

כל – אֲשֶׁה שְׁנֵרוֹהָ: All guilt-offerings that are mentioned 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 שְׁבֵתוֹרָה שֶׁהֵן מְעַבְּרִין, יְכוּל אִף זֶה מְעַבְּבוֹ.

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 שנגדרה 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 שנגדרה – אֲשֶׁה שְׁנֵרוֹהָ: A woman who vowed to be a nazirite, etc. – אֲשֶׁה שְׁנֵרוֹהָ: 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 – שנגדרה 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.

One who afflicts himself by abstaining from everything – **הַמְצַעֵר עֲצֻמוֹ מִכָּל דָּבָר** – Although one must stay away from the pursuit of the pleasures of the world when they result from jealousy, lust, and honor, it is not proper for a person to abstain from the pleasures of the world altogether and to practice self-denial. The Sages therefore directed that one should deprive himself only of things forbidden by the Torah, and he should refrain from prohibiting permitted matters to himself by means of oaths and vows (Rambam *Sefer HaMadda*, *Hilkhot Deot* 3:1; see *Shulhan Arukh*, *Orah Hayyim* 571:1).

אָמַר רַב חֲסֵדָא: רַבִּי יִשְׁמַעֵאל הִיא.

מֵאֵי קֶסֶבֶר? אִי קֶסֶבֶר בְּעַל מֵיעָקֵר עָקֵר – חֲטָאת הָעוֹף נִמְי לֹא לֵיִתִּי, אִי קֶסֶבֶר בְּעַל מֵינֹ גִיזוּ – עוֹלֹת הָעוֹף נִמְי לֵיִתִּי! לְעוֹלָם קֶסֶבֶר בְּעַל מֵיעָקֵר עָקֵר, וְרַבִּי יִשְׁמַעֵאל סָבֵר לָהּ כְּרַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר הַקָּפָר.

דִּתְנִינָא, רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר הַקָּפָר בְּרַבִּי אוֹמֵר: מַה תְּלַמּוּד לֹמַר "וְכַפֵּר עָלָיו מִאֲשֶׁר חָטָא עַל הַנֶּפֶשׁ"? וְכִי בָאִיוּ נֶפֶשׁ חָטָא זֶה? אֶלָּא שְׂצִיעֵר עֲצֻמוֹ מִן הַיַּיִן. וְקָל וְחוֹמֵר: וְיָמָּה זֶה שְׂלָא צִיעֵר עֲצֻמוֹ אֶלָּא מִן הַיַּיִן – נִקְרָא חוֹטָא, הַמְצַעֵר עֲצֻמוֹ מִכָּל דָּבָר – עַל אַחַת כְּמָה וְכְמָה.

Rav Hisda said: It is the opinion of Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yohanan ben Beroka. According to the opinion of the Rabbis, the burnt-offering is a gift, and she would bring it despite the fact that her naziriteship was nullified. According to Rabbi Yishmael, the burnt-offering is part of the atonement process, and since her naziriteship was nullified, there is no longer a need for atonement.

The Gemara asks: **What does he hold? If he holds that the husband uproots a vow entirely when he nullifies it, and she is considered not to have vowed at all, she should not bring the bird sin-offering, as she was never a nazirite, and she does not need atonement. Conversely, if he holds that the husband severs the vow from that point onward, but it did take effect beforehand, she should also bring the bird burnt-offering, as she requires atonement for becoming impure while she was a nazirite.** The Gemara answers: **Actually, he holds that the husband uproots the vow, and why is she obliged to bring a sin-offering? Rabbi Yishmael holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elazar HaKappar.^N**

As it is taught in a *baraita*: **Rabbi Elazar HaKappar, the esteemed one, says: What is the meaning when the verse states with regard to a nazirite: "And make atonement for him, for he sinned by the soul" (Numbers 6:11)? And with which soul did this person sin^N by becoming a nazirite? Rather, in afflicting himself by abstaining from wine, he is considered to have sinned with his own soul, and he must bring a sin-offering for the naziriteship itself, for causing his body to suffer. And an *a fortiori* inference can be learned from this: **Just as this person, in afflicting himself by abstaining only from wine, is nevertheless called a sinner, in the case of one who afflicts himself by abstaining from everything,^H through fasting or other acts of mortification, all the more so is he described as a sinner.** According to this opinion, Rabbi Yishmael holds that since the woman afflicted herself by abstaining from wine she must bring a sin-offering, even though, due to her husband's nullification, she did not actually become a nazirite.**

