

דאי סלקא דעתך דתגלחת טומאה – מי חלוטו מי לא בעי תגלחת? לא. תגלחת דגזירות קתני.

תא שמע: 'וטמא ראש נזיר' – בטור שנטמא הכתוב מדבר, שהוא טעון העברת שער והבאת ציפורין, ולפטור את הנזיר בקבר – שאין טעון העברת שער והבאת ציפורין.

והלא דברים קל וחומר: ומה טהור שנטמא – טעון העברת שער והבאת ציפורין, מי שהיה טמא מתחלה אינו דין שהיה טעון העברת שער והבאת ציפורין?

תלמוד לומר 'וטמא ראש נזיר' – במי שהיה טהור ונטמא הכתוב מדבר, שיהא טעון העברת שער והבאת ציפורין, ולפטור את הנזיר בקבר. שמע מינה.

מאן תנא הא, דתנו רבנן: אין בין טמא שזור לנזיר טהור שנטמא, אלא שטמא שזור שביעי שלו עולה לו מן המנין, ונזיר טהור שנטמא אין שביעי שלו עולה לו מן המנין?

אמר רב חסדא: רבי היא, דאמר רבי: אין נזירות טהרה חלה אלא עד שמיני. דאי תימא רבי יוסי ברבי יהודה היא – האמר נזירות דטהרה משביעי הוא דחיילא.

as if it enters your mind to say that the *baraita* is discussing the shaving done as a result of the nazirite's impurity, and contrasts a nazirite with a leper, do the end of a leper's days of confirmed leprosy not require shaving? A leper must shave when he is purified from his condition, so how can he be described as unfit for shaving? Rather, the *baraita* must be referring to the nazirite's shaving of purity, as suggested above (17b). The Gemara rejects this: **No**, it could be that the *baraita* is discussing the shaving done as a result of the nazirite's impurity, and when it states that a leper is unfit for shaving, the *baraita* is teaching about the shaving of naziriteship, and the *baraita* is stating that a leper is unfit for any shaving of a nazirite, since he must first shave for his leprosy.

The Gemara suggests another proof to answer the question of whether one who vows naziriteship while in a cemetery must shave upon undergoing purification. **Come and hear a baraita:** The verse states: "And he defiles his consecrated head, he shall shave his head on the day of his purification, on the seventh day shall he shave it" (Numbers 6:9). The *baraita* explains: **The verse is speaking of a ritually pure nazirite who became impure,^h who requires hair removal and the bringing of birds as offerings.** And this verse comes to exempt a nazirite who vowed while in the grave,^h i.e., a cemetery, that he does not require hair removal and the bringing of birds.

The *baraita* continues its analysis of this *halakha*. For one might have explained differently: **And are these matters**, the ruling that such a nazirite is exempt, **not** inferred with an *a fortiori* inference to reach the opposite conclusion: **Just as a nazirite who was pure from the outset and who subsequently became impure requires hair removal and the bringing of birds, if one was impure from the outset, as he took a vow of naziriteship while in a cemetery, is it not logical that he should require hair removal and the bringing of birds?**

Therefore the verse states: "And he defiles his consecrated head," indicating that the verse speaks only of one who was a pure nazirite and later became impure, and that only he requires hair removal and the bringing of birds. And the verse serves to exempt the nazirite who vowed while in a place of a grave, who was ritually impure from the outset. The Gemara concludes: **Learn from this** that a nazirite who was ritually impure from the outset does not have to shave; this answers the question of Rav Ashi.

¶ After resolving the question, the Gemara discusses additional *halakhot* involving a ritually impure person who took a vow of naziriteship. **Who is the tanna who taught this baraita that the Sages taught in the previous discussion: The difference between an impure person who took a vow of naziriteshipⁿ and a pure nazirite who became ritually impure is only the following halakha:** That with regard to an impure person who took a vow of naziriteship, his seventh day of purification counts^h as part of his tally of the term of naziriteship. **But with regard to a pure nazirite who became impure, his seventh day of purification does not count as part of his tally.**

Rav Hisda said: It is the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, as Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: **Naziriteship of purity takes effect only from the eighth day.** When a nazirite becomes impure during his term, he begins to count his term of observing naziriteship in purity only on the day following his purification. **For if you say it follows the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, didn't he say that the naziriteship of purity takes effect from the seventh day of his purification process?**

HALAKHA

The verse is speaking of a ritually pure nazirite who became impure – בטור שנטמא הכתוב מדבר – If a nazirite became ritually impure through contact with a corpse, whether intentionally, unwittingly, or even against his will, all of his previous days of naziriteship are negated. He must perform the shaving of ritual impurity and bring the offerings of impurity before he starts counting his naziriteship anew (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:3).

