



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) **MISHNAH (cont.):** The Mishnah continues its description of the nazir's concluding ritual.

2) The dispute in the Mishnah

A Baraisa is cited that presents a dispute similar to the dispute contained in our Mishnah.

The rationale for Rabanan's position, i.e. the nezirus ends after even one part of the ritual is completed, is presented.

3) The Waving Rite—תנופה

Rav asserts that the Waving rite is essential to remove the nazir prohibitions.

The Gemara inquires which opinion Rav was following when he made this assertion.

The Gemara answers that Rav follows R' Eliezer's opinion and explains why one may have thought that the waving is not essential to remove the nazir's prohibitions.

A challenge to Rav's assertion is presented.

The basic assumption of the challenge is undermined and thus the challenge is dismissed.

In responding to the challenge against Rav's position, Beis Shammai was cited as ruling that a bald nazir has no remedy to be released from his nezirus. R' Pedas aligns this position with that of R' Eliezer regarding a metzora that does not have a thumb or big toe.

A second version of this discussion is presented, this time the Gemara explains that Rav was following the opinion of Rabanan.

4) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah presents the different laws for a nazir who cut his hair after offering one of the karbonos and it then turns out the korban was unfit.

5) Clarifying R' Shimon's position

R' Ada bar Ahavah infers that R' Shimon maintains that even if the nazir shaved his head after offering a voluntary Korban Shelamim he has discharged his obligation.

The Gemara explains the reasoning behind this position. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

The mitzvah of cutting the hair and bringing his offerings

תנו רבנן: ואחר ישתה הנזיר יין- אחר המעשים כולן דברי רבי אליעזר

In his Sefer Hamitzvos (עשה קיא), Rambam points out that in terms of numbering the mitzvos of the Torah, the mitzvah of the metzora to shave and to bring his offerings are counted as two separate mitzvos. In contrast, the cutting of the hair of the nazir and his bringing his offerings are counted as one combined mitzvah. What is the reason for this distinction?

Rambam explains that there is no direct connection between the shaving of the hair of the metzora and the bringing of his offerings. On the one hand, the metzora is in a state of ritual impurity as is a שרץ. On the other hand, he is lacking his atonement (מחוסר כיפורים), and, as a result, he is not allowed to eat from consecrated meats. Therefore, he must perform two rituals before progressing beyond his impure state. When he shaves, he is no longer a source of impurity (see Mishnah, Negaim 14:3). However, he is still not permitted to eat from the meat of offerings until he brings his own offerings. This is why these two stages at the conclusion of the metzora term are listed as two distinct mitzvos. These procedures function independently and they serve different purposes for his advance toward normalcy.

The nazir, in contrast, is in need of two processes which together are one. It is not sufficient for him to only shave or to bring the offerings, as it is the combination of the two that serves to complete his nezirus and to allow him to drink wine. This is why these two procedures are counted together as only one mitzvah. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. When do the nazir restrictions end?

2. Explain כיון דלענין כפרה שירי מצוה היא

3. How does a nazir who is bald conclude his nezirus?

4. What happens if it is discovered that the nazir's korban was unfit?

HALACHAH Highlight

Taking the lulav and esrog with one's teeth

אין לו טהרה עולמית דברי ר' אליעזר ר' שמעון אומר ניחנו על מקומו ויצא

He can never become tahor, according to the words of R' Eliezer. R' Shimon says it should be applied to the place and he has discharged his obligation.

The Gemara presents a dispute between R' Eliezer and R' Shimon regarding a metzora who is missing his right thumb. R' Eliezer maintains that since the Torah's instruction to apply the blood of the Korban Asham to his thumb cannot be fulfilled, the metzora can never become tahor. R' Shimon disagrees and asserts that the blood should be applied to the place where the thumb should be, and that is sufficient for a metzora who is missing his thumb. Based on this, Shulchan Aruch¹ writes that a person who is missing a hand should take the lulav or esrog with his forearm. Mishnah Berurah² explains that Shulchan Aruch refers to a person who is missing both hands and the ruling is that he should take the lulav in his right forearm and the esrog in his left forearm. If a

person has one hand he should take the lulav in that hand, even if it is the left, and the esrog in the other forearm. If he cannot hold the esrog in his forearm he should take the lulav and the esrog in his hand, one after the other.

Sha'arei Teshuvah³ cites authorities who maintain that if a person is missing his arms altogether, he should take the lulav and esrog in his teeth since the Torah never states that the lulav and esrog must be taken by hand. Sha'arei Teshuvah questions whether taking something with one's teeth fulfills the requirement "to take" something since this is not the normal way of taking. Birkei Yosef⁴ also addressed the question of whether someone without arms should take the lulav and esrog with his teeth and ruled that since the Torah does not say that the "taking" must be done by hand using the teeth is sufficient. As proof to his position he cites the ruling in Shulchan Aruch⁵ pertaining to the chalitzah ceremony that a woman without arms may loosen the shoe of her yavam with her teeth. ■

1. שו"ע או"ח סי' תרנ"א סעי' ד'.

2. מ"ב שם כ"א-כ"ג.

3. שערי תשובה שם ס"ק י"א.

4. ברכי יוסף שם סק"ה.

5. שו"ע אה"ע סי' קס"ט סעי' ל"א. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Important Elements

"כיון דלענין כפרה שירי מצוה היא..."

Today's daf discusses various details of nezirus which are mitzvos min hamuvchar. We learn that even if the nazir's sacrifice wasn't waved or if he didn't cut his hair, he nevertheless gains atonement and may drink wine or become ritually defiled.

Rav Eliyahu Dushnizer, zt"l, the mashgiach of Yeshivas Petach Tikvah, would often learn a moral lesson from the most mundane experiences. Once he saw someone carrying around a transistor radio, then quite a new gadget in Eretz Yisrael.

"What is that?" asked the mash-

giach.

"It's a kind of radio, only without wires," the bochur explained.

The mashgiach was amazed. The bochur added, "Everything is extremely compact, so it fits in this little box."

"Hmm, so the wires *are* inside. You do need them, right?" asked the mashgiach.

"Yes, of course," was the reply.

"What if you were to cut a wire off?" the mashgiach probed.

"I assume that it would stop working," replied the bochur.

"Even a very small wire?"

"In such a small setup I think that every bit of wire must be essential," said the bochur.

The mashgiach said, "This is a good way to understand why certain mitzvos have many details without

which one doesn't discharge his obligation at all. This can be compared to your radio; just like the wires in this transistor are so essential that if even one is disconnected they are all useless, so too do many mitzvos comprise many details without which one completely fails to discharge his obligation."

We must not assume that if we missed a detail we discharged our obligation. Like the details of the nazir, we must learn to identify which elements are essential and prevent one from discharging his obligation and which are less important such that even if they are lacking do not impede the mitzvah's function and fulfillment. And whoever does not know the halacha should ask someone who does! ■