NOTES

In accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elazar HaKappar – כְּרַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר הַקָּפָר: The sin-offering is brought to atone for her self-affliction of abstaining from wine during her period as a nazirite. *Tosafot* note that if she did not become ritually impure before her husband nullified her naziriteship, she does not have to bring this sin-offering. The early authorities write, based on *Nedarim* 83a, that this *halakha* refers only to the bird sin-offering, which is brought by a nazirite who becomes impure during the term of naziriteship. Since the bird sin-offering can be offered conditionally, there is no concern that she might be violating the prohibition of bringing an unconsecrated bird into the Temple courtyard. She can therefore bring it even after her vow has been nullified, as it will serve to atone for her sin of afflicting herself by abstaining from wine. If she completed her term of naziriteship, which would obligate her to bring a sheep sin-offering, and her husband nullified her naziriteship, she does not bring a sin-offering even according to the *tanna* of this *baraita*. Since an animal sin-offering cannot be brought conditionally, bringing this offering could potentially

cause her to violate the prohibition of bringing an unconsecrated animal into the Temple courtyard.

וְכִי בָאִיוּ נֶפֶשׁ חָטָא זֶה – While the straightforward meaning of the verse would seem to be referring to a nazirite who contracted impurity through contact with a corpse, the commentaries offer several explanations as to why Rabbi Elazar HaKappar interprets it in a different manner. Some explain that this verse cannot be referring to the fact that he became impure through contact with a corpse, as this had already been written earlier in the passage (Numbers 6:9). Others explain that contracting impurity through contact with a corpse does not necessarily involve a sin, since he must bring an offering even if he was made impure against his will, as the verse states: "Very suddenly" (Numbers 6:9). Therefore, Rabbi Eliezer HaKappar understands that the sin mentioned here has nothing to do with his ritual impurity, but is referring to something he did willingly (Rabbeinu Peretz).

Since he repeated his sin – הואיל וְשָׁנָה בְּחַטָּא: He should have been careful to avoid becoming ritually impure, and by failing to do so he commits another sin (Commentary on *Nazir*). *Tosafot* and others state that his becoming ritually impure results in him extending his term of naziriteship, adding to the time that he is abstaining from wine and consequently repeating his earlier sin.

וְהָא בְּנֵזִיר טָמֵא כְּתִיב, וְאֵנָּה אֶפְיָלוּ
נֵזִיר טָהוֹר קָאֲמְרִינָן. קִסְבֵּר רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר
הַקַּפָּר: נֵזִיר טָהוֹר נִמְי חוֹטֵא הוּא, וְהֵיִינוּ
טְעַמָּא דְכְּתִיב בְּנֵזִיר טָמֵא – הוּאִיל
וְשָׁנָה בְּחַטָּא.

The Gemara raises a difficulty with Rabbi Elazar HaKappar's dictum: **But this verse, labeling the nazirite a sinner, is written with regard to an impure nazirite, and we are saying that even a pure nazirite is a sinner.** The Gemara answers: **Rabbi Elazar HaKappar holds that a pure nazirite is also a sinner. And this is the reason that the statement that a nazirite is a sinner is written in reference to an impure nazirite rather than a pure one: Since he repeated his sin,^N as his impurity causes him to start his naziriteship again, he thereby deprives himself for a longer period. He should have taken extra care to prevent this from happening.**

“יֵצֵא וְנִכְנַס עוֹלֵין לוֹ מִן הַמִּנְיָן.” קִתְּיָנָא
“עוֹלֵין לוֹ מִן הַמִּנְיָן.” מִשּׁוּם דְּיֵצֵא חָל
עֲלֵיהּ נְזִירוּתָא? אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל: בְּגוֹן שְׂנֵי צֵא
וְהֵזָה, וְשָׁנָה וְטָבַל.