To exempt a nazirite who vowed while in the grave – ולפטור את הנזיר בקבר: If a person took a vow of naziriteship while in a cemetery and became ritually impure there, he does not shave or bring the offerings of impurity (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:8).

His seventh day counts, etc. – שביעי שלו עולה לו וכו' – If one vowed to be a nazirite while in a state of ritual impurity, once he has received the sprinkling of the ashes of the red heifer and has immersed himself on the seventh day, that day counts as the first day of his naziriteship term. However, a ritually pure nazirite who contracted impurity only begins counting anew from the eighth day of his purification process. The *halakha* follows Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi when he has a dispute with his colleagues (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:7).

NOTES

The difference between an impure person who took a vow of naziriteship, etc. – אין בין טמא שזור וכו' – Although there are other significant differences between them, since a nazirite who became impure must shave and bring offerings while an impure person who took a vow of naziriteship does not need to do so, by stating that the seventh day counts toward the tally for one who was ritually impure from the outset, the *tanna* indicates that he is also exempt from shaving and from bringing the offerings, as explained in the Gemara earlier (17b).

מאי רבי ומאי רבי יוסי ברבי יהודה. דתנא: "וקדש את ראשו ביום ההוא" – ביום הבאת קרבנותיו, דברי רבי. רבי יוסי ברבי יהודה אומר: ביום תגלחתו.

והא דתנן: נזיר שנטמא טומאות הרבה אינו מביא אלא קרבן אחד, מאן תנא? אמר רב חסדא: רבי יוסי ברבי יהודה היא, דאמר: נזירות טהרה משביעי חילא. ומשבתת לה כגון שנטמא בשביעי וחזר ונטמא בשביעי, (ומני – רבי יוסי ברבי יהודה היא); בין דלא יצא שעה הראויה להביא קרבן – אינו חייב אלא קרבן אחד.

דאי תימא רבי היא, אי דנטמא בשביעי וחזר ונטמא בשביעי, (וחזר ונטמא בשביעי) – כולהו טומאה אריכתא היא. ואי דנטמא בשמיני וחזר ונטמא בשמיני – הרי יצתה שעה שראויה להביא קרבן.

מאי טעמא דרבי? אמר קרא "וכפר עליו מאשר חטא על הנפש" והדר "וקדש את ראשו". ורבי יוסי ברבי יהודה: אם כן לימא קרא "וקדש את ראשו".

The Gemara clarifies: **What is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, and what is the statement of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, that Rav Hisda referred to? As it is taught in a baraita:** The verse states with regard to a ritually impure nazirite who underwent the purification rite: **"And he shall sanctify his head on that day"** (Numbers 6:11). This means that he renews the sanctity of his hair growth, i.e., begin observing his naziriteship in purity, **on the day of the bringing of his offerings**, the eighth day of his purification. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. **Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, says:** This means that he renews the sanctity of his hair growth **on the day of his shaving**, the seventh day of his purification.

§ The Gemara cites a related *halakha*: **And that which we learned in a mishna (Karetot 9a): If a nazirite became impure by contracting many consecutive impurities,^h he brings only one set of offerings. Who taught that? Rav Hisda said: It is Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, who said the naziriteship of purity takes effect from the seventh day of his purification process. And you find this, that he contracts ritual impurity several times consecutively, in a case where he became ritually impure on the seventh day and, after undergoing the purification process, again became ritually impure on the seventh day. And whose opinion is it? It is that of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda. Since the appropriate time to bring an offering had not yet arrived, as all agree that his offerings are only brought on the eighth day, if he became ritually impure a second time he is obligated to bring only one set of offerings.**

For if you say it follows the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, how can this mishna be explained? If it deals with a nazirite who became ritually impure on the seventh day, and, after undergoing the purification process, again became ritually impure on the seventh day, and, after undergoing the purification process, again became ritually impure on the seventh day, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi would hold that all these impurities are in fact one long ritual impurity, because he never reached the eighth day, which would renew his observance of naziriteship in ritual purity, so the mishna would not refer to this as a case of multiple impurities. And if the mishna is referring to a nazirite who became ritually impure on the eighth day and, after undergoing the purification process, again became ritually impure on the eighth day, the appropriate time to bring an offering had already arrived, and if he becomes ritually impure at that stage, it is not viewed as a continuation of the previous ritual impurity, and he is obligated to bring another set of offerings.

