parameters for determining whether the nazir receives one set of lashes or multiple sets of lashes for the different prohibitions.

8) Multiple contacts with tumah

Rabbah in the name of R' Huna

asserts that one verse teaches that it is prohibited for a nazir to contract tumah from a corpse and a second verse teaches that once tamei, the nazir is not permitted to enter a "tent" that contains a corpse. However, there is no prohibition concerning other forms of contact with tumah.

R' Yosef maintains that R' Huna's position is that any second contact with tumah is prohibited for a nazir.

Abaye challenges R' Yosef's version of R' Huna's position.

R' Yosef responds to Abaye's challenge and in doing so asserts that

(Insight. Continued from page 1)

as one extended act of drinking.

In his Commentary to the Mishnah, Rambam writes that when the Mishnah rules that the nazir is liable for only one set of lashes, this refers to how the nazir is judged in Beis Din here on earth, which can only act when a formal warning is associated with a sinful act. However, the nazir is culpable in the heavens for each and every violation of his nezirus. This law applies as well for any Torah violation where the sinner is technically exempt from the powers of Beis Din to administer lashes. ■

The Gemara discusses the prohibition against a nazir combing his hair and if was true that men were not permitted to comb their payos that would have been the topic of discussion since that restriction applies to everyone. Additionally, Chasam Sofer notes that he did not find that the older rabbis exercised concern for this matter. Therefore, it is obvious that it is permitted, without any need for hesitation, to comb one's payos. Rav Moshe Shternbuch⁴ mentions the opinions of Rav Akiva Eiger and Chasam Sofer and mentions that the practice of Torah scholars was to be lenient on this matter and one who wishes to follow the ruling of Rav Akiva Eiger may do so for himself but he may not rule stringently for others on this matter. ■

1. גליון הש"ס שבועות ב:
2. גליונות קהלת יעקב שבועות שם.
3. שו"ת חת"ס יו"ד סי' קל"ט וק"מ.
4. שו"ת תשובות והנהגות ח"א סי' ת"ס. ■

טומאה בחיבורין is a Biblical law.

The assumption that טומאה בחיבורין is Biblical is challenged from a teaching of R' Yannai.

The Gemara distinguishes between two types of טומאה בחיבורין.

The rationale behind Rabbah's understanding of R' Huna is challenged.

R' Yochanan explains that the question of liability for two acts of tumah hinges upon whether the two contacts represent two transgressions or the same transgression twice. ■