§ The mishna taught that if one took a vow of naziriteship while in a cemetery, **left the cemetery, and then entered it again, the days he spent outside do count as part of his tally of his term of naziriteship, and he is obligated to bring the offerings of ritual impurity upon reentering the cemetery.** The mishna teaches: **They do count as part of his tally.** The Gemara questions the meaning of this linkage: **Does naziriteship take effect for him because he merely left the ritually impure place? He is still ritually impure, and he cannot begin counting his term of naziriteship until after he has undergone the purification process.** **Shmuel said:** The mishna is referring to a case **where he left and received the sprinkling^H of the ashes of the red heifer on the third day, and he again received the sprinkling on the seventh day and immersed,** after which he entered the cemetery a second time. Since he is now ritually pure, his naziriteship takes effect.

אֲלֵא נִכְנַס הוּא דְּעוֹלֵין לוֹ מִן הַמִּנְיָן,
לֹא נִכְנַס אִין עוֹלֵין לוֹ מִן הַמִּנְיָן? אֲלֵא
מִיִּבְעֵינָא קָאֲמַר: לֹא מִיִּבְעֵינָא יֵצֵא, אֲלֵא
אֶפְיָלוּ נִכְנַס – עוֹלֵין לוֹ מִן הַמִּנְיָן.

The Gemara poses another question: According to the precise reading of the mishna, his term of naziriteship starts only if he reentered the cemetery; **however, is it only if he returned and entered the cemetery that those days count as part of his tally, but if he did not enter, and remained outside the cemetery, those days do not count as part of his tally?** Why should the start of the naziriteship be dependent upon his reentering the cemetery? The Gemara answers: The *tanna* is speaking utilizing the style of: **It is not necessary, as follows: It is not necessary to state this halakha, that those days count as part of his tally, in the case of one who left the cemetery and began his naziriteship, but even if he entered the cemetery again immediately after his purification, those days count as part of his tally, and he will be obligated to bring the offerings of ritual impurity upon his reentry.**

אָמְרוּ לֵיהּ רַב כְּהֵנָּה וְרַב אַסִּי לְרַב: מַאי
טְעַמָּא לֹא מְפָרְשֵׁת לָן בְּהֵלֵין מִלֵּי?
אָמַר לְהוֹן: אָמֵינָא דְלָמָּא לֹא צְרִיכִיתָו.

Rav Kahana and Rav Asi said to Rav: **What is the reason you did not explain it to us with these words of Shmuel, as explained above? He said to them: I said to myself that perhaps you do not require that explanation, as I thought it was apparent that this is the proper explanation of the mishna.**

“רַבִּי אֶלְיָעָזָר אוֹמֵר לֹא בּוֹ בְּיוֹם שְׁנֵי אֲמָר:
וְהַיּוֹמִים הָרִאשׁוֹנִים יִפְלוּ, עַד שֶׁיִּהְיֶה
יָמִים רִאשׁוֹנִים.” אָמַר עוֹלָא: לֹא אָמַר
רַבִּי אֶלְיָעָזָר אֲלֵא בְּטָמֵא שְׁנֵי, אֲבָל
בְּנֵזִיר טָהוֹר שְׁנֵי טָמֵא, אֶפְיָלוּ יוֹם אֶחָד –
סוֹתֵר.

§ The mishna also taught an additional *halakha*: **Rabbi Eliezer says:** This *halakha* does not apply to one who entered the cemetery **on that very day that he left it, as it is stated with regard to the halakhot of an impure nazirite: “But the first days shall be void” (Numbers 6:12), which indicates that he does not bring the offerings unless he had his “first days” of ritual purity, during which he observed his naziriteship.** **Ulla said: Rabbi Eliezer said this halakha, that one day of naziriteship in purity is not sufficient to obligate him to bring offerings if he becomes impure, only with regard to an impure person who took a vow of naziriteship, but a pure nazirite who became impure, even if he was only pure for one day of naziriteship, it negates that day of his tally and he must bring the offerings of an impure nazirite.**

HALAKHA

בְּגוֹן – א case where he left and received the sprinkling, etc. – שְׂנֵי צֵא וְהֵזָה וְכוּ: One who took a vow of naziriteship while in a cemetery, left, and after a while reentered, does not count the days spent outside of the cemetery in his tally. However, if he left,

received the sprinkling of the ashes of the red heifer, immersed himself, began counting the days of his naziriteship, and then reentered the cemetery, those days do count as part of his tally (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 6:10).