The Gemara clarifies the dispute between Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi and Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda: **What is the reason for Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's ruling that he begins counting only from the eighth day? The Gemara answers: The verse states:** "And the priest shall prepare one for a sin-offering, and the other for a burnt-offering, and make atonement for him, for he sinned by the soul" (Numbers 6:11), and the same verse again states immediately afterward: **"And he shall sanctify his head."** This shows that the naziriteship of purity commences only after he has brought his offerings. **And Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, says in response: If so, if the verse intended to teach us that his naziriteship starts only on the eighth day, let the verse merely state: "And he shall sanctify his head,"** since that phrase addresses the bringing of his offerings, which is on the eighth.

HALAKHA

A nazirite became impure by contracting many impurities – set of offerings, even if he was warned each time he contracted impurity (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:15).
 נזיר שנטמא טומאות הרבה – A nazirite who became ritually impure by contracting many impurities is obligated to bring only one

מִבְּיּוֹם הַהוּא לָמָּה לִּי אִם אֵינוּ עֲנִין לְשִׁמְיִי, תִּנְהוּ עֲנִין לְשִׁבְעִי. וְרַבִּי נָמִי הִכְתִּיב "בְּיוֹם הַהוּא!" אָמַר לְךָ רַבִּי: הַהוּא לְהִכִּי הוּא דְאָתָּא, לֹאמַר לְךָ: אֵף עַל פִּי שְׁלֵא הִבִּיא קִרְבָּנוֹתָיו.

וְרַב חֲסִידָא, מֵאֵי דוֹחֲקִיָּה לְאוֹקְמִיָּה בְּרַבִּי יוֹסֵי בְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה? לְאוֹקְמָה כְּגוֹן דְּנִטְמָא דְחַוּיָּא בְּלֵיל שְׁמִינִי, וְרַבִּי הִיא!

מִדְּלָא מוֹקִים לָהּ בְּרַבִּי, לִימָא קְסָבֵר לִילֵיאָ לָאוּ מְחוּסָר זְמַן הוּא?

Why do I need the extra phrase “on that day” (Numbers 6:11)? This teaches that if it does not apply to the matter of the eighth^N day, since the verse is speaking of that day anyway, apply it to the matter of the seventh day, so that “on that day” means the day when he becomes ritually purified, even before he brings his offerings. The Gemara asks: And according to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi also, isn’t it written “on that day”? What *halakha* does he derive from these additional words? The Gemara answers: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi could have said to you: That verse comes for this purpose, to tell you that even though he did not yet bring his offerings, he starts counting his naziriteship of purity from the eighth day. This is derived from the verse’s emphasis of: “And he shall sanctify his head on that day,” indicating that it depends on the day itself, rather than the bringing of the offerings.

The Gemara asks: And what forced Rav Hisda to establish this mishna in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda? Let him establish it as referring to a case where one became impure by seeing, i.e., contracting, impurity on the night preceding the eighth^N day each time. Even according to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, the naziriteship of purity begins at the start of, presumably the night preceding, the eighth day. Therefore, this case will be one of a nazirite contracting ritual impurity many times. Nevertheless, the nazirite will be obligated to bring only one set of offerings for all of them, because each case of ritual impurity occurred at night, when he is unable to bring the offerings for his previous ritual impurity, as offerings can be brought only during the day. And therefore it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi.

The Gemara suggests: Since he did not establish it in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi in this way, shall we say that Rav Hisda holds that night is not considered premature? In other words, although he cannot in practice bring his offerings until the morning, as the Temple service was performed only in the daytime, the night is not considered a premature time, but rather it is viewed as part of the day in which it is appropriate to bring his offerings. Consequently, the *halakha* of one who becomes ritually impure on the night preceding the eighth day is the same as that of one who contracted ritual impurity on the eighth day itself, and they are both required to bring an additional set of offerings.