NOTES

I am hereby a nazirite, etc. – הֲרִינִי נֹזֵר וְכוּ׃ The commentaries note that even though this *baraita* is not explicitly attributed to Rabbi Eliezer, there is no other *tanna* who holds that his tally is not negated if he became impure on the first day (Rabbeinu Peretz; Rabbeinu Azriel). However, the *Kesef Mishne* writes that the Rabbis agree with the exposition of the words “and the first days,” but they hold that it refers only to a pure nazirite who became impure, and not to an impure person who took a vow of naziriteship. In any case, the middle *halakha* of the *baraita*, concerning one who became impure on the hundredth day, certainly is true only according to Rabbi Eliezer, as the Rabbis hold that in this case, the entire tally is negated, as stated in an earlier mishna (16a).

If one became ritually impure at the end of one hundred days, etc. – נִטְמָא בְּסוֹף מֵאָה וְכוּ׃ *Tosafot* write that this does not mean that no days are negated if he became ritually impure on the one hundredth day, but rather he is required to observe only an additional thirty days, and not a full hundred, as stated in the mishna on 16a.

It is written: Shall be void – יִפְלוּ בְּתֵיבֵי: The Commentary on *Nazir* explains that the plural form of “shall be void” indicates at least two days; that is, he must have counted at least two days of his naziriteship. This explanation is in accordance with the standard text of the Gemara, which reads: I would say that the *halakha* applies only if two days have finished and a third has started. Conversely, the Rosh and others follow Rabbeinu Tam’s opinion that “shall be void” indicates any number of days, even less than one. This explanation is in accordance with the variant text of the Gemara, which reads: I would say that the *halakha* applies if one day has finished and a second has started, as this can occur in less than a day, e.g., if he began his naziriteship in the afternoon.

And had not also written shall be void – וְלֹא יִפְלוּ: That is, the verse had instead written “and the first days shall be left” (Commentary on *Nazir*) or “apart from the first days” (*Tosafot*).

I would say even one – הֲוֵה אֲמִינָא אֶפְלוּ חַד׃ If this were the meaning, then the usage of the plural form of “shall be void” would be understood as a general term for all of the days he had counted, whether many, few, or even one. Alternatively, it might refer to nazirites in general, meaning that whenever this occurs to any nazirite the days they have observed are negated.

HALAKHA

And this nazirite does not have first days – וְזֶה אֵין לוֹ רֵאשׁוֹנִים: If one became ritually impure on the first or second day of his term of naziriteship, although the Rambam rules that he must bring the offerings of impurity, it does not negate his previous days as a nazirite, and he continues to count from where he left off after he has brought his offerings. It is only if he contracted ritual impurity from the third day onward that it negates all the previous days, as the Rambam’s text is like that of the Commentary on *Nazir* (*Kesef Mishne*). The *halakha* follows Rabbi Eliezer, as his opinion is discussed by the *amora'im* (Rambam *Sefer Hafla’a, Hilkhot Nezirot* 6:6).

אָמַר רַבָּא: מַאי טַעְמָא דְרַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר – אָמַר קָרָא “כִּי טַמְא נֹזֵר” – מִשּׁוּם דְּבִטּוּמָא נֹזֵר.