NOTES

אִם אֵינוּ עֲנִין – If it does not apply to the matter of the eighth^N day. The exegetic method of: If it does not apply to the matter, does not propose to link two unrelated matters. Rather, it applies one verse to a similar matter whose *halakha* is not explicit in the Torah. In this case, some commentaries understand that the derivation that “on that day” refers to the seventh day is due to the fact that these words seem superfluous (*Tosafot*; Rabbeinu Peretz). Others explain that this should be understood as an application of the exegetic principle: One restrictive expression after another restrictive expression serves to amplify, as the verse says “on that day,” which is a restriction, after already having stated that he must start counting from that day, another restriction. The double restriction therefore comes to include the seventh day (*Tosafot*; Rosh; Rabbeinu Peretz).

One became impure by seeing impurity on the night preceding the eighth – לִילֵיאָ בְּלֵיל שְׁמִינִי: The word seeing is problematic in this context, as the only type of ritual impurity relevant to a nazirite is ritual impurity contracted by coming into contact with or close proximity to a corpse, and the word seeing, in the context of ritual impurity, is referring to one who experiences a ritually impure discharge. The early commentaries have offered various explanations for the usage of this term. The Commentary on *Nazir* states that the quotation is taken in its entirety from the parallel discussion in tractate *Karetot* (8a) that refers to the ritual impurity of a *zava*, where the term is entirely appropriate.

The matter itself – גופא: The early commentaries are puzzled by the use of this term, which is usually used to indicate that the Gemara is returning to analyze in detail a *baraita* or mishna that was previously cited in passing. In this case the *baraita* now discussed was not quoted earlier at all. For this reason, some early commentaries (see Commentary on *Nazir* and *Tosafot*) emend the text and replace this term with: The Sages taught. However, the Rosh and others point out that the language of *Nazir* is peculiar in many respects, and it is possible that the standard text is correct, and the word here is used to mean that the Gemara is returning to analyze the topic mentioned earlier, even though this *baraita* was not quoted.

He begins counting immediately – מתחיל ומונה מיד: The Commentary on *Nazir* explains that this is referring to the eighth day, since Rabbi Eliezer holds that the time that his ritually pure naziriteship begins is dependent on the start of the day on which he can bring his offerings, rather than the bringing of the offerings in actuality. However, *Tosafot* and many other early commentaries question this explanation, since Rabbi Eliezer stated in the mishna (16b) that one is obligated to bring offerings for impurity only if he had observed more than one day of ritually pure naziriteship. If he became impure immediately after starting to count on the eighth day, he would not incur an obligation to bring an additional set of offerings. Consequently, they explain that this means that he begins counting his naziriteship on the seventh day, so that his seventh day and part of the eighth are considered his first days. Some early commentaries (see *Shita Mekubbetzet*) emend the text to read: This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. This would fit with Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's earlier opinion that he begins counting at the start of the eighth day.

HALAKHA

עד שביא את הטהרה – עד שביא: A nazirite who became ritually impure many times is obligated to bring only one set of offerings. This applies only if he became ritually impure the second time before he brought the sin-offering for his first instance of ritual impurity. If he contracts ritual impurity after he had already brought his sin-offering, even if he had yet to bring his guilt-offering and burnt-offering, he must bring a second set of offerings for his ritual impurity, in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:15).

If he brought his sin-offering and did not yet bring his guilt-offering, he begins to count – הביא חטאתו ולא הביא אשמו מונה: A nazirite who became ritually impure begins counting his term of naziriteship afresh from the moment he brings his sin-offering. His guilt-offering and burnt-offering are not indispensable to the start of his new term (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:12–13).

אמר רב אדא בר אבהו: הא בהא תליא; אי אמרת ליליא מחוסר זמן, אימת מיחוי לקרבן – לצפרא, נזירות נמי לא חיליא עד צפרא. ואי אמרת ליליא אינו מחוסר זמן – נזירות טהרה חיליא מאורתא.

גופא, נטמא בשביעי וחזר ונטמא בשביעי – אינו מביא אלא קרבן אחד. נטמא בשמיני וחזר ונטמא בשמיני – מביא קרבן על כל אחד ואחד. מתחיל ומונה מיד, דברי רבי אליעזר.

וחכמים אומרים: קרבן אחד על הכל, עד שביא חטאתו. הביא חטאתו ונטמא, והביא חטאתו ונטמא – מביא קרבן על כל אחד ואחד. הביא חטאתו ולא הביא אשמו – מונה.

רבי ישמעאל בנו של רבי יוחנן בן ברוקה אומר: כשם שחטאתו עיבבתו – בן אשמו מעבבו.