אֵיתִיבֵיהּ אַבְיִי: “הֲרִינִי נֹזֵר מֵאָה יוֹם” וְנִטְמָא בְּתַחֲלַת מֵאָה, יְכוּל יְהֵא סוּתֵר? תַּלְמוּד לֹא מֵרַחֵק וְהַיְמִים הָרֵאשׁוֹנִים יִפְלוּ – עַד שְׂיֵהוּ לוֹ יָמִים רֵאשׁוֹנִים, וְזֶה אֵין לוֹ רֵאשׁוֹנִים.

נִטְמָא בְּסוֹף מֵאָה, יְכוּל יְהֵא סוּתֵר? תַּלְמוּד לֹא מֵרַחֵק וְהַיְמִים הָרֵאשׁוֹנִים יִפְלוּ – מִכְּלָל דְּאִיכָּא אַחֲרוֹנִים, וְזֶה אֵין לוֹ אַחֲרוֹנִים. נִטְמָא בְּיוֹם מֵאָה חָסֵר אַחַת, יְכוּל לֹא יְהֵא סוּתֵר – תַּלְמוּד לֹא מֵרַחֵק וְהַיְמִים הָרֵאשׁוֹנִים יִפְלוּ – מִכְּלָל דְּאִיכָּא אַחֲרוֹנִים, וְזֶה יֵשׁ לוֹ רֵאשׁוֹנִים וְאַחֲרוֹנִים.

וְהָא בְּטַמְא שְׁנוֹר לֹא מִצִּית אֲמַרְתָּ, מִדְּקַתְנִי “הֲרִינִי נֹזֵר מֵאָה” וְנִטְמָא בְּתַחֲלַת מֵאָה, וְקַתְנִי: עַד שְׂיֵהוּ לוֹ יָמִים רֵאשׁוֹנִים! תְּיִבֵּתָא.

אָמַר לִיה רַב פַּפָּא לְאַבְיִי: הֲלִינן יָמִים דְּקָאֲמַרְינן, דְּנִפְקַח חַד וּמִתְחִילִין תְּרִין, אוּ דְלִמָּא דְנִפְקִין תְּרִין וּמִתְחִילִין תְּלָתָא? לֹא הֲוֵה בִידְיָה, אֲתָא שְׂיֵלִיה לְרַבָּא. אָמַר לִיה: “יִפְלוּ” בְּתֵיב.

וְאִיצְטְרִיךְ לְמִיבְתָּב “יָמִים” וְאִיצְטְרִיךְ לְמִיבְתָּב “יִפְלוּ”; דְּאִי בְּתַב רַחֲמֵנָא “יָמִים” וְלֹא בְּתַב “יִפְלוּ”. הֲוֵה אֲמִינָא: עַד דְנִפְקִין תְּרִין וְעֵילִין תְּלָתָא, בְּתַב רַחֲמֵנָא “יִפְלוּ”. וְאִי בְּתַב “יִפְלוּ” וְלֹא בְּתַב “יָמִים” הֲוֵה אֲמִינָא: אֶפְלוּ חַד, בְּתַב רַחֲמֵנָא “יָמִים”.

Rava said: What is the reason for the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, according to Ulla’s explanation? The verse states: “But the first days shall be void because his consecration was ritually impure” (Numbers 6:12), which he explains as follows: Why are his first days rendered void? They are void because he took a vow of naziriteship, consecrating himself, when he was in a state of ritual impurity.

Abaye raised an objection to Rava from a *baraita* that is not in accordance with the opinion of Ulla: One who said: I am hereby a nazirite^N for one hundred days, and he became ritually impure immediately, at the beginning of the one hundred days, one might have thought it should negate the time he spent as a nazirite. The verse therefore states: “But the first days shall be void” (Numbers 6:12), which indicates that this *halakha* does not apply until he will have “first days” as a nazirite, and in this case the nazirite does not have his first days^H completed, as he became ritually impure right away.

The *baraita* continues: If one became ritually impure at the end of one hundred days,^N that is, on the hundredth day, one might have thought it should negate the days he had counted. The verse therefore states: “But the first days shall be void,” indicating by inference that there are other days that can be called the last ones, while this nazirite does not have last days, as he has already completed the tally of his naziriteship. If he became impure on the one hundredth day less one, one might have thought it should not negate the days he had counted. Therefore, the verse states: “But the first days shall be void,” indicating by inference that there are last ones, and this nazirite has first ones and last ones.

Abaye now concludes his objection to Rava: But with regard to this *halakha* of the *baraita*, you cannot say it is referring to an impure person who took a vow of naziriteship from the fact that it teaches: I am hereby a nazirite for one hundred days, and he became impure immediately at the beginning of the one hundred, indicating that it is discussing one who became impure after his term had already started. And it further teaches: Until he will have “first days,” which proves that Rabbi Eliezer states his *halakha* even with regard to a pure nazirite who later became impure. This is a conclusive refutation of Ulla, and his opinion is rejected.

Rav Pappa said to Abaye: Those first days that we said he must observe in ritual purity according to Rabbi Eliezer, does it mean that one day has finished and a second has started, so that if he became impure on the second day it negates his tally, or perhaps it means that two days have finished, and a third has started, which would mean it negates his tally only if he became impure after the beginning of the third day? An answer was not available to him, so Rav Pappa went to ask Rava, who said to him: It is written: “But the former days shall be void [yippelu]” (Numbers 6:12)^N in the plural, which means at least two days need to have passed.

The Gemara comments: And it was necessary for the verse to write “days” and it was also necessary for it to write “shall be void” in the plural. For if the Merciful One wrote in the Torah only “days” and had not also written “shall be void”^N in the plural, I would say that the *halakha* applies only if two days have finished and a third has started. The Merciful One therefore wrote in the Torah the plural form of “shall be void.” And if the Merciful One wrote in the Torah “shall be void” and had not also written “days,” I would say even one^N day, that is, the *halakha* applies even if he became ritually impure on the first day. The Merciful One therefore wrote in the Torah “days,” indicating that he must have observed at least part of the second day.

And afterward came to Eretz Yisrael – **אַחַר כֵּן בָּא לְאֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל**: Naziriteship can be observed only in Eretz Yisrael, and one who vowed to be a nazirite outside Eretz Yisrael is obligated to ascend to Eretz Yisrael and observe his naziriteship there for the term he had specified, in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel. However, the vow of naziriteship itself takes effect outside Eretz Yisrael, and he is prohibited to drink wine, become ritually impure through contact with a corpse, or to shave, despite the fact that these days do not count as part of his term of naziriteship. Consequently, one who takes a vow of naziriteship nowadays must ascend to Eretz Yisrael and observe naziriteship there until his death, or until the Temple is rebuilt and he can bring his offerings. The Ra'avad claims that since all are considered ritually impure from the dead at this time, even those living in Eretz Yisrael, observing one's naziriteship in Eretz Yisrael has no advantage (Rambam Sefer Hafla'a, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 2:21–22).

NOTES

The land of the nations – אֶרֶץ הָעַמִּים: Although the ritual impurity of land outside of Eretz Yisrael is not by Torah law, it is a very ancient rabbinic decree. It is mentioned already in the Bible, with regard to those exiled from the Eretz Yisrael: "You shall die in an unclean land" (Amos 7:17). The Sages, however, increased the severity of this ritual impurity. As for the reason for the decree, the early authorities discuss whether it is because they were concerned about unknown burial sites of Jews, or whether it was a decree in its own right, in order to emphasize the ritual purity of Eretz Yisrael.

With regard to its earth – מִשּׁוֹם גּוֹשָׁה: If it is only its actual earth that imparts impurity through contact and the airspace is pure, then it does not have the same severity of impurity as a corpse, which renders ritually impure anything found inside a structure with it. Therefore, the Sages were not as stringent in this case as with one who takes a vow of naziriteship while in a cemetery. This is the standard version of the text, and has been accepted by several early authorities.

However, there is a variant text that reads that Beit Shammai hold that the decree was with regard to the airspace. This means that anyone who passes through the land of the nations, even if he does not come into contact with its earth, such as one who travels in a chest, a box, or a cabinet, is nevertheless ritually impure. According to this reading, this impurity is not due to the presence of graves, as graves do not impart impurity in this way; rather, it is a special form of impurity. Therefore, the *halakha* of a nazirite outside of Eretz Yisrael is not like that of one who takes a vow of naziriteship while in a cemetery, whose days in the cemetery do not count as part of his tally (Rosh; see Rabbeinu Azriel and *Tosafot* on 20a). The text of the Gemara on the following page would also be modified according to this reading.