בשלמא לרבי אליעזר, אמר קרא "וקדש את ראשו ביום ההוא" – אף על פי שלא הביא קרבנותיו, ורבנן: "ההוא" – אף על פי שלא הביא אשמו.

אלא רבי ישמעאל: "ההוא" למה לי? אמר לך: "ההוא" – אף על פי שלא הביא עולתו, ורבנן: עולה לא בעי מיעוטא, דורון בעלמא הוא.

Rav Adda bar Ahava said: This conclusion is incorrect, as even if Rav Hsida holds that the night is considered to be premature, he could not establish the mishna in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, as the offerings and his new term of naziriteship depend on each other: If you say night is considered premature, when is he fit to bring his offerings? Only in the morning. Accordingly, naziriteship also does not take effect until the morning. And if you say night is not considered premature, and he is already obligated in his offerings at night, in that case naziriteship of purity takes effect from the evening, which means that the ritual impurity he suffered at night renders him obligated to bring an additional set of offerings. Consequently, the mishna does not follow the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, whether night is considered premature or not, and nothing can be inferred from here with regard to Rav Hsida's opinion in that matter.

§ The Gemara cites a *baraita* (*Tosefta* 4:8) concerning the matter of a nazirite who contracted ritual impurity many times itself:^N If a nazirite became impure, and then became impure on the seventh day of his purification process, and again became impure on the following seventh day of his purification process, he brings only one set of offerings. If he became impure on the eighth day, and again became impure on the following eighth day, he brings a set of offerings for each and every time he became impure. Nevertheless, he begins counting his ritually pure naziriteship immediately^N on the eighth day, even if he has not yet brought his offerings. This is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer.

And the Rabbis say: If he had not yet brought his offerings on the eighth day when he became impure, it is considered one long period of ritual impurity, and he brings one set of offerings for all the times he became impure, until he has brought his sin-offering^H at the end of his period of ritual impurity. It is only then that he can begin counting his next term of naziriteship. Therefore, if he brought his sin-offering and then became impure, and again brought his sin-offering and then again became impure, he brings a set of offerings for each and every one. If he brought his sin-offering and did not yet bring his guilt-offering, he begins to count^H his term of naziriteship in ritual purity.

Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Beroka, says: Just as not bringing his sin-offering precludes him from starting his naziriteship in ritual purity, so too, not bringing his guilt-offering precludes him from starting his naziriteship in ritual purity, and if he became impure again before he brought his guilt-offering, he only brings one set of offerings for all his impurities.

After having quoted the *baraita*, the Gemara proceeds to analyze the three opinions: Granted, according to Rabbi Eliezer, his reason is that the verse states: "And he shall sanctify his head on that day" (Numbers 6:11), which indicates: Even though he has not brought his offerings, the eighth day determines the start of his ritually pure naziriteship. And the Rabbis agree that the phrase "on that day" is extra, and it teaches that he begins counting from that day even though he has not brought his guilt-offering, but he does not begin counting until after bringing his sin-offering.

But according to Rabbi Yishmael, why do I need the phrase "on that day"? According to his opinion the issue depends on the offerings, not the day. The Gemara answers: Rabbi Yishmael could have said to you: The phrase "on that day" teaches that he can begin counting even though he has not brought his burnt-offering, as he agrees that not bringing the burnt-offering does not preclude him from counting his naziriteship. And the Rabbis respond to this: A burnt-offering does not require a limitation in the text to teach that its omission does not preclude the start of his naziriteship in ritual purity, since it is merely a gift and not part of his atonement process.

כל – אֲשֶׁה שְׁגוּרָה: All guilt-offerings in the Torah are indispensable for one's atonement, apart from that of a nazirite, as ruled by the Rabbis (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot*, *Hilkhot Shegagot* 3:11).

מאי טעמייהו דרבנן? דתנא: "והזיר לה' את ימי נזרו והביא כבש בן שנתו לאִשָּׁם" מה תלמוד לומר? לפי שמצינו שכל אֲשֶׁמוֹת שְׁבִתוּרָה שֶׁהֵן מְעַבְּרִין, יכול אף זה מְעַבְּבוּ,

The Gemara explains: **What is the reason of the Rabbis for ruling that only refraining from bringing his sin-offering precludes the start of his new count of naziriteship? As it is taught in a *baraita*:** The verse states with regard to a nazirite who became ritually impure: **"And he shall consecrate to the Lord the days of his naziriteship, and he shall bring a lamb in its first year for a guilt-offering"** (Numbers 6:12). **What does this teach?** Doesn't he wait to begin the days of his naziriteship until after he has brought all of his offerings? Rather, **since we have found that all guilt-offerings that are mentioned in the Torah^h are indispensable for atonement, and before he has brought his guilt-offering he is forbidden from partaking of any sacred offerings, one might have thought that not having brought this guilt-offering also precludes him from counting his ritually pure naziriteship,**