מתני' מי שגזר נזירות הרבה, והשלים את נזירותו, ואחר כך בא לארץ, בית שמאי אומרים: נזיר שלשים יום, ובית הלל אומרים: נזיר בתחלה.

MISHNA One who vowed many days of naziriteship while outside Eretz Yisrael, and completed his naziriteship, and afterward came to Eretz Yisrael,^h in order to bring the offerings at the end of his naziriteship, **Beit Shammai say: He must be a nazirite for thirty days, so that he has observed a term of naziriteship in ritual purity in Eretz Yisrael, and Beit Hillel say: He is a nazirite from the beginning, that is, he must observe his entire naziriteship again.**

מעשה בהילני המלכה שהלך בנה למלחמה, ואמר: אם יבוא בני מן המלחמה בשלום – אהא נזירה שבע שנים. ובא בנה מן המלחמה, והיתה נזירה שבע שנים. ובסוף שבע שנים עלתה לארץ, והזרחה בית הלל שתהא נזירה עוד שבע שנים אחרות. ובסוף שבע שנים נטמאת, ונמצאת נזירה עשרים ואחת שנה. אמר רבי יהודה: לא היתה נזירה אלא ארבע עשרה שנה.

The mishna cites a related story: **An incident occurred with regard to Queen Helene,^p whose son had gone to war, and she said: If my son will return from war safely, I will be a nazirite for seven years. And her son returned safely from the war, and she was a nazirite for seven years. And at the end of seven years, she ascended to Eretz Yisrael, and Beit Hillel instructed her, in accordance with their opinion, that she should be a nazirite for an additional seven years. And at the end of those seven years she became ritually impure, and was therefore required to observe yet another seven years of naziriteship, as ritual impurity negates the tally of a nazirite. And she was found to be a nazirite for twenty-one years. Rabbi Yehuda said: She was a nazirite for only fourteen years and not twenty-one.**

גמ' קתני רישא: בית שמאי אומרים נזיר שלשים יום, ובית הלל אומרים: נזיר בתחלה, לימא בהא קמיפלגי: דבית שמאי סברי: ארץ העמים משום גושה גזרו עליה.

GEMARA The first clause of the mishna teaches that **Beit Shammai say: He must be a nazirite for thirty days, and Beit Hillel say: He is a nazirite from the beginning.** The Gemara suggests a possible explanation of their dispute: **Let us say that they disagree about this, that Beit Shammai hold that when the Sages declared that the land of the nationsⁿ outside of Eretz Yisrael is impure, they decreed so with regard to its earth.ⁿ In other words, they decreed that only the earth of the land of the nations is impure, but its airspace remains pure. If so, it is not a severe level of ritual impurity, and one who observed a vow of naziriteship outside of Eretz Yisrael is not considered to be impure to the extent that he would be required to start his naziriteship afresh once entering Eretz Yisrael,**

PERSONALITIES

Queen Helene – הילני המלכה: Helene, or in Greek Ἑλένη, *Helenē*, was queen of Adiabene, a small country subjugated to the Parthian Empire. Located on the Tigris River, it was situated in what is today northern Syria. More than a generation prior to the destruction of the Second Temple, Helene and her two sons, Munbaz and Izats, converted to Judaism, apparently along with much of the local nobility.

Queen Helene and her two sons maintained strong ties to the Jewish community in Eretz Yisrael. They would send substantial gifts to the Temple and enormous sums of money to assist the poor in years of drought. It is plausible that members of the royal family of Adiabene are buried in the magnificent Graves of the Kings in Jerusalem.

As mentioned in the Talmud, Queen Helene was a righteous proselyte who accepted upon herself all elements of *halakha* as taught to her by the Sages.



Images of the remains of what is believed to be Helene's palace in Jerusalem