Perek III

Daf 19 Amud a

תלמוד לומר "והזיר... והביא" – אף על פי שלא הביא – הזיר. רבי ישמעאל בנו של רבי יוחנן בן ברוקה אומר: "והזיר... והביא". אימתי הזיר – בזמן שהביא.

the verse therefore states: **"And he shall consecrate to the Lord the days of his naziriteship, and he shall bringⁿ a lamb in its first year for a guilt-offering,"** indicating: **Even though he has not brought his guilt-offering he has nevertheless consecrated his days for the start of a new term of naziriteship.** The opinion of **Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yohanan ben Beroka,** is as follows: **The verse states: "And he shall consecrate to the Lord the days of his naziriteship, and he shall bring,"** which means: **When has he consecrated his days of naziriteship, i.e., when does his new term of naziriteship begin? It begins when he has already brought his guilt-offering.**

מאן תנא להא, דתנו רבנן: אשה שגדרה בנייר ונטמאה, ואחר כך הפר לה בעלה – מביאה חטאת העוף, ואינה מביאה עולת העוף?

The Gemara poses a question: **Who is the *tanna* who taughtⁿ this that the Sages taught: With regard to a woman who vowed to be a nazirite^h and became ritually impure,ⁿ leading her to designate a bird for a sin-offering, a bird for a burnt-offering, and a sheep for a guilt-offering, and afterward her husband nullified her vow of naziriteship for her, she brings the bird sin-offering and she does not bring the bird burnt-offering?**

HALAKHA

אשה שגדרה – אֲשֶׁה שְׁגוּרָה: A woman who vowed to be a nazirite, etc. – **בנייר וכו':** If a woman who vowed to be a nazirite became ritually impure during her term of naziriteship, and afterward her husband heard of her vow and nullified it, she brings her offerings of impurity. The implication of this statement of the Rambam is that she brings all three of them: A sin-offering, a guilt-offering, and a burnt-offering. The *Mishne LaMelekh* explains that this is because the Gemara concludes (22a) that a husband severs the vow from that point onward, so her vow was in force at the time she became ritually impure (Rambam *Sefer Hafl'da*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 9:11).

NOTES

The verse states: **And he shall consecrate and he shall bring** – תלמוד לומר והזיר... והביא: Since the verse mentions the resumption of his naziriteship before it mentions the bringing of his offering, his naziriteship of purity resumes before he brings his guilt-offering (Commentary on *Nazir*).

Who taught, etc. – מאן תנא וכי: The Commentary on *Nazir* explains: Which *tanna* found it necessary to state that a woman whose vow of naziriteship was nullified before she violated it does not have to bring a burnt-offering? It is only Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yohanan ben Beroka, who holds that the burnt-offering is an integral part of a nazirite's offerings, and he therefore holds that it is necessary for the *baraita* to teach that the burnt-offering need not be brought after the naziriteship has been nullified by the husband. Since the Rabbis hold that this burnt-offering is merely a gift, she certainly will not have to bring it in this case.

Conversely, *Tosafot* and others explain that according to Rabbi Yishmael, the very fact that the burnt-offering is an

important part of the nazirite offerings is the reason why she cannot bring it, for she is no longer obligated in the offerings of a nazirite, so the bird is not consecrated. According to the Rabbis, by contrast, since the burnt-offering is a gift and is not integral to the naziriteship, there is no reason why she should not offer it even after her naziriteship has been nullified. The Commentary on *Nazir* also cites this opinion as an alternative explanation.

Who vowed to be a nazirite and became ritually impure – שגדרה בנייר ונטמאה: *Tosafot*, the Rosh, and many other commentaries explain that this *baraita* is discussing the case of a woman who had already designated her offerings before her husband nullified her naziriteship, and the question is whether she is required to, or even can, bring them after his nullification. If she had not designated her offerings, she certainly is not obligated to bring any of them. The *Keren Ora* cites an opinion mentioned by *Tosafot* and the Ran in tractate *Nedarim* (83a) that she is obligated to bring a sin-offering even if she had not yet designated it.